APPLICATION NO:
TL/2000/0705

LOCATION:
Land Adjacent 257 Nine Mile Ride, Finchampstead Wokingham.

APPLICANT:
One 2 One C/O Commpro Acquisition Services

PROPOSAL:
Proposed erection of 10 m high monopole with one *tri-sector* antenna and one equipment cabinet

EARLIEST DATE FOR DECISION: **30/03/2000**

APPLICATION EXPIRY DATE: **13/04/2000**

CASE OFFICER: **Elaine Connor**

WITHDRAWN

WORK SHEET FOR : Elaine Connor

Application Number : TL/2000/0705

Applicant : One 2 One C/O Commpro Acquisition Services.

Location : Land Adjacent 257, Nine Mile Ride, Finchampstead, Wokingham.

Proposal : Proposed erection of 10 m high monopole with one tri-sector antenna and one equipment cabinet

Site Notice Displayed ? :

YES	NO	DATE
✓		10-3-2000.

Date of Neighbour Notifications : .....

Date of Site Visit : 10-3-2000

Date Registered : 02/03/2000

Earliest Date for Decision : 30/03/2000

Latest Consultation Date/Site Notice Expiry Date : 30/03/2000

Application Expiry Date: 13/04/2000

Consultation Responses :
ENV. HEALTH : See file for comments.

PARISH COUNCIL : OBJECT - See file.

OBS : ~~26 LETTERS~~. 27, LETTERS.

PETITION : 398.

Planning Issues :
* PUBLIC PERCEPTION / CONCERN

Application Number: TL/2000/0705

Appraisal:

The proposed telecommunications mast is to be located on land adjacent to 257 Nine Mile Ride (Belmont Stores). The site itself actually lies on Kiln Ride. The area in question is an established and fairly densely populated residential area. The proposal involves a monopole construction, 10m in height, with tri-sector antenna fixed on to the top, and one equipment cabin.

Proximity to Residential Properties

The closest residential property to the proposed site is a flat above Belmont Stores (no.259 Nine Mile Ride), which is approximately 0.6m to the west. Kiln Ride extends for some distance in either direction (north and south) and has residential properties along. The site is also within close proximity to residential properties on Nine Mile Ride.

The National Radilogical Protection Board's (NRPB) current advice is that there is no proven human health risk from these installations. This position is confirmed by the Chartered Institute of Environmental Health and pressure groups such as Powerwatch Networks. Further research is currently being undertaken into possible health implications, although to date no definitive statement can be made.

26 letters of objection were received to the proposal, along with a petition of 398 signatures, from concerned local residents. The main issues raised were concerned with possible health risks and devaluation of properties. It is considered that this level of objection represents significant public concern about the effects of the proposal .

It is considered that the issue is not whether owners of neighbouring properties will suffer some form of financial or other loss, more whether the proposal will have a detrimental effect on the locality generally and on amenities that ought, in the public interest, to be protected. In an appeal against Wokingham District Council's refusal of planning permission, for telecommunications equipment the Inspector comments on the advice given in PPG1. This advice states that local opposition is not in itself a ground for refusing planning permission, unless that opposition is founded upon valid planning resons which can be substantiated. The Inspector commented that perceived fears are capable of being a material consideration, provided those fears are reasonably related to the development.

Given the level of perceived fear in relation to possible health hazards, in this case, (the circumstances around which are so uncertain), and the LPA'S capacity to act in the interests of the public, it is considered that the proposal would have a detrimental effect on the locality generally and on the amenities of the local community in particular.

Conclusion

It is considered that given the weight of public opinion showing public perception of danger as a result of the proposal, the application should be recommended for REFUSAL

RECOMENDATION: Refusal

Application Number TL/2000/0705
Conditions/Reasons for Refusal

No	Std Con	Std Reas	Non Std Conditions / Reasons for Refusal

RECORD OF SITE VISIT

SITE ADDRESS: Land Adjacent 257 Nine Mile Ride Finchampstead Wokingham.

APPLICATION NUMBER: TL/2000/0705

OFFICER: Elaine Connor

DATE OF SITE VISIT: 10/3/00

1 SITE/STATUTORY NOTICE DISPLAYED ? YES.

2. DESCRIPTION OF SURROUNDINGS
established residential area.
Identified settlement.

3. DESCRIPTION OF SITE/BUILDING
verge - along Kiln Ride, adjacent to 'Belmont Stores.'

4. RELATIONSHIP TO ADJOINING PROPERTIES
within 1 m of closest residential property.

5. SITE CONSTRAINTS

TREES N/A.

ACCESS/PARKING

LEVELS

BOUNDARY TREATMENT

OTHERS

COMMPRO
acquisition services

27980

EC

COPIES TO: ACK: FILE:

Our ref: CD/1/o2o/71015/wdl
Your ref: EC/TL/2000/0705

The Principal Development Control Officer
Wokingham District Council
PO Box 157
Shute End
Wokingham, Berkshire
RG40 1WR

For the attention of Elaine Connor

30 March 2000

Dear Sir

Application Tl/2000/0705 – Land adjacent 257 Nine Mile Ride, Finchampstead

I thank you for your letter dated 27th March and refer to my discussion this afternoon with your Miss Connor when we discussed the Council's policy as to the proximity of such telecommunications installations to existing property.

Whilst we do not accept that this policy is sustainable in all situations, and may well have to revert to you with a revised application that still falls within your own 60m guidelines, we recognise that the siting of this particular installation is such that it is not one for which you would wish to make an exception.

Accordingly, to save you any further work, we hereby withdraw our application of 28th February.

Yours faithfully

C I Duncan FRICS

Commpro Acquisition Services Limited: Unit 1 Silkstone Court, Dodworth Business Park, Barnsley, South Yorkshire S75 3SP
Telephone: 01226 290822 Facsimile: 01226 299427 e-mail: cas@commpro.co.uk
Registered Office: Hathaway House, Popes Drive, London N3 1QF
Registered Number 3453076 England

Received by Wokingham District Council

Application No: TL/2000/0705

Proposal:
Proposed erection of 10 m high monopole with one tri-sector antenna and one equipment cabinet

Location:
Land Adjacent 257, Nine Mile Ride, Finchampstead, Wokingham.

The application is available for inspection at Wokingham District Council's offices during the following times:

PLANNING DEPARTMENT, SHUTE END, WOKINGHAM TEL (0118) 974 6428
8.30 - 5.00 Monday - Thursday & 8.30 - 4.00 Friday

WOODLEY LIBRARY HEADLEY ROAD WOODLEY (9.30am - 7.00pm Mon, Thurs & Fri. 9.30am - 5.00pm Tues, 9.30am - 1.00pm Saturday. closed all day Wednesday). If you intend to view this application at Woodley Library (see details above) please allow 4 days from the date of this letter for delivery of plans.

Comments should be sent in writing QUOTING THE APPLICATION NUMBER to the Case Officer Elaine Connor P.O. Box 157 Council Offices, Shute End, Wokingham Berkshire, RG40 1WR to arrive on or before 30/03/2000. Written comments submitted will become available for public inspection.

In view of the very large number of planning applications and letters of comment received, it will not normally be possible for an individual reply to observations made. However any comments will be taken into account when the application is determined and you will be notified of the decision.

Head Planning and Transportation

Tel: (0118) 974 6451

Date:

My ref: TL/2000/0705

Environmental Services Department
Planning Services
P.O. Box 157
Shute End, Wokingham
Berkshire RG40 1WR
Tel: (0118) 974 6000
Fax: (0118) 974 6484
Minicom No: (0118) 974 6991
DX: 33506 – Wokingham

CONFIDENTIAL

Councillor G Cockroft
113a Nine Mile Ride
Finchampstead
RG40 4HX

Dear Councillor

Application Number: TL/2000/0705
Land Adjacent 257, Nine Mile Ride, Finchampstead, Wokingham.
Proposed erection of 10 m high monopole with one tri-sector antenna and one equipment cabinet

I write to let you know that the above mentioned application has been recommended for APPROVAL: ☐ REFUSAL: ☐ under delegated powers.

If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact **Elaine Connor** on **(0118) 974 6451**. If you then feel the application needs to be transferred to the next available Development Control Sub-Committee for decision please fill in the form below.
This form must be received no later than _____

Yours faithfully

Head of Planning and Transportation

LISTING FORM
Case officer: **Elaine Connor** Application Number: **TL/2000/0705**
Land Adjacent 257, Nine Mile Ride, Finchampstead, Wokingham.
Proposed erection of 10 m high monopole with one tri-sector antenna and one equipment cabinet

Transfer: Yes ☐ No ☐
Reason for Transfer:

_____

_____

Signed: _____ Date: _____

Councillor G Cockroft

NB. It would be helpful for speedy decision making if you could respond, even if you do not wish this application to be transferred.

Tel: (0118) 974 6451

Date:

My ref: TL/2000/0705

CONFIDENTIAL

Councillor M Long
Foxfield
Wick Hill Lane
Finchampstead
RG40 3PY

Environmental Services Department
Planning Services
P.O. Box 157
Shute End, Wokingham
Berkshire RG40 1WR
Tel: (0118) 974 6000
Fax: (0118) 974 6484
Minicom No: (0118) 974 6991
DX: 33506 – Wokingham

Dear Councillor

Application Number: TL/2000/0705
Land Adjacent 257, Nine Mile Ride, Finchampstead, Wokingham.
Proposed erection of 10 m high monopole with one tri-sector antenna and one equipment cabinet

I write to let you know that the above mentioned application has been recommended for APPROVAL: ☐ REFUSAL: ☐ under delegated powers.

If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact **Elaine Connor** on **(0118) 974 6451**. If you then feel the application needs to be transferred to the next available Development Control Sub-Committee for decision please fill in the form below.
This form must be received no later than _____

Yours faithfully

Head of Planning and Transportation

LISTING FORM
Case officer: **Elaine Connor** Application Number: **TL/2000/0705**
Land Adjacent 257, Nine Mile Ride, Finchampstead, Wokingham.
Proposed erection of 10 m high monopole with one tri-sector antenna and one equipment cabinet

Transfer: Yes ☐ No ☐
Reason for Transfer:
_____
_____

Signed: _____ Date: _____

Councillor M Long

NB. It would be helpful for speedy decision making if you could respond, even if you do not wish this application to be transferred.

COMMPRO
acquisition services

02 MAR 2000

Our ref: AF/1/o2o/71015/LN

Head of Planning and Transportation
Wokingham District Council
Environmental Services Department
Planning Services
PO Box 157
Shute End, Wokingham
Berkshire
RG40 1WR

02.MAR2000* 0705

Attention: Ms Carol Humphrey

28 February 2000

Dear Sir

LICENCE NOTICE

PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT PROPOSED BY ONE 2 ONE PERSONAL COMMUNICATIONS LIMITED FOR THE INSTALLATION OF A GROUND BASED 12M "STREETWORKS" MONOPOLE MAST WITH ASSOCIATED ANTENNAE AND EQUIPMENT CABIN AND DEVELOPMENT ANCILLARY THERETO ON KILN RIDE, WICK HILL, FINCHAMPSTEAD RG40 3NS - CELL 71015.

One 2 One Personal Communications Limited has been licensed to provide a Personal Communications Network (PCN) within the United Kingdom. In order to facilitate the deployment of the network, the Company has been conferred the status of a Public Telecommunications Code System Operator. PCN systems are designated as Public Telecommunications Systems under Section 9 of the Telecommunications Act 1984.

As a condition of their Operating Licence, One 2 One Personal Communications Limited are obliged to advise you of their intention to carry out the development outlined above and as specified on the attached drawings o2o/71015/01,02 & 03. The proposal constitutes permitted development under Class A of Part 24 of Schedule 2 of the Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (as amended). Accordingly, we hereby provide you with 42 days Notice of our intention to carry out the development as described above.

Yours faithfully

On behalf of
One 2 One Personal Communications Limited

Recorded Delivery &
Advice of Delivery

Enc: (1) Drawings o2o/71015/01,02 & 03

Commpro Acquisition Services Limited: Unit 1 Silkstone Court, Dodworth Business Park, Barnsley, South Yorkshire S75 3SP
Telephone: 01226 290822 Facsimile: 01226 299427 e-mail: cas@commpro.co.uk
Registered Office: Hathaway House, Popes Drive, London N3 1QF
Registered Number 3453076 England

COMMPRO
acquisition services

42 days 13/4/00

Our ref: AF/1/o2o/71015/GDO1

02 MAR 2000

£35-00
(15)

Head of Planning and Transportation
Wokingham District Council
Environmental Services Department
Planning Services
PO Box 157
Shute End, Wokingham
Berkshire
RG40 1WR

Attention: Ms Carol Humphrey

28 February 2000

Dear Sir

APPLICATION FOR DETERMINATION AS TO WHETHER PRIOR APPROVAL IS REQUIRED FOR DEVELOPMENT PERMITTED BY PART 24 OF SCHEDULE 2 OF THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (GENERAL PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT) ORDER 1995 (AS AMENDED) PROPOSED BY ONE 2 ONE PERSONAL COMMUNICATIONS LIMITED ON KILN RIDE, WICK HILL, FINCHAMPSTEAD RG40 3NS.

One 2 One Personal Communications Limited has been licensed to provide a Personal Communications Network (PCN) within the United Kingdom. In order to facilitate the deployment of the network, the Company has been conferred the status of a Public Telecommunications Code System Operator. PCN systems are designated as Public Telecommunications Systems under Section 9 of the Telecommunications Act 1984.

We write on behalf of One 2 One Personal Communications Limited to make application under Condition A.2.(4) of the above Order. We attach drawings o2o/71015/01/02 and 03 specifying the proposed installation which comprises ground based antennae and equipment cabinet, together with a cheque made payable to the Council for the sum of £35 (thirty five pounds). Please note that this application only relates to certain components of the installation.

Yours faithfully

On behalf of
One 2 One Personal Communications Limited

Recorded Delivery &
Advice of Delivery

Enc: (1) Cheque in respect of application
(2) Information Form as per Part 2.1(ii) of the Code
(3) Copy of site notice and plan
(4) Drawing Nos. o2o/71015/01/02 and 03

02.MAR2000* 0705

Commpro Acquisition Services Limited: Unit 1 Silkstone Court, Dodworth Business Park, Barnsley, South Yorkshire S75 3SP
Telephone: 01226 290822 Facsimile: 01226 299427 e-mail: cas@commpro.co.uk
Registered Office: Hathaway House, Popes Drive, London N3 1QF
Registered Number 3453076 England

INFORMATION TO ACCOMPANY AN APPLICATION FOR PRIOR APPROVAL DETERMINATION UNDER PART 24 OF THE GPDO IN RESPECT OF PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT BY TELECOMMUNICATIONS CODE SYSTEM OPERATORS (PART 2.1 (II) OF THE CODE REFERS).

1 PRE-APPLICATION CONSULTATION WITH LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY

i) Licence notification ie. pre rollout of network	Date Unknown
Name of LPA Contact	

ii) On sites in specific cell(s)	Date 5 November 1999
Name of LPA contact: Ms Carol Humphrey	

2A NAME AND ADDRESS OF APPLICANT

Name	ONE 2 ONE PERSONAL COMMUNICATIONS LIMITED		
Address	ELSTREE TOWER, ELSTREE WAY, BOREHAMWOOD, HERTFORDSHIRE		
Postcode	WD6 1DT	Tel	0181 214 2121

2B AGENT'S NAME, ADDRESS AND CONTACT

Name	COMMPRO ACQUISITION SERVICES		
Address	UNIT 1, SILKSTONE COURT, DODWORTH BUSINESS PARK, BARNSLEY		
Postcode	S75 3SP	Tel	01226 290822
Contact	ANTHONY FOGARTY		

2C LOCATION OF PROPOSAL

Location **Kiln Ride, Wick Hill, Finchampstead, RG40 3NS**

2D O.S. SHEET/GRID REFERENCE

Sheet and six figure grid reference of proposed development	
Sheet	Grid Reference **480379/164969**

02.MAR2000* 0705

3 PURPOSE OF DEVELOPMENT

To provide coverage along the B3430, near Wick Hill, Wokingham.

4 THE PROPOSED STRUCTURE (Please enclose a site plan and indicate details of cell boundaries, and whether shared mast/tower or free-standing)

i) Type of Structure (eg. tower, mast, etc.)

Overall height **10** metres

Height of existing building (where applicable) **N/A** metres

ii) Equipment Housing

Length **1340** mm Width **425** mm Height **1527** mm

iii) Materials (as applicable)

Tower/mast etc.:- type of material and external colour **steel/unpainted**

Equipment Housing:- type of material and external colour **steel/light grey**

iv) Location of and distance to nearest residential or commercial property (where applicable):- 0.75 metres

5 DISTANCE FROM AIRFIELD OR AERODROME (Please tick as appropriate)

Will the structure be within 3km of an aerodrome or airfield?	~~Yes~~ / No
Has the Civil Aviation Authority and Secretary of state for Defence (as appropriate) been notified?	~~Yes~~ / No

Signed Date 28 February 2000

On behalf of **ONE 2 ONE PERSONAL COMMUNICATIONS LIMITED**

02.MAR2000* 0705

NOTICE

Proposed development at Grid Reference	**Kiln Ride, Wick Hill, Finchampstead, RG40 3NS** **480379/164969**
I give notice that	**Commpro Acquisition Services**
on behalf of	**One 2 One Personal Communications Limited**
is applying to	**Wokingham District Council**

under paragraph A.2(4A) of Part 24 of Schedule 2 to the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 for its determination as to whether the prior approval of the authority will be required to the siting and appearance of a

10m high monopole with one tri-sector antenna and one equipment cabinet (1340 x 425 x 1527 mm high)

Under Part 24 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995, Wokingham District Council are allowed 42 days beginning with the date of application to consider whether prior approval will be required to the siting and appearance of the development proposed and, if so, to give or refuse such approval and to serve that decision upon the applicant.

Members of the public may inspect copies of the application and accompanying plans at the Environmental Services Department, Shute End, Wokingham.

Individuals and organisations wishing to make representations about the siting and appearance of the proposed development are invited to forward their views in writing no later than **20th March 2000** to the **Head of Planning and Transportation, Environmental Services Department, Planning Services, PO Box 157, Shute End, Wokingham, Berkshire, RG40 1WR** clearly stating that comments are being forwarded in relation to the proposed development of a ground-based mast on **Kiln Ride, Wick Hill, Finchampstead, RG40 3NS**, Grid Reference **480379/164969.**

SIGNED: _____ **(Commpro Acquisition Services)**

ON BEHALF OF: **One 2 One Personal Communications Limited**

DATED: 28/2/00

02.MAR2000* 0705

TC/2000/0706 WRONGLY FILED.
0705

295,NINE MILE RIDE,
WOKINGHAM,
BERKS.
RG40 3NS.

Tel..01189 733075.



Head of Planning and Transportation.
Wokingham District Council.

Ref Kiln Ride Wick Hill. *Proposed 10 m high monopole and equipment cabinet.*

Dear sir.

We understand that a proposal has been made to erect the above mast adjacent to Belmont Stores.

The junction at Nine Mile Ride and Kiln Ride is already a very dangerous one for both vehicles and pedestrians,with traffic already parking to use the telephone and letter boxes and for commercial vans servicing the telephone junction equipment.A bus stop is nearby.

The erection of a mast would obviously lead to a further impediment to vision at this road junction, and would also require periodic visits by servicing lorries again causing *difficulties for those using these roads.*

I object to permission being granted for the equipment.

Yours sincerely
David. N. Barnett.

Wilmington
16 Tomlinson Drive
Finchampstead
Wokingham
Berks
RG40 3NZ
Tel./Fax. 0118 973 1776



C Wood Esq.
Head of Planning & Transportation
Wokingham District Council
Environmental Services Department
Planning Services
PO Box 157 Shute End
Wokingham Berks RG40 1WR

Your ref : Elaine Connor
TL/2000/0705

15th March 2000

Dear Mr Wood

Application No: TL/2000/0705 - Proposed erection of 10m mast, antenna and cabinet on land at 257 Nine Mile Ride Finchampstead Wokingham

We understand from a neighbour that the above application is shortly to be considered by the Council. We are astounded that such an item is being considered in this area, given all the adverse publicity available, which is gaining in momentum, concerning radiation from mobile phones and the masts required to service them.

There is absolutely no open space at the site in question as it is surrounded on all sides by private residential properties. Having lived in this area for over eight years now we know that many of these properties will have young people, even babies, living in them with their parents and if this application is allowed then you will be responsible, along with the mobile phone companies, for subjecting them to unknown levels of radiation over many years.

We have read that a report is soon to be published which will highlight the effect of the radiation given off by these masts and the phones on the human brain. It seems likely very firm controls will be placed on the siting of the masts by legislation once this report is published. We certainly do not wish to be amongst the last people to be faced with constant radiation before the new rules come into force.

As mentioned above this is a good class residential area, an area where no doubt the Council relies on a good level of income from Council Tax. As this radiation problem becomes better understood the erection of such a mast will undoubtedly place a blight on the properties so effected. You will understand that this is not a situation either the Council or the residents should accept.

We ask that you record our very strong objection to this application and turn it aside on the grounds that the local population should not be subjected to the radiation from one of these masts in a densely populated area such as this.

Yours sincerely



J M & MG Hill

March 17, 2000

Planning Reference : TL/2000/0705



Elaine Connor
Wokingham District Council
Planning services
P.O. Box 157
Shute End
Wokingham
Berkshire RG40 1WR

Jason Longley
Rose Cottage
261A Nine Mile Ride
Finchampstead
Wokingham
Berkshire RG40 3NS

Dear Ms Connor,

SUBJECT: ERECTION OF A 10M HIGH MONOPOLE FOR MOBILE COMMUNICATIONS

Thankyou for your recent letter regarding the proposed erection of a mobile communications antenna and equipment cabinet on the land adjacent to 157 Nine Mile Ride. I would like to oppose this planning application on a number of grounds :

Health concerns : I am very concerned with the health implications that would result from living so close to a mobile repeater, and feel that the increased risk of leukaemia and other diseases that could be brought about by continuous exposure to the RF and microwave frequencies is reason enough to question the placement of this device.

I am aware that mobile operators claim that there are no health risks associated with prolonged exposure to mobile phones - a large number of scientific bodies with no vested interest in the mobile communications industry would disagree.

I feel uncomfortable that my year old daughter may be placed in a situation that is detrimental to her health, with the possibility of health problems in later life. I do not feel that I am an over anxious parent, as I am aware that many schools have refused to host similar antennae.

Property Value : I feel that a mobile repeater is enough of a blight to the surrounding properties to devalue the market price. It may even be difficult to sell the property due to the health concerns that have been widely publicised via newspaper and television coverage.

I have spoken with a number of neighbours who also feel that the site is inappropriate. I do understand that mobile operators need to supply complete coverage, as a mobile user I am aware that Finchampstead is a poor reception area, however I do believe that alternative sites in the local vicinity may be more suited to this mobile repeater. There are a number of fields, golf courses and other non residential settings that would be better suited to an application of this type.

Sincerely,

Jason Longley.

PLANNING SECTION
POL
DC obs
APP
CS
24 MAR 2000
COPIES TO:
DI
LS
EC
ACK: ✓
FILE:

Oakleigh House
7 Tomlinson Drive
Finchampstead
Berks RG40 3NZ

20th March 2000

Environmental Services Department
Planning Services
P.O. Box 157
Shute End
Wokingham
Berks RG40-1WR

Ref: Elaine Connor TL/2000/0705

Dear Ms Connor,

I believe that this mast will be sited immediately adjacent to my property, yet the only notification I have received has been through word of mouth.

There is considerable debate about the safety of the radiation from these masts and I would like to know if you can guarantee that there will be no ill effects. The area is totally residential, meaning that any of the local inhabitants will be exposed to the emissions for about 100 hours per week, whereas, if the site were on industrial premises the exposure would be limited to around 40 hrs/week. There are many young children living close to the proposed site and the risk to these is, as yet, un-quantifiable.

I think the Hogwood Industrial Estate is a much more suitable location. In addition the visual impact will be of less significance amongst buildings with higher rooflines and the affect on property values will not be an issue.

I strongly object to the siting of this mast as well as the lack of advance information.

Please let me have your guarantees of safety, and, if not, your confirmation that this application will be rejected.

Yours sincerely

M. M. Mizen.

Tel: 9734035.

24a Nine Mile Rode,
Wokingham,
BERKS RG40 3PA

OBS CC

24th march 00

Dear Sir / Madam,

Re: Application Number TL/2000/0705.

I wish to object to the above application for the siting of the 10m high monopole with one tri-sector antenna and equipment cabinet. These are my reasons:-

1) It is not yet known if the small ammount of radiation discharged from these appliances could be harmful

to humans, particularly children. I have three children of my own aged 4, 8 and 12 so it therefore concerns me that the pole is so near to our house.

2) This area is very densely populated so to put a pole in the middle of the houses again poses a risk to health and I feel would look rather unsightly! I cannot think of anywhere locally that has such a monopole.

I know a similar device was to be erected on farm land at the rear of Nine Mile Ride School. I believe this application was refused mainly due to the objections mentioned above.

Yours faithfully

V. Parry

MRS V PARRY & M.H. PARRY

20, Tomlinson Drive,
Finchampstead, Wokingham,
Berkshire RG40 3NZ.
Tel: (0118) 973-1965
Fax: (0118) 973-5038
Email: LeeFamUK@aol.com

Dr. Mark C. Lee MB ChB DOccMed DRCOG

20 March 2000

Re: Application No. TL/2000/0705

Planning Services
Wokingham District Council
P.O. Box 157
Shute End
Wokingham
Berkshire
RG40 1WR

Dear Sir or Madam,

I write to express my strong objection concerning this planning application. I am a local resident and a medical practitioner, being the senior partner at the Woosehill Surgery in Wokingham.

My objection concerns the possible impact on the health of the local community from having such a mast situated in an area of high population density. The evidence concerning electromagnetic radiation from masts of this type is not conclusive. However, it is not possible to claim that such masts are without any health impact whatsoever. Some evidence has been presented which suggests possible adverse health risks to individuals exposed to radiation of this type. I would respectfully suggest therefore that the District Council would be unwise to grant permission for the erection of this mast. I consider that there are real risks to the health of the local community should the development take place.

Yours faithfully,

Mark Lee

Mark C. Lee

Quality Perspectives

looking to yourfuture

British Quality Foundation
PROMOTING BUSINESS EXCELLENCE
Member

Ash Cottage
46 Foxcote
Wokingham
Berkshire
RG40 3PE

VAT Reg No: 688 9045 72
Bus. Reg. No.: 2237568
Tel/fax: +44 (0)118-932-8398
Mobile: +44 (0)956-596-878
Email: jcburleigh@aol.com

25 March, 2000

Elaine Conner
PO Box 157
Council Offices
Shute End
Wokingham Berks RG40 1WR

Dear Ms Connor:

: Planning Application TL/2000/0705 – Proposed Aerial mast & antenna adjacent to 257 Nine Mile Ride, Finchampstead, Wokingham

I have worked for One-2-One as a subcontractor and know them to be a sound and socially aware organisation. I loyally use one of their mobile phones and have long awaited improvement to unreliable transmission/reception I currently get in my locality.

In spite of all this and with obvious regret, I am strongly opposed to the erection of an antenna at this site, so close to habitation. My reasons are as follows:

1. The jury is still out regarding the "safety" or otherwise of transmitting stations and mobile phones. The scientists are very good at providing one-off inconclusive evidence to show that they are/are not safe but, in practice and over the full range of operational conditions, **nobody really knows**. It is still a relatively young technology and an area of potential, unquantified risk. It should be treated as such until people, not just scientists, understand are happy to embrace the risks.

2. Since mobile phones haven't been around for very long it is difficult to see what convincing evidence the scientists can produce about the long term effects of the radiation that the system generates. All radiated energy has *some* effect. We don't want to be told that the long term effect is "safe", but exactly what the effects are so that we can make up our own minds about it. Until such time as scientific investigation makes this possible society should be very cautious at exposing people to an unknown risks, particularly against their own will.

3. The people at 257 Nine Mile Ride are a decent, hardworking family who live above the shop and work very long hours there to provide a much appreciated service to our neighbourhood. They would be subject to radiation at close quarters 24 hours day, 365 days per year probably for many years to come. So *why should the community endorse the proposed improvement to their local* infrastructure at the expense of this family's peace of mind and, very possibly, their long term health prospects? That is not socially acceptable behaviour towards them. The Council have to be our advocates in this respect.

Following the recent sad death of a Finchampstead child who lived close to an existing antenna and regardless of whether or not that had anything to do with his demise (unproven), it would appear to have been a major PR blunder of One-2-One to propose the erection of another mast even closer to habitation in the same district.

I suggest, half seriously, that the Council offer One-2-One the following challenge:

Would one of their directors like to volunteer to sit on top of a publicly operational mast with no special radiation protection and with his arms around the business end of it for, say, five hours per day for a week? If at the end of that time he/she is medically examined over a period of three months and found to be showing no effects from the experience we can all shut up and let them get on with things. On the other hand, if he/she has an interesting "sun tan" or turned into a raving idiot we may have arrived at the first visible step on the ladder of knowledge about the subject. The nation could show its gratitude by offering a death-bed life peerage to the selfless noble victim.

If such a volunteer is not forthcoming the first question to be asked "why not?". If the technology is so safe then surely the cost of one director's time for a few days is a small price for One-2-One to pay in the interests of science and their public image? The nationwide publicity it would generate, albeit not very scientific, would go far towards alleviating public anxieties and enables the company to proceed unhindered with their countrywide network programme. It could save them millions!

Sincerely,

John Burleigh
Business Quality Consultant

EC

Tel. 0118 974 6315 (Direct Line)
Fax. 0118 974 6313
Email. karen.satterford@wokingham.gov.uk
Date. March 28, 2000
My ref. KS/KC/DesMar/Gen

Director of Environmental Services
Environmental Services Department
P.O. Box 153
Shute End, Wokingham
Berkshire RG40 1WL
Tel: (0118) 974 6000
Minicom No: (0118) 977 8909
DX: 33506 – Wokingham

Cllr Roland Cundy

Dear Roland

PETITION – COMMUNICATIONS MAST BELMONT STORES

I am writing to confirm receipt of the 394 signature petition from the residents of Finchampstead which you sent me last week.

As this falls within delegated powers, I have forwarded it to [redacted] Wood, Head of Planning and Transportation, to be considered with the planning applications under Standing Order 22,6(a). The case officer dealing with the matter is Elaine Connor who can be contacted on 0118 974 6451 if you need any further information.

I enclose a copy of the petition for your records.

Yours sincerely

Karen Satterford

Karen Satterford
Director of Environmental Services

cc: Mike Thorp, Principal Development Control Officer
Elaine Connor, Planning Assistant

BELMONT STORES MOBILE ANTENNA
YOUR CHANCE TO PROTEST!!!!!

As you may be aware , a propasal by One-to-One has been submiited for a 30 foat antenna to be erected next to Belmont Stores.

On health grounds , this is wholly unacceptable. The Times reported that study by the government's own National Radiological Protection Board revealed serious concerns about the dangers of these masts. A committee report due next month will confirm that these masts **CAN AFFECT the workings of the human brain.**

The erection of the mast will affect house prices as potential buyers will be deterred from moving close to a mast on health grounds.

Please sign below to register the fact that you do **NOT** wish for the antenna to be erected adjacent to 257 Kiln Ride.

BELMONT STORES MOBILE ANTENNA

YOUR CHANCE TO PROTEST!!!!!

	r Name	Address	Signature		
1	Example: Scott Cooper	123 Askrigg Road, Hamilton, L9A 1T2			
2	L BRAY	132 Kiln Ride	[illegible]		
3	S. CHAPMAN	127 Nine Mile Ride	[illegible]		
4	R. TENCH	29 Vermont Wood, Barkham Ride	Robert Tench		
5	A.S. GREWAL	257, Nine Mile Ride.	A.S. Grewal		
6	S. CHAPMAN	283A NINE MILE RIDE	[illegible]		
7	P. AUSTIN	3 LINDEN ROAD	P. Austin		
8	D. A. BALDWIN	"PINEWOOD" HEATH RIDE	D. A. Baldwin		
9	H. MARTIN	FINDON TINTAGEL RD	[illegible]		
10	P REDFORD	Faringdon Tinkagel Road	Pamela Redford		
11	M BUTLAND	72 FOXCOTE	M. Butland		
12	M LEE	7 NEW ACERS	M Lee		
13	M JONES	41 KILN RIDE	M Jones		
14	J G BENZIE	350 NINE MILE RIDE	J G Benzie		
15	R.G. OWEN	43 KILN RIDE	R G Owen		
16	M PRAULX	269 NINE MILE RIDE	[illegible]		
17	J. Buckland	265 Nine Mile Ride	J Buckland		
18	Toloate	1 Ashdale Park	[illegible]		
19	P. Clark	Warren Rane. Tinkagel Rd	P. Clark		
20	J LEWIS	242B NINE MILE RIDE	[illegible]		
21	J LAMBERTON	64 FOXCOTE, OFF KILN RIDE	[illegible]		
22	L.J THORNTON	47 FOXCOTE OFF KILN RIDE	[illegible]		
23	WM. PRAULX	269 Nine Mile Ride Finchampstead	[illegible]		
24	A.L HOGG	14D Glove Farm Park Mytchett	[illegible]		
25	[illegible]	261B NINE MILE RIDE	TOTAL: [illegible]	[redacted]	[redacted]

BELMONT STORES MOBILE ANTENNA

YOUR CHANCE TO PROTEST!!!!!

	r Name	Address	Signature		
1	Example: Scott Cooper	123 Askrigg Road, Hamilton, L9A 1T2			
2	ADAM DRAPER	CHERRY TREE HSE, WICK HILL LANE	ADT		
3	Chris Russell	325 N M R.	CJR		
4	J R [illegible]	170A N. M. R	[illegible]		
5	K DAVIES	17 cypress Close	[illegible]		
6	J. Monk	betneways. Heath Ride	J. Monk		
7	DJ BRETT	'Karalinga' Heath Ride	[illegible]		
8	H. BEATTIE	102A KEAN RIDE.	[illegible]		
9	D. COLEMAN	12 CYPRESS CLOSE F'NCHAMPSTEAD.	[illegible]		
10	A. [illegible]	299A Nine Mile Ride	[illegible]		
11	J [illegible]	Hollybush Ride	[illegible]		
12	[illegible]	'STAMFORD' HEATH RIDGE	[illegible]		
13	A. dlacmillan	'Ramore" Range Road	A. dlacmillan		
14	[illegible]	263A Nine Mile Ride	[illegible]		
15	D. STOKES	Silver Trees, Tanyard Rd.	[illegible]		
16	N. NORRIS	261 Nine Mile Ride	N. Norris		
17	P GULL	28 FINCHHAMPSTEAD RD	P Gull		
18	MRMRS J LAMPON	PENNARTH KILN RIDE EXT	[illegible]		
19	J Parker	310 Nine Mile Ride	[illegible]		
20	R HENBROW	255 NINE MILE RIDE	R Henbrow		
21	A F HOPE	16 GRANT RD CROWTHORNE	A F Hope		
22	P Noyce	263 Finchampstead Road.	P. Noyce		
23	Schlumberger	357 N M R.	Schlumberger		
24	B Hamilton	306 N. M R	[illegible]		
25	Jamson	259 N. M. R.	TOTAL: [illegible]	[redacted]	[redacted]

BELMONT STORES MOBILE ANTENNA

YOUR CHANCE TO PROTEST!!!!!

	r Name	Address	Signature		
1	Example: Scott Cooper	123 Askrigg Road, Hamilton, L9A 1T2			
2	C.V. HASKAL	83 Foxcote Wokingham RG40 3PG	C.V. Haskell		
3	J. DEAN	2 CALIFORNIA PARK	[illegible]		
4	G. J. BURTWELL	1 OLD KINGSBRIDGE COTTS N/MILE RIDE	[illegible]		
5	[illegible]	21 LONGDOWN RD. SAND.	[illegible]		
6	M. [illegible]	61 KILN RIDE WOK RG40 3PS	[illegible]		
7	[illegible]	40 FOXCOTE WOKINGHAM	[illegible]		
8	H Bamberger	1 Burch Road Wokingham	H BAMBERGER		
9	[illegible]	26 Mr Carry way Wokingham	[illegible]		
10	[illegible]	22 Harris Rd [illegible]	[illegible]		
11	[illegible]	Queensgate, Southwest Rd, Wokingham	[illegible]		
12	[illegible]	119 Rogers Ft [illegible]	[illegible]		
13	P. LUCKEN	299 NINE MILE RIDE	[illegible]		
14	[illegible]	134, Kiln Ride RG40 3PB	[illegible]		
15	C. RIXON	LA TOQUADE, SOLDIERS RIDE, RG40 3NF	[illegible]		
16	A. OSGOOD	BUMBLESFOLLY FOREST RD NORTH ASCOT SL5 8BT	[illegible]		
17	M. A. Pearce	1 Tanglewood Finchampstead	M. Pearce		
18	M. I COWIE	255A NINE MILE RIDE	M. I Cowie		
19	V. SPOONER	49A Nine Mile Ride	[illegible]		
20	[illegible]	24 TRUBULL ROAD BARNHILL	[illegible]		
21	[illegible]	11 Wimbushe Finchampstead	[illegible]		
22	M.G. Stone	252A Nine Mile Ride	M.G. Stone		
23	John Stone	252A NINE MILE RIDE	John Stone		
24	U Jacobs	310 NINE MILE RIDE	U Jacobs		
25	[illegible]	61 Ashdale Pk [illegible]	TOTAL:	[redacted]	[redacted]
26	[illegible]	CORNERWAYS, HEATH RIDE	[illegible]		

BELMONT STORES MOBILE ANTENNA

YOUR CHANCE TO PROTEST!!!!!

	r Name	Address	Signature		
1	Example: Scott Cooper	123 Askrigg Road, Hamilton, L9A 1T2			
2	R. MOSS	35 ST. MICHAELS COTTAGES.			
3	[illegible]	12 Kingsbridge Cottages			
4	[illegible]	28 [illegible]			
5	MR HATT	124 KILN RIDE			
6	R MARTIN	24 WINDSOR RIDGE			
7	D [illegible]	81 ROYCROFT LANE			
8	[illegible]	GLEN ROWAN TINTAGEL			
9	[illegible]	90 [illegible]			
10	Michelle Evans	Ferndale Heathride			
11	Richard Agnes	47 Pine Drive, Wokingham			
12	[illegible] Carter	56 Kiln Ride Wokingham			
13	THENRY	334 NINE MILE RIDE			
14	BANNERMAN	250 NINE MILE RIDE			
15	PHILIPSON	7 WELLINGTON RD.			
16	PATRICKS	43 HARVETT AVE FINCHAMPSTEAD			
17	DAVIES	38 [illegible]			
18	[illegible]	NINE MILE Road			
19	[illegible]	16th RISE			
20	P. Brown	37 PINE DRIVE	P. Brown		
21	[illegible]	Heath Ride Finch	[illegible]		
22	[illegible]	45 [illegible]	[illegible]		
23	[illegible]	52 Mornington Rd.	[illegible]		
24	P. [illegible] P. LATTON	2 BOWMAINE CLOSE	[illegible]		
25	E. MORRIS	Lake Side N.M.R	TOTAL: E Morris	[redacted]	[redacted]

BELMONT STORES MOBILE ANTENNA

YOUR CHANCE TO PROTEST !!!

	Name	Address	Signature
1	R Bolton	Wokingham	[illegible]
2	H. LINDSAY	Wokingham	H. Lindsay
3	J. WARNER	Little sandhurst	[illegible]
4	[illegible]	RG40.	[illegible]
5	Belmont K.	257 N.M.R	S.K. [illegible]
6	J Davis	11 Cypress close	[illegible]
7	Ian Hughes	262B NMR	[illegible]
8	L FRITH	288 NMR	[illegible]
9	G REDFORD	Farringdon Tintagel Rd	[illegible]
10	M. CHISHOLM	302 NMR	[illegible]
11	W COLEMAN	Ronestow Heath Ride	[illegible]
12	M. Carter	244A N.M.R.	M. Carter
13	D. MORRIS	'HEATHELLEA' TINTAGEL RD	[illegible]
14	S Cooper	15 Tomemson Drive	[illegible]
15	[illegible]	The Haven Tintagel Rd	E.A.C. HARVEY
16	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
17	P. ROBERTS	35 COOMBE PINE CROWNWOOD	[illegible]
18	K CHAPMAN	Pine Platt Heath Ride	K Chapman
19	P Pilder	Boradaigh Hollybush Ride	P Pilder
20	S. ALBRIGHTON	32 LYNDHURST RD	[illegible]
21	M. E SMITH	170A N.M.R.	[illegible]
22	M. MARTIN	FINDON, TINTAGEL RD	M. Martin
23	K. Claridge	KILN Ride	K.L. Claridge
24	B RAY.	31 The Spinney.	B. Ray
25	S Brown	27 Little Eryth	[illegible]
26	G. GEALY.	291 BONYCE DRIVE	[illegible]
27	S. Phelps	297a Nine Mile Ride	[illegible]
28	J. Smith	Wokingham	J. Smith
29	Satbal K Grewal	257 Nine Mile Ride	S.K Grewal
30	A.P.S. GREWAL	257 NINE MILE RIDE	A.P.S. GREWAL
31	[illegible]	3 The Rise Finchenstead	[illegible]
32	B Hartley	Braunwald Heath Ride	[illegible]
33	S. PIKE	256 NINE MILE RIDE	[illegible]

BELMONT STORES MOBILE ANTENNA

YOUR CHANCE TO PROTEST !!!

	Name	Address	Signature
1	R.A CROFT	10 WOODMOOR	RACroft.
2	STEVE	1 NINE MILE RIDE	S Peers
3	CHARMAN	254 NINE MILE RIDE	[illegible]
4	CLOVER.	118 Nine Mile Road	D.R. Clover
5	N Jones	284 Nine Mile Ride	[illegible]
6	E BIRD.	3 Cypress Close	[illegible]
7	J Burgess	Deerleap Hollybush Ride	[illegible]
8	A CHIVERS	19. ORBIT CLOSE	A Chivers
9	S. PRING	278, NINE MILE RIDE	[illegible]
10	P MORTON	5 MANOR PARK DR.	P Morton
11	M STROUD	330 Nine Mile Ride	M.G. Stroud
12	S.E Sparrow	265. Nine Mile Ride	S.E Sparrow
13	B Chaplin	nine mile Ride.	B Chaplin
14	R. IHART	89 KILN RIDE	[illegible]
15	A.P. JILKS	59 HYDE END ROAD	[illegible]
16	J.R OWENS	5 TOMLINSON DRIVE	James Owens
17	H.A FUTTON	Hogg Lane, Finchamstead.	Hat Utton.
18	M GORE	59 KILN RIDE FINCH	M Gore
19	M GRANT	29 BirkBeck Place	[illegible]
20	D ROSE	280 NINE MILE RIDE	[illegible]
21	[illegible]	290A Nine Mile Ride	Rose Burton
22	C.J. SMITH.	97, KILN RIDE.	[illegible]
23	[illegible]	82 Vendons Lane	[illegible]
24	K. WOODS	HEATH RIDE	[illegible]
25	K Wills	Heath Ride	K Wills
26	M. COOPER.	79 FOXCOTE WOKINGHAM	[illegible]
27	E. EDMINSON	83 McCARTHY WAY	[illegible]
28	J. WHYTE	82, Kiln Ride	J.T. Whyte
29	S.C. VERY	HEATH RIDE	S.C. Very
30	D. FITCH	105 KILN RIDE	D Fitch
31	C LAMBERT	10 RADICAL RIDE	[illegible]
32	J. KELEY	117 FOXCOTE	[illegible]
33	[illegible]	106 KILN RIDE	[illegible]

BELMONT STORES MOBILE ANTENNA

YOUR CHANCE TO PROTEST !!!

	Name	Address	Signature
1.	D. MORRELL	42. DELANE DRIVE WINNERSH	[illegible]
2	EA Carter (EA Carter)	'Hill Top' Heath Ride Finchampstead	EA Carter
3	J D CLARK	CORNER WAY 3 MILLY	[illegible]
4	[illegible]	62 MANOR PARK DR, FINCHAMPSTEAD	[illegible]
5	C J Parnwell	43 Lupin Ride Crowthorne	C J Parnwell
6	R.D. RUSSELL	325. NMR.	[illegible]
7	[illegible] MULLANE	22 PINE DRIVE FINCHAMPSTEAD	[illegible]
8	M. Douglas	235 NMR	[illegible]
9	R NATEAL	1, RANGE ROAD	[illegible]
10	S. NEWLANDS	NORREY'S AVE WOKINGHAM	S. Newlands
11	I Macdonnell	50 KILN RIDE	I Macdonnell
12	Carole Coleman	12. Cypress CL.	C A Coleman
13	Julie Riddell	Greywell, Ddeslane, Wokingham	[illegible]
14	MARK SUTHERLAND	6 NELSON CLOSE Bradenell	[illegible]
15	Colin Dix	Wytch-Waye Lodge RG40 3QE	[illegible]
16	BARRIE SARGEANT	23 McCARTHY WAY, RG40 4UA	[illegible]
17	TJ BRADSHAW	Tanglewoods, Heath Ride, Finch	[illegible]
18	L Ross	100 Kiln Ride	[illegible]
19	J SKIVINE	27 ROYCROFT LANE	[illegible]
20	H. Osborne	126 KILN RIDE	H Osborne
21	L Rowson	8 Birch Rd.	[illegible]
22	K D Carey	48 Pine Drive	K D Carey
23	NEWSON	301 Nine Mile Ride	[illegible]
24	NUTBEEM	SMALLOAK, DELL RD, FINCH	[illegible]
25	R. GOOD	'Ladygate' Heath Ride	R. Good
26	[illegible]	28 Pine Drive	[illegible]
27	[illegible]	1A BIRCH Rd.	[illegible]
28	[illegible]	34A Kentwood Hill Tilehurst RG.	[illegible]
29	W BARNETT	437 FINCHAMPSTEAD RD	W Barnett
30	A Smith	Winkfield	A Smith
31	J Hawley	Reading	J. Hawley
32	[illegible]	Crown Wood	[illegible]
33	[illegible]	60 Foxcote	[illegible]

BELMONT STORES MOBILE ANTENNA

YOUR CHANCE TO PROTEST !!!

	Name	Address	Signature
1	[illegible]	72 Roycroft Lane	[illegible]
2	[illegible]	29 [illegible]	[illegible]
3	[illegible]	23 LITTLE FRYTH	[illegible]
4	S. MORGAN	5 STRAWBERRY FIELDS	[illegible]
5	E.M. KEMP	96 FOXCOTE	E.M. Kemp
6	C SMITH	252A NINE MILE RIDE	[illegible]
7	K H HART	40, ROYCROFT LANE	K H Hart
8	B C CLAPPSON	121 FOXCOTE	[illegible]
9	J MILLS	23 HENRY ST. REDDIT	[illegible]
10	C. Benger	350 Nine Mile Ride	C. Benger
11	D.V. MATHER	THE BEECHES, HEATH RIDE	D.V. Mather
12	J MERRITT	75 WATER RD	[illegible]
13	M KEMP	12 MOOR PARKHASE B. [illegible]	[illegible]
14	A. FASTNEDGE	146A CLIFTON RD	[illegible]
15	D. Lengthorn	Little Beaulieu Heath Ride	[illegible]
16	S. M. JOSELIN	130. KILN RIDE	[illegible]
17	[illegible]	343 NINE MILE RIDE	[illegible]
18	[illegible]	HOLLYBUSH LODGE [illegible] RD	D. EMBLETON
19	P.L. Coles	4 Russley Green.	P.L. Coles
20	L. DEVONISH	6 BANKSIDE	[illegible]
21	P AGNESS	47 PINE DRIVE	P. Agness
22	E. WINTER	28 CYPREST CLOSE	[illegible]
23	[illegible]	264 NINE MILE RIDE	[illegible]
24	[illegible]	Lezanne Heath Ride	[illegible]
25	[illegible]	84 Chagford Road	J. GOODENOUGH
26	H. MATTHEWS	35 HEROES WALK	H. Matthews.
27	J Blackwell	253 N. Mile Ride	J. Blackwell
28	[illegible]	302 N.M.R.	[illegible]
29	A H Smith	SOLDIERS RISE	[illegible]
30	J.W. BLACKWELL	253 N.M.R.	J.W. Blackwell
31	S. GRAINGER	Birchenwood Hollybush Ride	S. Grainger
32	C Roads	239 Nine Mile Ride	[illegible]
33	P. WOOLDRIDGE	86 KILN RIDE	[illegible]
34	T. DANLEY	70 FOXCOTE	[illegible]
35	[illegible]	59 KILN RIDE	C MORGAN
36	P. Tayler	53 Wordsworth. RG12 8YF	[illegible]
37	C. EVANS	FERNDALE HEATH RIDE	[illegible]

BELMONT STORES MOBILE ANTENNA

YOUR CHANCE TO PROTEST !!!

	Name	Address	Signature
1	W.E. LENGTHORN	Little Beaulieu, Heath R.	[illegible]
2	J.L. BUTLAND	72 FOXCOTE	J Butland
3	L. Perry	"Rosslea" Heath Ride	[illegible]
4	J Davidson	1 Pine Drive Fundiampton	[illegible]
5	M WEBB	295 NINE MILE RIDE	[illegible]
6	A. MITCHELL	TREETOPS HEATH RIDE	[illegible]
7	T. PERRY	Treyrstor Close	[illegible]
8	C. GRUNDY	MOLLY MILLARS LANE	[illegible]
9	R.F. Christopher	21 Cambrian Way, Wok.	[illegible]
10	MP Christopher	21 Cambrian Way	MP Christopher
11	A. HUTSON	98 FOXCOTE	A Hutson
12	S Grove	12 Hunton Close	S Grove
13	L MITCHELL	Treetops, Heath Ride	[illegible]
14	F. O'Conn	Primrose Cottage, Fleet Hill	F.A. O'Conn
15	K G JAMES.	290 NINE MILE RIDE	[illegible]
16	K. BEVERSTOCK	KEYNWOOD HEATH RIDE	[illegible]
17	G Turner	4 Talisman Close	[illegible]
18	D. BARNETT	295 NINE MILE RIDE	[illegible]
19	L BLOOMFIELD	Thistle, Heath Ride	[illegible]
20	J CHARMAN	254 NINE MILE RIDE	B.J. Charman
21	J.M. BARNETT	295 NINE MILE RIDE	J.M. Barnett
22	M. WILSON	286 " " "	[illegible]
23	P. SIMMONDS	316 N.M.R.	[illegible]
24	C A COX	6 Tomlinson Drive Wokingham	[illegible]
25	D.W. SAUNDERS	251 Nine Mile Ride,	D.W. Saunders
26	R. HELLEWELL	67 Barkham Ride	R Hellewell
27	D Hall	Soldiers Rise The Cannon	[illegible]
28	T.J. BALDWIN	235 Nine Mile Ride	[illegible]
29	K SURMAN	50 TURNBERRY Homepark	K Surman
30	G. OSBORNE	126 KILN RIDE	[illegible]
31	C. HART	40 ROUCROFT LANE	[illegible]
32	D. Carroll	The Bungalow Fidel Tech	D Carroll
33	[illegible]	4 CAMBRIAN WAY	[illegible]
34	D Hawkins	4 Cambrian Way	D Hawkins
35	Peter Frank	299a Nine Mile Ride	Peter Frank
36	D. Skellett	9 Tomlinson Dr.	D. Skellett

BELMONT STORES MOBILE ANTENNA

YOUR CHANCE TO PROTEST !!!

	Name	Address	Signature
1	A. HEASMAN	58 FOXCOTE, WOKINGHAM	[illegible]
2	K. [illegible]	BURLEIGH HEATH RIDE, FINCHAMPSTEAD	[illegible]
3	J. GEERING	347, NINE MILE RIDE	[illegible]
4	J. WILD	94 KILN RIDE	[illegible]
5	P. JONES	6 INGLE CROW	[illegible]
6	G HAYTER	65 TERRYMOOR HILL	[illegible]
7	L. GILLETT	82 KILN RIDE	[illegible]
8	A Doyle	11 Gorse Ride North	A Doyle.
9	J. WILSON	286, Nine Mile Ride	[illegible]
10	T. HARPER	22 KILN RIDE	[illegible]
11	Karl Wojna	Heath lodge Heath ride	Karl Wojna
12	D [illegible]	21 Mc Carthy (Nay	[illegible]
13	M. Sampson	Portelet, Kiln Ride Ext	[illegible]
14	T. Norman	'Tubney', Wick Hill Lane, Finchampstead	[illegible]
15	S DANCE	8, KINGSBRIDGE COTTAGES, NINEMILERIDE	S. Dance.
16	A CHAPMAN	115 WORREYS AVE	[illegible]
17	B. D HALLEY	89 PINEHILL RD. CROWTHORNE.	[illegible]
18	A. PAM	9 PINE WOOD CROWTHORNE	[illegible]
19	D. Devereaux	2 Tangley Drive	Wokingham
20	D Morley-Ham	20 Bloom Acres	Sandhurst D.M.M.
21	W. McMYLLAN	28 SOMER VILL CRES	YATELEY
22	E Clarke	50 FOXCOTE	E Clarke.
23	[illegible]	58 GLAYCATE	[illegible]
24	NICK KYLE	22 KINGFISHER DR	[illegible]
25	S. HICHISSON	110 WHITLEY WOOD LANE	[illegible]
26	M. CARVER	74 FOXCOTE, FINCHAMPSTEAD	[illegible]
27	M. Brunning	Brunsden Farm. Heath Ride.	[illegible]
28	[illegible]	162c Nine Mile Ride	[illegible]
29	L. Henry	334 Nine Mile Ride	L Henry
30	R. Waller	" " " "	R. E. Waller.
31	M. Boakes	'Evergreen' Heath Ride	
32	D. HILLMAN	STONECHATS, HOLLYBUSH RIDE	[illegible]
33	[illegible]	10 Wolfe City Crowthorne	

6

BELMONT STORES MOBILE ANTENNA

YOUR CHANCE TO PROTEST !!!

	Name	Address	Signature
1	G. Johnson	259 Nine Mile Ride	G. Johnson
2	S. Johnson	" " " "	S. Johnson
3	R. Ely	16 Kiln Ride	R. Ely
4	S. Sampson	Portelet Kiln Ride Ex	S. Sampson
5	E. Sampson	Portelet Kiln Ride Ex	E. Sampson
6	D. Maclean	12 TOMLINSON DR	D. Maclean
7	M. MACLEAN	" " "	M. Maclean
8	R. READER	7 NASHBROOK LANE	[illegible]
9	B. MUSIAL	61 KILN RD.	
10	M. WILD	94 KILN RIDE	M. Wild
11	[illegible]	92 FOXCOTE	[illegible]
12	V. BIFULCO	HEATH RIDE	[illegible]
13	PIDDLESDEN	LOWER EARLEY	[illegible]
14	C. WAGHORNE	GREEN ACRE, HEATH RIDE	C. N. Waghorne
15	E. M. WAGHORNE	GREEN ACRE, HEATH RIDE	E. M. Waghorne
16	J. E. GREEN	SILVER BIRCHES RANGE RD	[illegible]
17	[illegible]	93 CLAM GREEN SLOUGH	[illegible]
18	[illegible]	85 TEBBIT CLOSE BRACKNELL	[illegible]
19	L. DYSON	21 BRAMLEY GROVE CROWTHORNE	L. Dyson
20	[illegible]	234 NINE MILE RIDE	[illegible]
21	H. E. Beattie	102 A KILN Ride	M. E. B.
22	J. S. Russell	325 N. M. R.	J. S. Russell
23	[illegible]	Newtonch Fm	
24	[illegible]	Nine Mile Ride	[illegible]
25	P. RICHARDS	27 Mornington Ave	P. Richards
26	L. Evans	93 FOXCOTE	[illegible]
27	[illegible]	"	[illegible]
28	J. W. GREEN	Silver Birches Range Rd	[illegible]
29	S. JENKINS	MORNINGTON AV.	S. N. Jenkins
30	B. SILVER	28 GILBERT WAY FINCH.	[illegible]
31	J. D. Briggs	15 ASHDALE PARK	
32	[illegible]	9 Cambrian Way	9 COCHRANE
33	J. HASLER	88 KILN RIDE	J. Hasler

BELMONT STORES MOBILE ANTENNA

YOUR CHANCE TO PROTEST !!!

Name	Address	Signature__
N Henry	334 Nine Mile Ride	[illegible]
R Clarridge	6 Orbit Grove Finchampstead	[illegible]
J. Turner	27 Swan Lane Sandhurst	[illegible]
E J. HASLER	88 KILN RIDE	E J Hasler
A Loussey	12 Hungue Rd.	
Chanda Doshi	61 ASHDALE PARK	[illegible]
G HUGHES	252B NINE MILE RIDE	[illegible]
[illegible]	66 Westside Green	[illegible]
M Rosnell	14 Ratcliffe Way	[illegible]
B. HARDEN	246 N.M.R.	[illegible]
J. LONGLEY	261a NINE Mile Ride	[illegible]
J GARD	2 St Sebastian's Close	J Gard
K. [illegible]	23 Ficey Way Ayshore	[illegible]
[illegible]	28 Nine Mile Ride	[illegible]
K. James	9 Pine Drive	K James
C Dickthall	Lowood Heath Ride	C. Dickthall
L. Hopwood	119 Foxcote	L Hopwood
ALEX BRAIN	71 KILN RIDE	[illegible]
CHRIS ILSLEY	117 FOXCOTE	[illegible]
Elliot Cidley	5 Pine drive	[illegible]
[illegible]	286 Nine Mile Ride	[illegible]
[illegible]	38 Ashdale Park	[illegible]
A. LONGMOOR	296 Nine Mile Ride	[illegible]
J FITCH	105 Kiln Ride	[illegible]
JOAN BINKS	1 WINDSOR RIDE	Joan Binks
[illegible] Gordon	11 Foxcote	[illegible]
LEIGH THOMAS	20 Woodmoor, Finchampstead	[illegible]
Jagdeep Grewal	257 Nine Mile Ride	[illegible]
Alan Ezell	29 Billing Avenue	A. Ezell
Matthew Browning	37 Pine Drive	[illegible]
CHRIS Banning	30 GORSE RIDE SOUTH	C Banning
Steve Bursill	28 FOXCOTE	S Bursill
[illegible]	52 LOANS	[illegible]

BELMONT STORES MOBILE ANTENNA

YOUR CHANCE TO PROTEST !!!

Name	Address	Signature
P. Bowering	332A Nine Mile Ride	P Bowering
F. KELLY	16 BRAMLEY GROVE	F J Kelly
C. WASON	10, GRANGE AVE	[illegible]
L. KONGRAFF.	6. BUCHANAN DRIVE.	[illegible]
D HUNTER	430 Reading Rd	[illegible]
B HUNTER	12 LISMORE CLOSE	[illegible]
C COX	114 VALON RD	[illegible]
A Watt	15 AZALEA	[illegible]
L Watt	//	[illegible]
W. Watt	//	W Watt
N P. PRATT	5 FURZEHILL CRES	[illegible]
J Green	19 Farm WHITLEY	D Green
C Mattinson	255 Nine Mile Ride	[illegible]
[illegible]	252 Hook [illegible] Rd	[illegible]
A. Evans	25 Foxcote	A Evans
S WOODLEY	128 NINE MILE RIDE	[illegible]
J LEMIA	128 NINE MILE RIDE	[illegible]
J WOODLEY	8 MOLES CLOSE	[illegible]
N PAWLEY	91 WESTWOOD RD	N Pawley
D HAZLETT	50 WINSCOMBE C/HOLLAND	[illegible]
J. HEATH	CRACKLEBOURN HEAM LANE	[illegible]
Laura Kesteg Lin	6 Fir Cottage Rd	[illegible]
T CLAY	24 [illegible] LANE	[illegible]
G. MEWES	" "	[illegible]
R. CUNDY	BUMBLES LONGWATER LANE F'STEAD	[illegible]
K Jones	59 Cambridge Rd	K Jones

Paul & Jill Bray

Rothesay,
132 Kiln Ride,
Finchampstead,
Berks RG40 3PB

Home Phone 0118 973 5642



27 March 2000

Mr C Wood
Head of Planning and Transportation
Planning Services
Wokingham Council
P.O Box 157
Shute End
Wokingham , RG40 1WR

Dear Mr Wood ,

Re: Application Number: TL/2000/0705

Proposal for erection of monopole for One-to-One

Further to my letter 27th March , I enclose a copy of a recent article from the Sunday Mirror regarding the the safety of mobile phones and masts.

It further strengthens my point regarding the public perception of the safety of mobiles and masts. It also throws into doubt the safety claims by the mobile phone providers.

With the large number of children affected by the proposed mast , you cannot in all conscience let the proposal proceed .

I trust we can count on your support.

Yours sincerely ,

Paul Bray

Paul Bray

'We were told there was no risk to humans...this may not be true'

THIS report by Polish scientists has cast doubt over previous assurances that there is no link between mobile phone radiation and cancer.



By Dr IAN GIBSON MP
Member of the Select Committee on Science and Technology

Although the research does not include mobile phones it shows that the same type of radiation produced by mobile phones can cause a range of cancers, including those of the skin and brain.

There is also preliminary evidence that there may be effects on brain function (headaches, memory loss, dizziness etc).

This scientific research should result in alarm bells ringing in the heads of the 24 million people, including children, who use mobile phones in the UK.

Worringly, it has been claimed that children may be more susceptible to the effects of microwave radiation.

The National Radiological Protection Board (NRPB) was asked for a rigorous assessment of existing research so that the public can receive clear advice on any risks.

The NRPB reported that there was no human evidence of a risk of cancer resulting from the exposure to radiation.

The Polish scientists' report has shown that this may not be true.

However past experience, whether on chemicals or radiation, has always led to the lowering of current "safe" levels following further research.

The Select Committe on Science and Technology agreed that the Government must put more money into research into the use of mobile phones by children.

We must also look at the effects of microwave radiation on young children living near mobile masts. The great fear is that these masts may be associated with childhood leukaemia.

There is money available from the European Commission, and scientists must be encouraged to bid for it.

With the third generation of mobile phones almost upon us, we need to ensure that these produce less microwave radiation.

The media has taken up the issue, and this is to be welcomed because it is an area which is of equal concern as genetically modified food.

It's going to be hard to persuade people to give up their mobile phones — but it looks like it will become a question of health before convenience.

NEW PROOF MOBILES MAKE YOU LOSE YOUR MEMORY

10 AMAZING MOBILE FACTS

- AROUND 250,000 under-16s now have a mobile of their own.
- THREE years ago fewer than 3,000 children aged under 16 owned their own mobile. Now almost that number are getting one every WEEK.
- ALMOST a quarter of a million people admitted to answering their mobile while making love.
- AT least one in 16 married people sends secret text messages to ex-lovers via their mobile.
- ONE in six suspicious husbands and wives use mobiles to keep track of their other halves.
- THURSDAY is the busiest day for calls.
- BETWEEN 10-11am and 4-5pm are the busiest times.
- THE first mobile phone service was launched in the US in 1946. Handsets were like walkie-talkies – only one person at a time could talk.
- AT midnight on Millennium Eve, 13 million people tried to make calls, causing a multi-network crash.
- AN MP tried to bring in a law in 1997 to curtail irritating mobile users.

Life with the sex-swap SAS man, by his wife

MOBILE PHONES CANCER LINK

EXCLUSIVE

By RUPERT HAMER

SCIENTISTS have established the strongest link yet between mobile phones and cancer.

In the first-ever study of the effects of microwave radiation on humans, army personnel exposed to it were found to have a higher death-rate than other soldiers.

The Sunday Mirror, which has led the campaign to uncover the truth about the health dangers of mobiles, has been given exclusive access to the research.

FULL STORY: Pages 4&5

Shock findings of first human study



SEX change soldier John White's wife Pat told last night how he kept his cross-dressing secret from her for nearly 30 years. When she found lipstick and eyeshadow in their bathroom she was distraught, because she thought he was having an affair.

FULL STORY AN

120 Kiln Ride
Wokingham
RG40 3PB

28 March 2000

Planning Application TL/2000/0705

Dear Mr Wood,

I refer to the above Planning Application . I object to the application on the following grounds.

1. I would have thought that reception would be further improved by having the aerial on the higher ground to the south of Kiln Ride known as The Ridges. There is open space there that would be ideal for sighting such equipment amongst trees and away from housing.

2. The proposed sight is near to a large number of houses and is an area where schoolchildren congregate in the mornings and evenings on their way to and from school. With the potential health risks these masts ought to be sighted away from high density housing.

3. The site is on a busy and potentially dangerous crossroads that is already under investigation into the number of accidents there. To add to the already high number of items of 'road furniture' in the near vicinity would only add to the dangers of this crossroads. The equipment will also, presumably, need servicing from time to time adding to the high number of parked vehicles that congregate around this junction.

4. To add a mast and equipment box to all the other roadside items in the immediate vicinity would only add to the already rather shabby appearance of this corner and complete disregard shown towards the important road signs.

Yours faithfully

G A J Lewis

PLANNING SERVICES
POL
DC
APP
CS 0155 EE
29 MAR 2000
COPIES TO: ACK:
FILE:

261 Nine Mile Ride
Finchampstead
Berks
RG40 3NS

27th March 2000

Dear Sir,

I am writing a letter to oppose in the strongest possible terms the plans you have received to erect a mobile phone antenna at the side of Belmont Stores, Finchampstead. (application No TL/2000/0705).

There are several reasons for opposing these plans. The first being for health reasons. We live next door but one from the proposed site, approximately 60 feet away. We have a four year old child and I am six months pregnant with the next one. Both children will be sleeping on that side of the bungalow and will be in almost permanent residence during the daytime. Therefore we will all be under the effect of constant low level radiation emmiting from this antenna. It is only just coming to light in the press about the effects this low level radiation can have on the brain, and nearly every week

we see a new article in the papers.

We have only just recently purchased this property, and when house hunting we specifically avoided any radio masts or electricity sub-stations being directly nearby because of their known effects.

This brings me to my second point of opposition, the effect this antenna will have on house prices in the area. As we have only just recently purchased this property, we have paid top money with the housing market being as it is at the moment. We are planning on spending a considerable amount of money renovating the property. We are therefore worried that the property will be worth less when it is finished than it owes us, and also less desirable to sell as people will be put off by the antenna.

I am sure that the number of people signing the petition and also turning up at the local Parish Council meeting must be an indication of how all the local people feel about this antenna in a residential area

Yours sincerely

M. Nairs.

PLANNING SERVICES | HPT
POL | TLS
DC | EMF
APP
CS OBS | EU
29 MAR 2000
COPIES TO: | ACK:
FILE:

250A Nine Mile Ride
Finchampstead
Wokingham
Berkshire
RG40 3PA

Mr C Wood
Head of Planning and Transportation
Wokingham District Council
P.O. Box 157
Shute End
Wokingham
Berkshire
RG40 1WR

26th March 2000

Dear Sir

Reference Application Number: TL/2000/0705
Proposal: The erection of one 10 m high monopole on the land adjacent to 257 Nine Mile Ride.

We are writing in protest against this application. Our reasons are as follows:

- A government appointed committee inquiring into the potential health risks associated with the low level radiation emitted from such masts is due to report its findings next month. It is expected that the report will confirm that this low level radiation can affect the workings of the human brain, as has already been indicated by the governments National Radiological Protection Board which carried out studies about masts erected on school sites.
- There is a high level of public perception that these masts pose a health risk to the community if they are sited within a populated area. This will undoubtedly have an adverse effect on property prices in the immediate vicinity of the mast.
- In December 1998, the Government issued a draft circular 'Land Use Planning and Electromagnetic Fields'. Reference was made to a court case, which heard "any genuine public perception of danger is a valid planning consideration".
- We have two small children aged 5 and 4, and we take all reasonable precautions to ensure our children are safe and cannot come to any harm in both the short and long term. We believe that having this mast a very short distance from the end of our garden will pose an unacceptable level of risk.
- The siting of the mast outside a corner shop frequented by a large number of customers on a daily basis, and right next to a school bus drop off and pick up site must also be very short sighted.
- A petition has been handed into the council, which hopefully will indicate the level of public concern surrounding this application. We personally have yet to find a member of the local community who is in support of the application.

The council needs to take account of the cost in terms of health and financial compensation if our fears are realised.

The erection of the pole will serve no useful community purpose, there are already many mobile phone providers who can provide adequate coverage in this area. The proposal should be rejected.

Sian Gates.

Sian Gates and Nigel Canning



134, Kiln Ride,
Finchampstead,
Wokingham,
Berks.
RG40 3PB

Environmental Services Department,
Planning services,
PO Box 157,
Shute End,
Wokingham,
RG40 1WR

March 25th 2000

Dear Sirs,

Application Number: TL/2000/0705
Site Address: Land adjacent 257, Nine Mile Ride, Finchampstead.

Thank you for the information regarding the above application.

It really beggars believe that anyone would even think of such a site for a tri-antenna. There are a few factors for objection, mainly radiation, aesthetic and value of nearby property.

1. While I believe that that it is stated that this antenna is of low level radiation, there is still conflicting evidence as to the long term safety. The fact that it is so close to bedroom windows is very worrying. The argument using microwave ovens as a comparison is not relevant, you don't stay near one for hours. Children and teenagers gather and chatter, where the monopole is to be sited.

2 Although the height is quoted as 10 metres, I suspect that this would be increased as the nearby trees are near this height. I do not relish the prospect of having to see this object everytime I look out of my window or when working in my garden.

3 Buyers for nearby property would be put off by this structure.

I believe the application is because subscribers in Nine Mile Ride complain of blind spots. Possibly they would like it on their property.

Yours sincerely,

Joan M Betts

Miss J.M.Betts

91 KILN RIDE
RG40 3PD

Application TL/2000/0705



To
The Planning Officer

It may yet be shown that radiations from such an aerial may be a serious health hazard to those who spend months/years in the immediate vicinity thereof. If in due course such a health risk be confirmed, then to ignore warnings may well be considered negligent. The mast could be placed on one of the various alternative sites - it is not meant to be exhaustive - listed or below

1) Wood Way Golf Course
2) The Golf Course (name unknown) blocked from Finchampstead Road on the right coming from Sowerings Garage
3) National Trust land at Simon's Wood on the Ridge
4) California Country Park
5) land behind Finchampstead Surgery
6) land behind Close with Garage
7) land behind Warren Lodge Nursing Home
8) Army land at Arnfield

None of these would seriously affect the safety of the area covered by the aerials.

Yours faithfully

PAUL VALLÉE

253 Nine Mile Ride
Finchampstead
Berks. RG40 3NY



Wokingham District Council
Environmental Services Dept.,
POB 157
Shute End
Wokingham
Berks RG40 1WR

Dear Sirs,

Application No.TL/2000/0705

I refer to the proposed erection of a 10m high monopole against the wall of Belmont Store corner of Kiln Ride and Nine Mile Ride.

I strongly object to this proposal on the grounds of possible health risk particularly to young people in this highly residential area. I would like to point out that a larger than usual number of children and young adults pass this location on a daily basis - on their way to and from school and using the shop and I feel that this is a particularly undesirable place to put such a monopole.

In addition to that, it seems to me totally ridiculous to place the monople close up to the wall of a private dwelling, and I wonder if any thought has been given to what would happen if the owners wish at some stage to re-render and paint their wall

I sincerely hope and trust that a more suitable location can be found.

Yours faithfully,

J.M. Blackwell.

Belmont Stores
257 Nine Mile Ride
Finchampstead
Berks.

PLANNING SERVICES | PPT
POL | TLS
DC | ENF
APP | ee
CS | 28 MAR 2000
COPIES TO: | ACK: | FILE:

Wokingham District Council
Environmental Services Dept.,
POB 157
Shute End
Wokingham
Berks RG40 1WR

Dear Sirs,

Application No.TL/2000/0705
Proposed erection of 10m high monopole with one Trisector antenna and one equipment cabinet

Further to various letters and petitions already sent to you, I wish to make the following points regarding the above Planning Application:

1) I note on drawing Nos. 020/71015/02 and /03 that the planned "equipment cabin" is hard against the outside wall of my property. I object to this most strongly since it could, in certain circumstances bridge the damp-proof course and cause damage; it would also prohibit access to my wall for re-pointing, rendering or whatever else I should wish to do.

2) I am incensed at having a planning notice attached to my property (i.e. my boundary fence) for something I strongly oppose. I appreciate this is to allow complaints to be voiced, but find it very insensitive indeed.

Yours faithfully,

Ajit Singh Grewal

FINCHAMPSTEAD PARISH COUNCIL

PARISH OFFICE, MEMORIAL HALL, THE VILLAGE,
FINCHAMPSTEAD, BERKS RG40 4JU
THE CLERK: MRS CHERRY COLE
TELEPHONE: 0118 - 9328256 or 0118 - 9793684 (if urgent)
FAX NO. 0118 - 9730515

21 March 2000

Miss E Connor
Planning Officer
Environmental Services
Wokingham District Council
P O Box 153
Shute End
WOKINGHAM
Berks
RG40 1WL



Dear Miss Connor,

APP NO.TL/2000/0705 - ONE 2 ONE C/O COMMPRO AQUISITION SERVICES PROPOSED ERECTION OF 10M HIGH MONOPOLE WITH ONE TRI-SECTOR ANTENNA AND ONE EQUIPMENT CABIN ON LAND ADJACENT TO 257 NINE MILE RIDE, FINCHAMPSTEAD

At the Annual Gathering of Parishioners of Finchampstead held on 16 March 2000, the Finchampstead Parish Council wholeheartedly supported local residents in their safety concerns in respect of the proposed erection of the One 2 One communications mast, on the grounds that this proposed location is situated too close to a residential area and would entreat the applicant to find a more suitable remote location.

Yours sincerely

C.S. Cole

Mrs Cherry Cole
Clerk to the Parish Council
cc. District Cllrs Mrs M Long, G Cockroft, R Cundy, T Charlesworth

805

13th March 2000



Mr DN Hitti
124 Kiln Ride
Finchampstead
Wokingham
BERKSHIRE
RG40 3PB

Elaine Connor
Planning Services
Wokingham District Council
PO Box 157
Shute End
Wokingham
Berkshire RG40 1WR

REF TL/2000/0705

Dear Ms Connor

With regard to the proposed erection of 10m high monopole at land adjacent 257, Nine Mile Ride, Finchampstead.

I wish to express my extreme opposition to this planning application. The proposed antenna will cause grave concern to all households within its vicinity, especially of those families with children, of which I have 4 of my own. As you are probably aware, there is a committee report being released this month, which states that it is now clear that the radiation given off by mobile phone masts can affect the workings of the human brain, and therefore would prove to be a most serious risk to the health of all people within the area, subjecting them to near-constant low-level radiation.Another important factor is that the antenna would be extremely unsightly for such a picturesque area.

There is also the impact on house prices to consider. Potential buyers will be put off by the existence of such an antenna, therefore reducing the value of property in the area.

The erection of the antenna would serve no useful purpose at all for the community. However, it will pose a health risk to all and an economic risk to the immediate local community.

I therefore ask you to please, please refuse this permission, and consider the horrific impact that the Antenna would have on our own lives aswell as that of our future - our children.

Kind regards

Yours sincerely

Mr David N. Hitti

253 Nine Mile Ride
Finchampstead.
Berks RG40 3HY.

Wokingham District Council
attn. Chris Wood, Head of Planning & Transportation



Dear Sirs,

Re: Application TL/2000/0705 - 10m monopole by 25 N.M.R.

Thank you for your letter of 8th March, and the facility for seeing detailed plans of the above application from One-2-One.

In common with everyone in the immediate neighbourhood, I object most strongly to the siting of this monopole; and I do this on grounds of health and siting which are inter-linked.

I fully appreciate that there is "no scientific proof" that such low radiation is harmful. However such were the statement in the early days of nuclear explosions, the B.S.E fiasco and the Gulf War syndrome. — look where these have led us!

The siting of this pole in the middle of a housing settlement and virtually attached to a shop which many people frequent daily seems totally inappropriate in light of the public's total scepticism on the health issue.

There just have to be better sites which are at a "sensible"

(PTO →

distance from residences. I would make 2 specific suggestions and would appreciate your considered response please: —

① Why not site the pole alongside an existing lamp post at a safe distance from residences. This would have the advantage of being much less visible.

② Why on earth cannot these Cos. share 'poles'. I believe there is an "Orange" one at the top of Wick hill; why not site this alongside?

I gather 5 new licences are about to be released by the Govt. Does this mean each will want their own poles? That seems to me plain poor planning.

Yours ever hopefully,

John. W. Blackwell

P.S. There is "no scientific proof" that G.M foods are harmful, and yet public opinion has forced it virtually out of our food chain. The same response from the public should be acknowledged in this case.

27309

12th March 2000

PLANNING SERVICES	HPT
POL	TLS
DC	SNF
APP	
CS	
17 MAR 2000	
COPIES TO:	ACK:
	FILE:

Mrs JP Conn
15 Gorse Ride South
Finchampstead
Berkshire
RG40 4EH

Ms E Connor
Environmental Services Dept
Planning Services
PO Box 157
Shute End
Wokingham Berkshire RG40 1WR

Ref Application No: TL/2000/0705

Dear Ms Connor

I would like to take this opportunity to express my concern at the proposed erection of a Mobile Phone Antenna at land adjacent to 257 Nine Mile Ride. I strongly oppose this application for the following reasons. Mobile phone antenna are a severe health hazard and it has now been proved that they have some damaging impact on the human brain. They should not be allowed to be erected in areas where people live and children play, endangering their lives unnecessarily. There is also Nine Mile Ride School to consider, which would be endangering children's lives all day, everyday - how is this going to effect them now and in the future if they are exposed to radiation all day, every day of their most precious lives?

The Antenna would also be a terrible eyesore for the area and would not serve any useful purpose to the local community, and I am sure there are lots of other less built up areas where these poles can be erected, away from estates, schools and houses.

I do not live in the immediate area, however, my grandchildren do and it will endanger their health. I am sure that it will also have detrimental effects on the surrounding areas, both health wise and affecting the prices of our properties . It would not serve any useful purpose to the local people at all.

I would urge you most strongly to oppose this application, and consider the effect that it will have on the local community and their children.

Yours sincerely

J. P. Conn.

Mrs Jean P. Conn

PLANNING SERVICES	APT
POL	TLS
DC	ENF
APP	
CS	
14 MAR 2000	
COPIES TO:	ACK: ✓
	FILE:

12 March 2000

Ms Elaine Connor
Wokingham District Council
Environmental Services Department
Planning Services
P O Box 157
Shute End
Wokingham
Berkshire RG40 1WR

Dear Ms Connor

Application Number: TL/2000/0705

Site Address: Land Adjacent 257, Nine Mile Ride, Finchampstead, Wokingham.

Proposal: Proposed erection of 10 m high monopole with one tri-sector antenna and one equipment cabinet.

Reference the above-proposed application. We would like to put in writing that we *stro*[illegible] opposed the above planning application and would ask the Council to take into accoun[illegible] following points:

- as you are probably aware that there is a lot of concern about peoples health living near t[illegible] these monopoles i.e. radiation. We have school buses that pull up near to the proposed ar[illegible] what about the local children's health.
- why has Kiln Ride been proposed! Surely there must be a much better area for this to b[illegible] erected and not in a built up residential area. Who wants to look out of they window and [illegible] a monopole!
- It serves no useful commercial purpose for the community.
- if the above application goes through what about the value to houses – they would surely g[illegible] down in price as people would be reluctant to move into the area. Who would want to mo[illegible] into area with one of those erected nearby. If we were looking to buy we certainly wouldn[illegible] buy a house with a (MP) near.

We strongly ask you to consider the above – we live in a really nice residential area of Finchampstead and the above application would totally spoil the area.

Yours sincerely,

Mr & Mrs D A & J E Fitch
105 Kiln Ride
Finchampstead, Wokingham, Berks RG40 3PD

Shs

PLANNING SERVICES
POL
DC
APP
CS
17
COPIES TO:
ACK



Elaine Connor
Wokingham District Council
Environmental Services Department
Planning Services
P O Box 157
Shute End
Wokingham
Berkshire
RG40 1WR

Application Number TL/2000/0705
Land Adjacent 257, Nine Mile Ride, Finchampstead, Workingham

Dear Ms Connor

Reference my fax which you have acknowledged on the above. I would like to add some further comments.

You probably have already seen this article, but I have enclosed it for your information and I really do hope that Wokingham Council takes this matter very seriously, because we are.

We are sure that there could be another place for the mast to go where it is not in the middle of a residential area. Is the Council going to reduce our Council Tax! – and take responsibility for the health of local people in the area and reduction in property prices!

Yours sincerely,

Mr. Mrs Fitch

Mr Mrs Fitch
105 Kiln Ride
Finchampstead
Wokingham
Berkshire RG40 3PD

EXCLUSIVE: STAR TELLS HOW SISTER'S CANCER BATTLE LED HER TO JOIN CAMPAIGN

Jerry mobilises to halt march of phone masts



By Kathy Moran



WHEN a major mobile phone company revealed plans to put up one of its masts in a fashionable area of London, it obviously had not reckoned on the opposition of the redoubtable Jerry Hall.

The former supermodel has four children, and such is her health concern about mobile phones that she banned them from using the devices.

So when she learned that a mast might go up yards from a primary school near the family's home she decided she must speak out publicly. The anguish of seeing her twin sister Terry fighting cancer has been a key factor.

Mobile phone masts have been linked to cancer-related illnesses, Jerry points out. Her sister, who is now in remission, was warned by specialists to stay away from the masts and mobile phones.

"Nothing in the world can compensate for a loved one getting a deadly disease," said Jerry. "Even the possibility of a health risk should be enough of an issue to stop them from putting up masts near people, especially small children."

She is backing residents fighting an application by Orange to put an eight-metre mast close to a primary school near the home in Richmond Hill, South London, she shares with her children following her split from Mick Jagger.

"This worries me so much," she said. "I'm sitting here thinking I'm providing a safe healthy environment for my children in one of the most beautiful areas of England then Orange want to put up a mast which will zap microwaves at them as they walk down the street.

"The companies cannot prove to us that there is no risk. They are putting money before people. This is a complete violation of our human rights." Texan Jerry, 43, first became concerned about the health risks after Terry was diagnosed with breast cancer last year.

"One of the things my sister was asked by her cancer doctors was whether she lived near a mast or used a mobile phone," she said. "That was in a cancer institute, South Western, in Dallas and they should know what the risks are.

"Thankfully she is cancer-free at the moment but it could come back because she has a mutated gene and they have told her she must stay away from mobile phones and masts." Oncologists told Terry that her cancer was not hereditary but due to the mutated gene caused by toxins in her diet or in her environment. In the search for a cure, the sisters investigated alternative therapies and also did some research on the effects of microwaves.

"We know microwaves can be absorbed into the head," said Jerry. "Everyone knows already radioactivity is bad for you. Radiation can cause cancer and these masts emit radiation." She is so concerned about the damage mobiles could be causing she will not let her children Elizabeth, 16, James, 14, Georgia May, eight, and Gabriel, two, use them.

"All their friends have them and they try to borrow them but I just tell them 'no'," she laughed. "Seriously though, as a mother I just want to protect my children, and I also want to protect my local community."

She is urging mothers to use their power as consumers to protect their children. Jerry hopes enough people will start thinking about the issue in time to prevent the masts and phones from turning into a health issue on the scale of tobacco or BSE. "Look at genetically modified food," she said. "Housewives and mothers decided they would say no because they were worried about their families. We as consumers can change things."

Jerry has written to the local council and her three ward councillors and is angered by their refusal to ban the masts. "Bromley council has banned all these masts," she pointed out. "Our council should be strong enough to do this, to stand up to the big companies. They should be completely banned near schools. The council should not be giving in no matter what sort of money is on offer. I've heard they pay around £10,000 to put masts up but no money can compensate for cancer."

She wants the Government to fund research into the potential dangers of microwave radiation.

A spokesman for Orange said: "There is no substantiated scientific evidence that makes a link between exposure to radio waves, transmitter masts and long-term public health risks.

"Such transmitters operate very low power levels, many times below the guidelines laid down by the National Radiological Protection Board."

kathy.moran@express.co.uk

They are very bad for our health especially our childrens health. They are linked with Cancer. I hope that I was living in a safe protected environment. I intend to speak out against this danger very loudly. Thankyou J. Hall

CARING: Jerry with Terry in 1995 and, left, a protest letter she sent to the local council

Paul & Jill Bray

Rothesay,
132 Kiln Ride,
Finchampstead,
Berks RG40 3PB

Home Phone 0118 973 5642



18 March 2000

Mr C Wood
Head of Planning and Transportation
Planning Services
P.O Box 157
Shute End
Wokingham, RG40 1WR

Dear Mr Wood,

Re: Application Number: TL/2000/0705

Proposal for the erection of 10m high monopole @ 257, Nine Mile Ride

Thank you for your letter of 8th March.

I am writing to protest against the proposed erection of the monopole for the following reasons:

1. I am greatly concerned about the possible health dangers arising from the positioning of the proposed pole so close to my house , some 20m . I have two boys aged 4 & 6 , whom I would not wish to be subjected to the constant exposure to the EMF generated by the ariel.

A report in the Sunday Times on 12th march this year noted :

"A (government sponsored) committee report, due for release next month, will say it is now clear that the microwave radiation given off by mobile phones and masts can affect the workings of the human brain."

Much of the information about the risks associated with such radiation has been inconclusive. However , there is also a common theme that such dangers cannot be ruled out, and as such, preventative measures should be adopted. The new report is sure to stir up much heated debate.

2. One-to-One are sure to produce some reassuring data to support their case. Few people have the necessary technical background to query this.

Nevertheless, the common perception is that such a mast **will** produce a potential health risk given the constant levels of low frequency radiation. This will affect house prices in the immediate vicinity. This is a commonly held view.

I gather from the recent Parish Council meeting , that the mast is intended to boost reception inside houes along Nine Mile Ride. One could question , why not use a land line? Also, how many One-to One users will benefit?

The pole is being erected for no real benefit to the local community, yet I am being expected to suffer a financial loss by a reduction in the value of my house to a accomodate a marginal improvement in the service to one of many providers of mobile phones.

3. My over-riding concern is that the pole will damage my sons health.

In Decmber 1998, the Government issued a draft circular ' Land Use Planning and Electromagnectic Fields'. Reference was made to a court case which held " any genuine public perception of danger is a valid planning consideration".

There is very clearly a very genuine public perception of danger. Witness the petition handed to you by a Parish Councillor ; this affirms the local residents' fears about the mast.

The site of the mast is metres away from a school bus pick-up point . The implications are obvious. Even if One-to-One are confident for the present about the safety aspect, they must be aware of public concerns. No effort has been made to quell these. From a PR perspective, this is very poor. The Council must share the responsibility for this as well.

4. The plan to erect the pole must **not** proceed on the basis of the local residents' fear about the impact of health.

The danger cannot be ruled out. Moreover , there is growing evidence that such technology does pose a threat to humans.

The erection of the pole will produce financial loss to the owners of properties in the immediate vicinity of the proposed structure.

The financial impact will be immediate. The impact on health could potentially occur in the future. The Council needs to take account of the cost in terms of health and financial compensation if our fears are realised. The risks are too great for the marginal improvement to a small group of customers of just one of many mobile phone providers.

The erection of the pole will serve no useful community purpose. The proposal should be rejected.

Paul Bray

Paul & Jill Bray

S. Times 12/3/00

Radiation curbs to hit phone firms

MOBILE phone companies could face tough new restrictions on the siting of masts and on the radiation levels emitted from handsets under proposals being discussed by a government-appointed committee inquiring into potential health risks, *write Jonathan Leake and Guy Dennis*.

A committee report, due for release next month, will say it is now clear that the microwave radiation given off by mobile phones and masts can affect the workings of the human brain.

The committee will warn ministers that the mobile phone industry has already erected 20,000 masts around the country and that, with another 100,000 planned, hundreds of thousands of people will soon be subjected to near-constant low-level radiation.

About 20m people have mobile phones and there will be a likely boom with the new generation of phones allowing access to the internet.

The concern follows studies by scientists from the government's National Radiological Protection Board about masts erected on school roofs...



abriel Bouis

tical faculties

Head of Planning & Transportation
Wokingham District Council
Environmental Services Dept.
PO Box 157
Shute End, Wokingham

254 Nine Mile Ride
Finchampstead
Wokingham
Berkshire
RG 40 3NT

Your Ref. TL/2000/0705

20-03-00

22 MAR 2000
ACK:
FILE:

Dear Sir

Proposed erection of 10 metre Monopole on land adjacent To 257 Nine Mile Ride, Finchampstead.

We wish to protest in the strongest possible terms at the above mentioned proposal. We consider it totally unnecessary to have a mobile telephone mast so close to private residences. It is completely alien to the local environment, will be an eyesore and will adversely affect the value of property in close proximity.

We also feel the most important single factor is the unknown potential health hazard from microwave radiation.

Yours faithfully,

K.A.Charman B.J.Charman

(K.A.Charman B.J.Charman)

WOKINGHAM DISTRICT COUNCIL

MEMORANDUM



From: John Mullaney
Environmental Health

To: Elaine Connor
Planning Department

Date: 13/03/2000

LAND ADJOINING 257 NINE MILE RIDE, FINCHAMPSTEAD. TL/2000/0705

Having considered the environmental health implications of the above application I have no objection to the development but have the following comments to make:

There have been questions raised as to the possibility of adverse health effects from electromagnetic radiation from telecommunication base stations and their positioning in relation to residential development and in particular schools.

The National Radiological Protection Board (NRPB) was established by the Radiological Protection Act 1970 and is responsible for conducting research and providing advice and services for protection against ionising and non-ionising radiation in the U.K. They are continually reviewing the vast body of world-wide research on the subject.

The NRPBs' current advice is that there is no proven human health risk from these installations. This position is confirmed by the Chartered Institute of Environmental Health and pressure groups such as Powerwatch network. There are however countries and areas of the world where precautionary measures have been adopted, e.g. New Zealand Ministry of Education has issued a policy statement preventing cellular phone antennas from being sited at state schools in the future.

Further research is currently being undertaken into possible health implications although to date no definitive statement can be made.

The NRPB have set up an Advisory Group to look into this matter. This Group has concluded, in reference to buffer zones for sensitive developments, that there is neither a clear basis from which to derive a meaningful assessment of risk, nor is there any indication of how putative risk might vary with exposure. Thus there is no scientific justification for seeking to reduce exposure in these situations and that a decision to do so must be based on social and economic rather than scientific grounds.

continued.....

The Chartered Institute of Environmental Health's current policy is as follows:

"The CIEH with regard to overhead and buried high voltage power lines, electricity sub-stations, wind generators, microwave and radio transmitters mobile phone base stations and other similar installations emitting electro magnetic radiation (EMR) in close proximity to dwellings considers:

(a) That the effect on human health based on scientific evidence is insignificant and not proven.

(b) That there is no convincing national or international scientific research linking Electromagnetic Radiation and deterioration in human health.

(c) That a precautionary approach to restricting building or access near such installations (apart from physical safety barriers) cannot be sustained on health grounds alone and if adopted must be based on access, amenity and public acceptability considerations.

(d) That Local Authorities should adopt a policy on how to address questions from the public on Electromagnetic radiation from such sources."

Please contact me if you require further information.

J Mullaney

John Mullaney
Environmental Health Officer

To:
Property



From: Elaine Connor

Date: 08 March 2000

Application Number: TL/2000/0705

Proposal: Proposed erection of 10 m high monopole with one tri-sector antenna and one equipment cabinet.

Site Address:
Land Adjacent 257, Nine Mile Ride, Finchampstead, Wokingham.

Applicant:
One 2 One C/O Commpro Acquisition Services.

Your observations are required in respect of this application within **7 days** of the above date.

No objections

GS

PLANNING SERVICES
PDL
DC
AEP
CS
15 MAR 2000
COPIES TO:
FILE

126 Kiln Ride
Finchampstead
Berkshire
RG40 3PB

Tel: 01189 733452

15th March 2000

For the attention of Elaine Connor

Ref: Planning Application No TL/2000/0705

Proposal to erect 10m monopole with one tri – sector antenna and one equipment cabinet on land adjacent to 257 Nine Mile Ride Finchampstead Wokingham

I am a little confused. There appears to be 2 planning applications being submitted for this proposal, both equally ambiguous by omission and/or design.

The first is the application above. This fails to specify exactly where the erection is proposed - where is the 'land' adjacent to 257 Nine Mile Ride. This property is Belmont Stores, and as far as I am aware has no adjacent land associated with it.

The second is that displayed on a Road Sign outside Belmont Stores. It is an application for the erection of a similar structure, but this has a proposed site of 'Kiln Ride / Wick Hill' area. As these are two different geographical sites, by definition, the actual site has purposely been made ambiguous.

Therefore, before I can make any comments I need to be informed exactly what is being proposed and where. As I can foresee strong opposition to any plans to erect medium energy microwave transmission equipment anywhere within this populated area I request detailed written information on this issue.

Please provide specific erection plans together with:

- Power output
- Polar diagrams if this is a directional antenna
- Predicted field strengths within 800 metres of the tri sector antenna
- Frequency bands to be used

I consider that the current application/applications have defaulted due to a definite ambiguity of information and that any comment return dates are left open until this situation is fully understood by the local residents.

I await further clarification on the issues above from you.

Yours sincerely,

G. S. Osborne

SD S

PLANNING SERVICES	HPT
POL	TLS
DC	ENF
APP	
CS	
16 MAR 2000	
COPIES TO:	ACK: ✓
	FILE:



Roy C.Hembrow
255 Nine Mile Ride
Finchampstead
Wokingham
Berkshire, RG40 3NY\

14-Mar -2000

Dear Madam

Ref Planning application No TL/2000/0705

I am writing to express my concerns over the erection of a 10 Metre high monopole situated on the pavement adjacent to 257 nine-mile-ride.

The erection of the monopole would be 18-Metres from our bedroom window and we think we have a valid complaint as currently street lights, 30-M-P H signs, shop advertisements, all shine directly into our bedroom window. We have not complained previously as we realise they are all essential for safety on a very busy and dangerous junction.

The necessity for a monopole to be erected where children gather to board school buses, particularly after reading the article in the Sunday times about the danger of emissions from these aerials. Why on earth would permission be given to place the monopole in such a heavily populated area? Our understanding is that there is already one sited on farm land close by and concerned that the erection of one in such close proximity could heighten the danger to all residents.

We plan to sell our house in the near future to move nearer our daughter and we are certain it would affect the value and salability of our property. Could you give us details of pre and post house prices in other areas where these monopoles have been erected.

We understand that enormous sums of money by these companies are offered for rental, and would appreciate your comments on who would gain from this application as I am sure it would not be the local residents. The owners of 257 Nine Mile Ride assure us that it would not be them.

If it is to be Wokingham District Council, could you provide us with the information as to where this money will be spent.

Yours sincerely,

R C. Hembrow

R.C.Hembrow

8075

PLANNING SERVICES	HPT
POL	TLS
DC	ENF
APP	
CS	
16 MAR 2000	
COPIES TO:	ACK:
	FILE:

130 Kiln Ride
Wokingham
Berks.
RG40 3PB

14/03/00

Reference: TL/2000/070

Ms. E. Connor

Wokingham District Council
Environmental Services Department
Planning Services
P.O. Box 157
Shute End
Wokingham
Berkshire RG40 1WR

Dear Ms. Connor,

Having just been made aware of the proposal to erect 10M antennae on the land adjacent to 257, Nine Mile Ride, I am writing to express my objections.

I am horrified that you would consider siting this in such a highly populated area.

Firstly, I am very concerned that there have been many reports in the papers, regarding health issues associated with these antennae. Medical evidence may not yet be conclusive, but why take needless risks with people's health when there is plenty of land in the vicinity which is unpopulated.

Secondly, it is an eyesore in a pleasant residential area, which will be ugly to look at and could easily affect the value of property in the vicinity. It is also probable that once erected, other service providers will want to attach their own equipment to it, thus it will get larger and more obtrusive, to say nothing of the potential interference with electrical appliances.

I trust that you will consider these objections seriously before making any decision.

Yours sincerely

Mrs. S.M. Joselin

SNS

PLANNING SERVICES | HBT
POL | TLS
DC | ENF
APP | FIL
CS |
15 MAR 2000
COPIES TO: | ACK: ✓
FILE:

BELMONT STORES
257 Nine Mile Ride,
FINCHAMPSTEAD,
Berks. RG40 3NS

Chris Wood,
Head of Planning Dept.
Wokingham District Council,
Shute End,
Wokingham, Berks.

14th March 2000

Dear Sir

Application No. **TL/2000/0705**

Site Address: **Land adjacent 257 Nine Mile Ride, Finchampstead.**

Proposal: **Proposed erection of 10m high monopole with one tri-sector antenna and one equipment cabinet.**

We are astonished and most distressed to hear of the above Planning Application adjacent to our property without even the courtesy of prior notification and consultation with your goodselves or your client.

We strongly object to this application on the following grounds;

1. Its visual aspect alone will be most obtrusive

2. The possible health hazards in such close proximity - not only to ourselves but to all our neighbours, many with young children. This is a very built-up area.

3. Concern on interference with our T.V. reception.

4. Will have a detrimental effect on the value of our property and those in close proximity.

May we reiterate that we strongly object to this application.

Yours faithfully,

Agit Singh Grewal

Satpal Kaur Grewal.

Satwant Kaur Grewal

Copy to Finchampstead Parish Council.

Copy to Mrs. Muriel Long, District Councillor

EC

SMS

PLANNING SERVICES	HPT
POL	TLS
DC	ENF
APP	
CS	
17 MAR 2000	
COPIES TO:	ACK: ✓
	FILE:

Mr & Mrs Collins
11 Tomlinson Drive
Finchampstead
Wokingham
Berks
RG40 3N

15th March 2000

Wokingham District Council
Planning services
PO Box 157
Shute End
Wokingham
Berkshire
RG40 1WR

Reference - Application Number TL/2000/0705

Dear Sir / Madam
We would like to place on record our strong objection to the proposed erection of a 10m high monopole at 257 Nine Mile Ride.
Our objection is based on -
The great concern that this may well prove to be a health hazard

The unwelcoming appearance of such a structure.

Its placement in a residential area when the must be more appropriate sites available.

Yours sincerely

M.Collins.

Tel: (0118) 974 6451 (Direct Line)
Fax: (0118) 974 6484
Date: 27 March, 2000
My ref: EC/TL/2000/0705
Your ref:

Environmental Services Department
Planning Services
P.O. Box 157
Shute End, Wokingham
Berkshire RG40 1WR
Tel: (0118) 974 6000
Fax: (0118) 974 6484
Minicom No: (0118) 974 6991
DX: 33506 – Wokingham

Commpro Acquisition Services Ltd.,
Unit 1 Silkstone Court
Dodsworth Business Park
Barnsley
South Yorkshire
S75 3SP

Dear Sir/Madam

RE: PROPOSED ERECTION OF A 10M HIGH MONOPOLE MAST WITH ONE TRI-SECTOR ANTENNA AND ONE EQUIPMENT CABINET, AT LAND ADJACENT TO 257, NINE MILE RIDE, FINCHAMPSTEAD.
TELECOMMUNICATION NOTIFICATION: TL/2000/0705

I refer to your notification for a telecommunications 10m monopole style mast with one tri-sector antenna, and one equipment cabinet, at land adjacent to 257, Nine Mile Ride, Finchampstead.

I write to formally advise you that the Local Planning Authority require Prior Approval of this scheme, in view of the close proximity of the proposed mast to residential properties.

I would be grateful if you would advise me in writing within 7 days of this letter, if you are able to revise the scheme and locate it to an alternative location, which would be significantly further away from any residential properties.

Yours sincerely

M L THORP
Principal Development Control Officer

42 days
13/4/00

WOKINGHAM D.C. DEVELOPMENT CONTROL

Start date:	02 MAR 2000
Officer: EC	Application No. TL/2000/0705

Map No. 109 Site 0:01

Easting: ..... Flood Pln .....

Northing: ..... Mineral .....

Level: ☐ Sub Committee ☑ Delegated ☐ Sec. State

☐ Incorrect Fee ☐ Invalid ☐ PD

Description:
(TL) PROPOSED ERECTION OF 10M HIGH MONOPOLE WITH ONE TRI-SECTOR ANTENNA AND ONE EQUIPMENT CABINET

Location: ~~KILN RIDE~~ LAND ADJACENT 257 Nine Mile Ride

Parish: FINCHAMPSTEAD Ward: Finchampstead South

Applicant: ONE 2 ONE

Fee Received 35-00 (13) Required ..... Additional ..... Refund .....

Enforcement Section to be notified ☐ tick if required

Additional information required for validation

		Reason	Requested	Received
1	1:2500 OS location plan showing property edged in blue/red			
2	1:500 block plan showing existing & proposed dev. + adj. Properties			
3	Forms unsigned			
4	Correct S 66 certificate			
5	Elevation plans			
6	Floor plans			
7	Metric scale disclaimer			
8	Encroachment letter			
9	Miscellaneous			

APPLN NO. _____

ACTION REQUIRED BY DEVELOPMENT CONTROL

Conservation Area .....

Listed Building 1 2 2*

Advertisement Required .....

Date Site Notice Sent : ..... Parish Council Informed - YES / NO

INTERNAL CONSULTATIONS

Building Control	NF: .....
Landscape	NK: .....
Trees	NK: .....
Conservation Officer	NK: .....
Environmental Health	NA: .....
Housing	NA: .....
Leisure & Cultural services	PA: .....
Public Rights of Way	PA: .....
Property	NG: .....
District Secretary (only if called in by SOS)	MA: .....
Policy & Plans	QA: .....
Strategic Planning (JSPU)	HA: .....
Minerals (BABTIE)	GA: .....
Archaeological Site (BABTIE)	: .....
Education	AP: .....
Social Services	BT: .....
Highways	XA: .....

EXTERNAL CONSULTATIONS

Adjacent D P A	: .....
Adjacent Parish	: .....
Southern Electricity Board	BN: .....
British Gas	BM: .....
PSA Oil Pipeline	BD: .....
Transco	: .....
Environment Agency	BP: .....
Rail Track	BI: .....
Police Arch. Liaison Officer	PC: .....

HERITAGE BODIES

The Georgian Group	KC: .....
Ancient Monuments Society	KA: .....
Council for British Arch.	KB: .....
RCHME	KF: .....
Telecommunications (NRPB)	: .....
Sport England	: .....

OTHERS:

.....

.....

.....

NEIGHBOURS:

~~249~~, ~~251~~, ~~253~~, ~~255a~~, ~~255~~, ~~257~~, ~~259~~, ~~261~~, ~~261a~~, ~~261b~~, ~~263~~,
~~263a~~, ~~265~~ Nine Mile Ride

~~134~~, ~~132~~, ~~130~~, ~~128~~ 107 Kiln Ride

~~246~~, ~~248~~, ~~248a~~, ~~250~~, ~~250a~~, ~~252a~~, ~~b~~, ~~c~~, ~~d~~, ~~254~~

COMMPRO
acquisition services

02 MAR 2000

Our ref: AF/1/o2o/71015/LN

Head of Planning and Transportation
Wokingham District Council
Environmental Services Department
Planning Services
PO Box 157
Shute End, Wokingham
Berkshire
RG40 1WR

02.MAR2000* 0705

Attention: Ms Carol Humphrey

28 February 2000

Dear Sir

LICENCE NOTICE

PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT PROPOSED BY ONE 2 ONE PERSONAL COMMUNICATIONS LIMITED FOR THE INSTALLATION OF A GROUND BASED 12M "STREETWORKS" MONOPOLE MAST WITH ASSOCIATED ANTENNAE AND EQUIPMENT CABIN AND DEVELOPMENT ANCILLARY THERETO ON KILN RIDE, WICK HILL, FINCHAMPSTEAD RG40 3NS - CELL 71015.

One 2 One Personal Communications Limited has been licensed to provide a Personal Communications Network (PCN) within the United Kingdom. In order to facilitate the deployment of the network, the Company has been conferred the status of a Public Telecommunications Code System Operator. PCN systems are designated as Public Telecommunications Systems under Section 9 of the Telecommunications Act 1984.

As a condition of their Operating Licence, One 2 One Personal Communications Limited are obliged to advise you of their intention to carry out the development outlined above and as specified on the attached drawings o2o/71015/01,02 & 03. The proposal constitutes permitted development under Class A of Part 24 of Schedule 2 of the Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (as amended). Accordingly, we hereby provide you with 42 days Notice of our intention to carry out the development as described above.

Yours faithfully

On behalf of
One 2 One Personal Communications Limited

Recorded Delivery &
Advice of Delivery

Enc: (1) Drawings o2o/71015/01,02 & 03

Commpro Acquisition Services Limited: Unit 1 Silkstone Court, Dodworth Business Park, Barnsley, South Yorkshire S75 3SP
Telephone: 01226 290822 Facsimile: 01226 299427 e-mail: cas@commpro.co.uk
Registered Office: Hathaway House, Popes Drive, London N3 1QF
Registered Number 3453076 England

COMMPRO
acquisition services

42 days 13/4/00

02 MAR 2000

Our ref: AF/1/o2o/71015/GDO1

£35-00

(15)

Head of Planning and Transportation
Wokingham District Council
Environmental Services Department
Planning Services
PO Box 157
Shute End, Wokingham
Berkshire
RG40 1WR

Attention: Ms Carol Humphrey

28 February 2000

Dear Sir

APPLICATION FOR DETERMINATION AS TO WHETHER PRIOR APPROVAL IS REQUIRED FOR DEVELOPMENT PERMITTED BY PART 24 OF SCHEDULE 2 OF THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (GENERAL PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT) ORDER 1995 (AS AMENDED) PROPOSED BY ONE 2 ONE PERSONAL COMMUNICATIONS LIMITED ON KILN RIDE, WICK HILL, FINCHAMPSTEAD RG40 3NS.

One 2 One Personal Communications Limited has been licensed to provide a Personal Communications Network (PCN) within the United Kingdom. In order to facilitate the deployment of the network, the Company has been conferred the status of a Public Telecommunications Code System Operator. PCN systems are designated as Public Telecommunications Systems under Section 9 of the Telecommunications Act 1984.

We write on behalf of One 2 One Personal Communications Limited to make application under Condition A.2.(4) of the above Order. We attach drawings o2o/71015/01/02 and 03 specifying the proposed installation which comprises ground based antennae and equipment cabinet, together with a cheque made payable to the Council for the sum of £35 (thirty five pounds). Please note that this application only relates to certain components of the installation.

Yours faithfully

On behalf of
One 2 One Personal Communications Limited

Recorded Delivery &
Advice of Delivery

Enc: (1) Cheque in respect of application
(2) Information Form as per Part 2.1(ii) of the Code
(3) Copy of site notice and plan
(4) Drawing Nos. o2o/71015/01/02 and 03

02.MAR2000* 0705

Commpro Acquisition Services Limited: Unit 1 Silkstone Court, Dodworth Business Park, Barnsley, South Yorkshire S75 3SP
Telephone: 01226 290822 Facsimile: 01226 299427 e-mail: cas@commpro.co.uk
Registered Office: Hathaway House, Popes Drive, London N3 1QF
Registered Number 3453076 England

INFORMATION TO ACCOMPANY AN APPLICATION FOR PRIOR APPROVAL DETERMINATION UNDER PART 24 OF THE GPDO IN RESPECT OF PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT BY TELECOMMUNICATIONS CODE SYSTEM OPERATORS (PART 2.1 (II) OF THE CODE REFERS).

1 PRE-APPLICATION CONSULTATION WITH LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY

i) Licence notification ie. pre rollout of network	Date Unknown
Name of LPA Contact	

ii) On sites in specific cell(s)	Date 5 November 1999
Name of LPA contact: Ms Carol Humphrey	

2A NAME AND ADDRESS OF APPLICANT

Name	ONE 2 ONE PERSONAL COMMUNICATIONS LIMITED		
Address	ELSTREE TOWER, ELSTREE WAY, BOREHAMWOOD, HERTFORDSHIRE		
Postcode	WD6 1DT	Tel	0181 214 2121

2B AGENT'S NAME, ADDRESS AND CONTACT

Name	COMMPRO ACQUISITION SERVICES		
Address	UNIT 1, SILKSTONE COURT, DODWORTH BUSINESS PARK, BARNSLEY		
Postcode	S75 3SP	Tel	01226 290822
Contact	ANTHONY FOGARTY		

2C LOCATION OF PROPOSAL

Location **Kiln Ride, Wick Hill, Finchampstead, RG40 3NS**

2D O.S. SHEET/GRID REFERENCE

Sheet and six figure grid reference of proposed development	
Sheet	Grid Reference **480379/164969**

02.MAR2000* 0705

3 PURPOSE OF DEVELOPMENT

To provide coverage along the B3430, near Wick Hill, Wokingham.

4 THE PROPOSED STRUCTURE (Please enclose a site plan and indicate details of cell boundaries, and whether shared mast/tower or free-standing)

i) Type of Structure (eg. tower, mast, etc.)

Overall height **10** metres

Height of existing building (where applicable) **N/A** metres

ii) Equipment Housing

Length **1340** mm Width **425** mm Height **1527** mm

iii) Materials (as applicable)

Tower/mast etc.:- type of material and external colour **steel/unpainted**

Equipment Housing:- type of material and external colour **steel/light grey**

iv) Location of and distance to nearest residential or commercial property (where applicable):- 0.75 metres

5 DISTANCE FROM AIRFIELD OR AERODROME (Please tick as appropriate)

Will the structure be within 3km of an aerodrome or airfield?	~~Yes~~ / No
Has the Civil Aviation Authority and Secretary of state for Defence (as appropriate) been notified?	~~Yes~~ / No

Signed Date 28 February 2000

On behalf of **ONE 2 ONE PERSONAL COMMUNICATIONS LIMITED**

02.MAR2000* 0705

NOTICE

Proposed development at	**Kiln Ride, Wick Hill, Finchampstead, RG40 3NS**
Grid Reference	**480379/164969**
I give notice that	**Commpro Acquisition Services**
on behalf of	**One 2 One Personal Communications Limited**
is applying to	**Wokingham District Council**

under paragraph A.2(4A) of Part 24 of Schedule 2 to the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 for its determination as to whether the prior approval of the authority will be required to the siting and appearance of a

10m high monopole with one tri-sector antenna and one equipment cabinet (1340 x 425 x 1527 mm high)

Under Part 24 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995, Wokingham District Council are allowed 42 days beginning with the date of application to consider whether prior approval will be required to the siting and appearance of the development proposed and, if so, to give or refuse such approval and to serve that decision upon the applicant.

Members of the public may inspect copies of the application and accompanying plans at the Environmental Services Department, Shute End, Wokingham.

Individuals and organisations wishing to make representations about the siting and appearance of the proposed development are invited to forward their views in writing no later than **20th March 2000** to the **Head of Planning and Transportation, Environmental Services Department, Planning Services, PO Box 157, Shute End, Wokingham, Berkshire, RG40 1WR** clearly stating that comments are being forwarded in relation to the proposed development of a ground-based mast on **Kiln Ride, Wick Hill, Finchampstead, RG40 3NS**, Grid Reference **480379/164969.**

SIGNED: _____ **(Commpro Acquisition Services)**

ON BEHALF OF: **One 2 One Personal Communications Limited**

DATED: 28/2/00

02.MAR2000* 0705



Site Plan, Scale: 1 to 1250 02 MAR 2000 0705

This copy has been produced specifically for the map return scheme purposes only. No further copies may be made.

This map is reproduced from Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Controller of HMSO Office. © Crown Copyright. Wokingham District Council, Licence No. LA086134

Date: 3 March 2000

N W E S

Org No: o2o/71015/03



WEST ELEVATION

02.MAR2000* 0705

NOTES

1.1. Do not scale
1.2. All dimensions are in mm unless otherwise specified.
1.3. Assume all site details are existing unless otherwise specified.
1.4. For details of o2o equipment refer to Drg No 02 of this series.

	Date	
Mn	Approv.	
	Date	
Mn	Approv.	
	Date	
Mn	Approv.	

one 2 one

One 2 One Personal Communications Limited
Deutsche Telekom Group

COMMPRO acquisition services

Woolgar Hunter
CONSULTING CIVIL & STRUCTURAL ENGINEERS
ST ANDREW HOUSE, 141 WEST NILE STREET, GLASGOW, G1 2RN.

Site Address:
Kiln Ride
Wick Hill
Finchampstead
RG40 3NS

Title:
Kiln Ride

Title:
Site Elevation

Purpose of issue:
Planning

Drawing No:	Cell No:
o2o/71015/03	71015
WH ref: 200403/004/03	Site no: 742104

Issue:	Scale: 1:100		Ch'd: GMcS	Date: 10.02.2000
	Drn: JAL	Date: 10.02.2000	Approv: AMcS	Date: 10.02.2000

© One 2 One Personal Communications Ltd 1999 This drawing and any information or description shown on it are the confidential and copyright property of One 2 One Personal Communications Ltd and must not be loaned, copied or used for manufacturing, tendering or any other purpose without One 2 One Personal Communications Ltd prior written consent.

When quoting the drawing number please state the latest letter of issue.

Size A3 (420mm x 297mm).