

LOCKERLEY GREEN PROPOSED MAST

Further comments and queries

This is a collated set of further responses that have been received.

A: Can the Parish Council please clearly explain why other potentially more suitable sites in the area have been rejected or not considered by GallifordTry (or the Parish Council)?

B: Where can residents see the ecological, economic and technical data outlining the appropriateness of their choice for Lockerley Green and rejecting the other sites?

C: Can the Parish Council assure the electorate of Lockerley Parish that other sites are still being considered and that it is not a *fait accompli* that “negotiations for an agreement to install telecommunications apparatus on land at Lockerley Green” is the only option?

D: Can the Parish Council please outline their thoughts on how monies for the preservation of Lockerley Green will be spent?

E: The process followed by Cornerstone Telecommunications ("the company") and Galliford Try ("The Agent") is flawed in that they have repeatedly broken rules and conventions. Sue Holder, at the recent Zoom meeting of the PC, mentioned that there are at least 5 (five) ways in which the company breached laws, e.g.

E 1: digging up the Green without the permission of the landowner,

E 2: lying to say they had made contacts which they had not.

E 3: only writing to the nearest four households affected, rather than all of them.

F: Common sense, and a few tests of signal strength, should reveal that there are several sites equally suitable from a telecomms point of view. I get the feeling from that PC meeting that the company has done little or no further research into a site that has far less impact on the visual quality of the village.

Of the alternatives:

F 1: I believe Roger Henderson has volunteered a site.

F 2: The Glebe Field is there - and the company's suggestion that it wasn't tested because of spoiling the view from the church (which is - ridiculously - a listed building) is just rubbish.

F 3: How about the church tower (tho' I have no idea how this can be achieved, but it's not my expertise).

F 4: Three-quarters of the way up the road onto Dean Hill (to Paul Stewart's) is a trig point - perfect, surely, for a good spread of signal.

F 5: By the railway track half-way between Lockerley Green (railway bridge) and the Romsey Road railway bridge.

G: From an environmental angle, i.e. the quality of living in this area, such a mast would reduce it markedly.

H: One of the correspondents works in the telecommunications industry for a company who specialise in gathering, maintaining, and analysing data relating to mobile telecommunications equipment. One of our specialities is the ability to calculate and understand the impact on coverage of changes in site location and height of masts etc. Our systems are used by most of the UK operators and installers to aid best practice in this field. My personal thoughts on the matter are that, given the mast is 20m tall, it must be a 5G mast. I believe I read it was a 5G and a 4G mast on the technical drawings provided in the planning application too.

I: In terms of whether or not it is actually necessary 5G is absolutely unnecessary. 4G is plenty fast enough that there is nothing you could possibly do on your phone or mobile device that would require a 5G connection. The main downside of 5G is that the coverage is not nearly as good as 4G or even 3G. In essence, the slower the network the better the coverage. Also, they have to be an unreasonable 20m tall, towering above the tallest trees. Given that Lockerley has a superb broadband network and we all have very good connections in our homes, the only thing missing for me is the ability to receive a text message, which could be solved by installing an old 2G mast positioned miles away. Things like smart meters do not require 5G, they barely transmit any data at all and would run perfectly on a 2G connection. I believe they could and should find a better site for the mast.

J: Have they approached the church around the corner for an antenna at the top of the steeple for example?

K: We have such a lovely community green that would be totally spoilt by this mast (and once built, potentially other masts as well!). I am concerned about potential H&S issues, especially for those (including myself) who live in the vicinity of the proposed mast. In addition, it could also potentially lower house values on the green.

L : It is totally incongruous with the locality and the Parish Council need to make it clear to GallifordTry that this site (chosen by GallifordTry with no consultation with the Parish Council) is totally unsuitable.

M : I get the impression that GallifordTry are used to following their own agenda, with no respect to others. The audacity of them to 'test' out this site, with no permission from the owners (Lockerley Parish Council) and then draw up plans is just disgusting.

N : I hear comments made by our Parish Councillors regarding timescales, etc but I am very concerned that a clear and firm stance needs to be made.

O : I know that the local community has raised money for the preservation and upkeep of Lockerley Green. What is this money for? I am of the opinion that the Parish Councillors need qualified advice and support from an expert, now. Very soon it will be too late.

P : I firmly believe that the vast majority of residents in Lockerley and the surrounding areas are keen to improve their mobile phone signal and I am personally not against this particular development in technology. I do feel though that they need to consider our views, regarding any siting of a mast. It is us who will live with it!

Q : I am sure that there are other sites (some have been kindly offered by the local community). GallifordTry need to meet with our Parish Council to hear our views and our proposals. We need to be positive and supportive of what they are trying to do (in improving our infrastructure) but not ride roughshod over our community lives.

R : It is clear from the letter that the primary purpose of the proposed mast is to gather data on behalf of the energy companies viz. remote reading of smart meters. Thus - the primary purpose of the mast is not to improve mobile signal and access to the benefit of the occupants of Lockerley and surrounding area. It is made clear that - despite the company (Cornerstone Telecommunications Infrastructure Ltd) being jointly owned by both Vodafone and Telefonica - only those people or entities who are customers of Telefonica/O2 will be able to access better mobile signal.

S : This is not an acceptable position as many parish residents will be customers of other networks - including but not limited to 3, Virgin mobile, Tesco

Mobile, EE and Vodafone (a co-owner of Cornerstone) - and will therefore gain no benefit from this proposed activity.

T : Unless and until it is irrevocably committed and guaranteed by Cornerstone and or it's agents that all residents - no matter which operator they use - will receive better mobile network service and coverage as a result of this or any mast being erected - then I fully object to the proposal.

U : I am sure most people from Lockerley would strongly agree we need better mobile signal/access in Lockerley and the surrounding area. But maintaining the character and aesthetics of the village/area is equally important.

V : The siting of any mast - and its visual and any possible health impacts - need to be carefully considered. The appearance of the mast must also be investigated - can it not be disguised as a tree? And a bloody great metal pole and a raft of hoardings and power units surrounding it sitting in the middle of the green?

W : Can the mast be located adjacent to the railway line? Or hidden in the church spire (am sure that will get the conversation going!!)? Or in the large lines of trees running along the River Dun?? Elsewhere as appropriate.....?

X : On balance am in favour but the proposed appearance and siting of the mast must cause as little visual 'interference' as possible - and be put to a vote for all parishioners to decide.

Y: Have you a properly set out list of all the transgressions committed by Cornerstone and their agent (GallifordTry)? Such should include:

Y 1: the digging of Lockerley Green without permission, and

Y 2: making promises that were not kept,

Y 3: If not, please explain why not.

Z : What do you know about alternative sites in the village? Such should include:

Z 1: opinion from local people with knowledge of telecommunications,

Z 2: offers of other sites

Z 3: sites that seem just plain obvious (by the railway line between Lockerley Green and the railway bridge, or the Glebe Field, or the church tower, etc. etc.

Z 4: all the information from Cornerstone about their supposed searches

AA : We do need better mobile signal in the village but it should be placed in an appropriate site that doesn't impact visually, particularly for householders living nearby.

AB : I believe the mast is very much needed, but that the location could certainly be improved. My thoughts about it being needed are based largely on the fact it will bring 5G Internet and therefore mean that the village will have access to ultrafast Internet. I can't see us having fibre to premises for at least 5 years, so 5g Internet will be a major boon. Can the council confirm that the mast will provide 5g, and that it will work with 5g routers such as that offered by Vodafone.