

SITE SPECIFIC SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

1. Site Details

Site Name:	Wicks Farm	Site Address:	Land at Wicks Farm, South of Ford Lane, Ford, West Sussex, BN18 0HY
NGR:	498848, 103390		
Site Ref Number:	38664	Site Type: ¹	Macro

2. Pre Application Check List

Site Selection

Was an LPA mast register used to check for suitable sites by the operator or the LPA?	Yes	
If no explain why: N/A		
Was the industry site database checked for suitable sites by the operator:	Yes	
If no explain why: N/A		

Annual roll out consultation with LPA

Date of last annual rollout information/submission:	Annual Roll Out Plans issued October 2009
Name of Contact:	Chief Planning Officer
Summary of outcome/Main issues raised:	Not aware of any response received.

Pre-application consultation with LPA

Date of written offer of pre-application consultation:	N/A
Was there pre-application contact:	No
Date of pre-application contact:	N/A
Name of contact:	N/A
Summary of outcome/Main issues raised: In this instance no pre-application consultation was carried out. It is not considered necessary due to the minor nature of the proposal.	

¹ Macro or Micro

Ten Commitments Consultation

Rating of Site under Traffic Light Model:	Green		
Outline Consultation carried out: Letters have sent to Ward Councillors for the Yapton Ward and Ford Parish Council at the time of submission of this application, informing them of the proposal.			
Summary of outcome/Main issues raised: Any relevant comments be received they will be forwarded when received.			

School/College

Location of site in relation to school/college: There are no schools close to the site.
Outline of consultation carried out with school/college: None carried out.
Summary of outcome/Main issues raised: N/A

Civil Aviation Authority/Secretary of State for Defence/Aerodrome Operator consultation (only required for an application for prior approval)

Will the structure be within 3km of an aerodrome or airfield?		No
Has the Civil Aviation Authority/Secretary of State for Defence/Aerodrome Operator been notified?		No
Details of response: N/A		

Developer's Notice

Copy of Developer's Notice enclosed?	Yes	
Date served:	29 October 2010	

3. Proposed Development

The proposed site: The site is an existing telecommunications base station which provides O2 with 2G coverage to the surrounding area. The area is rural in character. The existing installation is located close mature trees to the site which provide a high degree of screening. All telecommunications development has an impact on its surrounding area, however it is considered that the chosen option keeps this impact to an absolute minimum. An existing telecommunications site is proposed to be utilised and this will allow O2 to gain 3G coverage of the surrounding area with no additional impact.

Type of Structure:	
Description:	
The removal of the existing 15 metre high monopole mast and its replacement with a new 15 metre high monopole mast complete with 3 no. antennas, the installation of radio equipment within the existing cabinet, and development works ancillary thereto.	
Overall Height:	15 Metres
Height of existing building:	N/A
Equipment Housing:	
Length:	N/A
Width:	N/A
Height:	N/A
Materials:	
Tower/mast etc – type of material and external colour:	Steel pole with a brown wood effect finish.
Equipment housing – type of material and external colour:	Existing cabinets are grey – no changes proposed.

Reasons for choice of design:
This design has been chosen as it allows the upgrade of the site whilst keeping the impact of the proposal to an absolute minimum. This ensures the overall number of telecommunications sites in the area is kept to a minimum. This approach accords with the recommendations held within PPG8.

4. Technical Information

ICNIRP Declaration attached	Yes	
ICNIRP public compliance is determined by mathematical calculation and implemented by careful location of antennas, access restrictions and/or barriers and signage as necessary. Members of the public cannot unknowingly enter areas close to the antennas where exposure may exceed the relevant guidelines. When determining compliance the emissions from all mobile phone network operators on the site are taken into account.		
Frequency:	2100 UMTS 2134.9MHz - 2149.7MHz	
Modulation characteristics²	QPSK and GMSK	
Power output (expressed in EIRP in dBW per carrier)	30 dBW	

² The modulation method employed in GSM is GMSK (Gaussian Minimum Shift Keying) which is a form of Phase modulation

The modulation method employed in UMTS is QPSK (Quad Phase Shift Keying) which is another form of Phase Modulation

In order to minimise interference within its own network and with other radio networks, O2 operates its network in such a way the radio frequency power outputs are kept to the lowest levels commensurate with effective service provision	
As part of O2's network, the radio base station that is the subject of this application will be configured to operate in this way.	
Height of antenna (m above ground level)	13.8m (u/s of antennas)

5. Technical Justification

Enclose predictive coverage plots.

Reason(s) why site required e.g. coverage, upgrade, capacity (map attached if required):
This application is required in order to provide improved O2 network 3G services to the area surrounding the proposed site. This is required to be improved as part of a drive to increase network coverage and capacity. The coverage plots attached as part of this application illustrate the need for an installation in the area to provide additional O2 3G network coverage and capacity. The plots showing the existing coverage clearly shows that there is a deficiency in O2 3G coverage. The plots showing proposed coverage represents the coverage that will be provided by the proposed site integrated into the network. As can be seen from these plots the proposed development shall greatly improve O2 3G coverage to the area. Further detail regarding the general operation of the network can be found in the accompanying document entitled 'General Background Information for Telecommunications Development'. This information is provided to assist the local planning authority in understanding any technical constraints on the location of the proposed development.

6. Site Selection Process – alternative sites considered and not chosen (Enclose map highlighting all alternatives that have been considered by the operator)

Site ³	Site Name and address	NGR	Reason for not choosing ⁴
	N/A		

If no alternative site options have been investigated, please explain why:

As this application is for the upgrade of an existing O2 base station site in order to provide improved O2 network 3G coverage and capacity no alternative locations have been examined.

³ ETS – Existing Telecomm site, ES – Existing Structure, RT – Roof Top, GF – Greenfield
⁴ SP – Site Provider, RD – Redevelopment Not Possible, T – Technical Difficulties, P – Planning, O – Other

Additional relevant information:

This brief statement outlines the background to this proposal for the upgrade of this existing Vodafone base station at this location and explains it within the context of the wider network and planning policy and Guidance.

Schedule 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory purchase Act 2004 states "If regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the Planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise."

The Arun District Local Plan (Adopted 2003) is the adopted relevant development plan document for the area. Policy DEV41 is the relevant policy to telecommunications development and is copied in full below:

POLICY DEV41 Telecommunications

Planning permission will be granted for telecommunications development provided that it is demonstrated that careful consideration has been given to possible sharing of sites or use of existing buildings or structures, and that there are no satisfactory alternative sites available, and the following criteria are met:

- (i) Development will not be permitted within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Sites of Special Scientific Interest or Conservation Areas unless the developer is able to demonstrate a sequential approach has been taken and that there are no suitable alternative locations. Under such circumstances considerable weight will be placed on good design and landscaping to minimise visual intrusion. Elsewhere, proposals should not harm local amenity.**
- (ii) The use of conditions or planning agreements will be considered to secure landscaping, as well as restoration of the site once operations have ceased.**

Where prior notification is required, the Council will require developers to demonstrate what attempts have been made to minimise impact through appropriate siting and design.

It is considered the proposal complies with the above policy for the following reasons:

- (i) the site is not located within the AONB or other sensitive area and it is considered the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on local amenity;**
- (ii) impact is minimised by utilising an existing site and replacing the pole with one of the same height. 3G coverage would be provided with no additional impact;**
- (iii) no additional landscaping is proposed, however the existing trees close to the site provide a high level of screening to the development.**

The Code of Best Practice and PPG8 stresses the Government's aim to facilitate the growth of new and existing telecommunications systems while keeping the environmental impact to a minimum.

PPG8 Paragraph 19 states:

'In order to limit visual intrusion, the Government attaches considerable importance to keeping the numbers of radio and telecommunications masts, and the sites for such installations, to the minimum consistent with the efficient operation of the network.'

In relation to the new 3rd Generation service requirements, PPG8, Appendix – Supporting Guidance, Paragraph 28 States;

'...They [The Network Operators] are expected to use existing structures where possible (including those owned by other operators and radio site management companies) though they will likely also need to develop a substantial number of new site.'

Paragraph 123 of the Code of Best Practice states 'The Governments General policy on telecommunications development is to facilitate the growth of efficient and effective telecommunications systems whilst keeping the environmental impact of such development to a minimum. The siting and design of telecommunications equipment, if undertaken with care and sensitivity, will be vital in achieving this policy aim. Good siting and design should not only be respected in environmentally sensitive areas but also be applied to all.'

We believe that the selected option represents the best compromise between the operational needs of Vodafone and O2 and the inevitable environmental impact of telecommunications with this application fully complying with national policy guidelines.

Siting of equipment:

The design and siting of this proposed development has been chosen so as to keep to a minimum the impact upon its surroundings.

It is considered that the proposal balances the needs of O2 and amenity and environmental considerations. The equipment is located at an existing telecommunications installation and provides the required level of coverage whilst ensuring there is only the absolute minimal impact on the surrounding area. The alternative option would be for O2 to search for a separate site to provide 3G coverage which is considered to almost certainly have a greater impact than the current proposal.

Perceptions of Health and Safety

In response to the growing concern related to the health implications of exposure to electromagnetic fields (EMFs) the Government asked its statutory advisors on radiological protection (the National Radiological Protection Board (NRPB)) to establish an Independent Expert Group on Mobile Phones (IEGMP). This Group considered the concerns about the health effects from the use of mobile phones, base stations and transmitters. The expert groups' report (also known as the Stewart Report) was published in May 2000. It concluded that:

"the balance of evidence indicates that there is no general risk to the health of people living near to base stations on the basis that exposures are expected to be small

fractions of the guidelines

It is the Government's view that if a proposed development meets the International Commission on Non-Ionising Radiation Protection (ICNIRP:1998) public exposure guidelines, as recommended on a precautionary basis in the Stewart Report, it should not be necessary for a planning authority, in processing an application, to consider health effects further. This message was re-stated by Nick Raynsford to all English MPs and local authorities in a letter, dated 29 June 2000.

The EU Recommendation is based on ICNIRP (1998) guidelines for limiting general public exposure to electromagnetic fields (radio waves). ICNIRP (1998) guidelines apply a 50-fold safety margin for continuous exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields, providing a conservative public exposure guideline set at 2% of the level where replicated biological effects have actually been observed.

The UK mobile phone operators will, as a minimum, build base station sites to comply with the ICNIRP (1998) general public exposure guidelines in areas where the public spend a significant amount of time. These areas are those locations where antennas are accessible to the public without the use of climbing aids such as ladders, crossing barriers or other access controls.

Planning Policy Guidance Note 8 also makes reference to Health and Safety implications of telecommunications proposals and clearly states in paragraph 30 that:

"...it is the Government's firm view that the planning system is not the place for determining health safeguards. It remains central Government's responsibility to decide what measures are necessary to protect public health. In the Government's view, if a proposed mobile phone base station meets the ICNIRP guidelines for public exposure it should not be necessary for a local planning authority, in processing an application for planning permission or prior approval, to consider further the health aspects and concerns about them."

Although this quote comes from the PPG 8 published in August 2001, this message builds upon earlier Government statements. For example the Government's announcement on 16 March 2001 on 'Better public consultation on mobile phone masts' stated:

"It is the Government's responsibility to decide what measures are necessary to protect public health. It remains the Government's firm view that the planning system is not the appropriate mechanism for determining health safeguards... In the Government's view, if a proposed development meets the ICNIRP guidelines it should not be necessary for a local planning authority, in processing an application, to consider the health aspects further."

In a more recent report, **HEALTH EFFECTS FROM RADIOFREQUENCY ELECTROMAGNETIC FIELDS**: By the Independent Advisory Group on Non-Ionising Radiation (AGNIR), published on the 14th January 2004, AGNIR has stated that **"...exposure levels in the vicinity of mobile phone base stations are extremely low and the evidence indicates that they are unlikely to pose a health risk."**

Following on from this, the first part of the Danish Interphone study was published in January 2004. The conclusion reached from the first part of their study was that: **"On the basis of these first data from the Interphone Study, we conclude that there is no evidence for an association between use of cellular telephones and the risk of developing acoustic neuroma."**

The results of the second part of this study were published on the 13th April 2005 in 'The

Journal of the American Academy of Neurology'. The conclusions reached by this study was that "In this nationwide population based case-control study of incident meningiomas and gliomas, we found no support for the hypothesis that use of cellular telephones increases the risk for these brain tumours."

In their Factsheet (No.304) entitled ' Electromagnetic Fields and Public Health – Base Stations and Wireless Technologies' of May 2006 the World Health Organisation concluded; **" Considering the very low exposure levels and research results collected to date, there is no convincing scientific evidence that the weak RF signals from Base stations and Wireless Networks cause adverse health effects."**

This was further substantiated in the findings, of the recent Danish study, of the "Cellular Telephone Use and Cancer Risk: Update of a Nationwide Danish Cohort" published on the 8th December 2006, in the "Journal of the National Cancer Institute". This is a follow-up to the 2001 paper from the same study group. The study group was over 400k private Danish mobile phone users (as of 1982-1995) has been monitored for cancer incidence and statistics prepared to investigate the association of disease with various agents including mobile phone use. Overall, this study should be seen as reassuring for our customers in that it is the first such study to make strong reassuring statements about long-term mobile phone use not being associated with an increased risk of cancer. The report concludes that: ***"We found no evidence for an association between tumor risk and cellular telephone use among either short-term or long-term users. Moreover, the narrow confidence intervals provide evidence that any large association of risk of cancer and cellular telephone use can be excluded"***

Cancer Research UK have recently stated; **"Many research studies have failed to find an increased brain cancer risk to mobiles. Mobile phone base stations are unlikely to increase your cancer risk either. The exposure you would get from a base station is usually a hundred times or more below international guidelines. And it is much less than the exposure you would get from a phone."**

The Irish Government published a report from an Expert Group on the Health Effects of Electromagnetic Fields in March 2007 which concluded **"So far no adverse short or long-term health effects have been found from exposure to the radiofrequency (RF) signals produced by mobile phones and base station transmitters. RF signals have not been found to cause cancer."**

In relation to the continued operation of the site in relation to the ICNIRP guidelines all base stations are designed so as to operate well within these guidelines. Under the terms of the mobile operators operating licence "a person authorised by the Secretary of State" can take measurements at any time to confirm that maximum permissible levels are not being exceeded. Generally random unannounced audits are undertaken by OFCOM on behalf of the DTI. These random tests can also be requested via the Mobile Operators Information (MOA).

It is also of noted that Research into Radio Frequency has been undertaken globally for the past 50 years or more, the consensus of which is that there is no substantiated link between mobile technology and adverse health effects.

The Stewart report goes on to state **"Some people propose that new developments should only be permitted when they have been shown to be completely safe, but this is unrealistic. Science can never provide a guarantee of Zero risk."**

The House of Commons Science and Technology Committee in its report Mobile Phones and Health further expands on this; **"No matter how much research is done, it will never be possible to prove that something is not harmful. Scientific research can say that there is no evidence of risk or it can demonstrate that any risk is very low, but it cannot produce evidence of no risk."**

One of the key recommendations of the Stewart Report published in 2000 by the Independent Expert Group on Mobile Phones (IEGMP) was that an independent research programme be established in the UK. The Mobile Telecommunications and Health Research Programme (MTHR) commenced in 2001, with the purpose of co-coordinating and scientifically managing a research programme on the possible impact on health from mobile telecommunications. The programme, established by the UK Government, and funded jointly by Government and industry, was conducted under the direction of an independent scientific management committee, free of any influence from the government and industry that funds it. The report concludes "none of the research supported by the programme and published so far demonstrates that biological or adverse health effects are produced by radiofrequency exposure from mobile phones." The report also notes that measurements of radio signals from base stations show that exposures are well below international guidelines.

These MTHR interim findings are consistent with the conclusions that no adverse health effects from mobile phone use have been established reflected in the significant number of independent scientific reviews published in the UK and around the world during the past six years. Equally reassuring, the MTHR report recognises that no further research is required in certain areas.

It can be seen that the site subject of this application has been sited and designed in line with current Local, National and International guidelines.

Conclusion

It can be seen that the development as proposed within this application has been sited and designed in line with all local, national and international guidelines as well as the telecommunication industries Code of Best Practice. There is a clear and demonstrable need for the proposal, due consideration has been given to all practicable solutions for providing the required telecommunications service and this proposal has been designed in such a way as to minimise its visual impact upon the surrounding area.

Given the above we request that due consideration is given to the planning application and we look forward to your determination in due course.

Contact Details

**Name: (Agent)
Operator:**

**Telephone:
Fax no:**

Address:

Email Address:

Signed:

Date:

Position:

**Company:
(on behalf of
above operator)**