Application No: N/04/01602/FUL
Date Registered: 8th September 2004
Applicant: Hutchison 3G (UK) Ltd  
C/o Mono Consultants Ltd  
1/8 St Vincent Street  
Glasgow  
G2 5TS
Agent: Mono Consultants Ltd  
1/8 St Vincent Street  
Glasgow  
G2 5TS
Development: Installation of 3 Antenna, 3 Transmission Dishes and Equipment Cabinet
Location: Carrickstone Water Tower, off Portland Road, Carrickstone Cumbernauld
Ward: 57: Westerwood, Carrickstone and Dullatur  Councillor Gordon Murray
Grid Reference: 275438 676126
File Reference: N/04/01602/FUL
Site History: 6 similar structures have been installed on the Water Tower under Permitted Development Rights N/04/01525/FUL: Installation of 3 Antenna on existing structures – also being reported to this committee.
Development Plan: The site is identified as being within an area for new housing (Policy HG5) of the Cumbernauld Local Plan, 1993
Contrary to Development Plan: No
Consultations: 
Representations: 31 Representation Letters (including letters from the Local Member and the Community Council)
Newspaper Advertisement: Not Required
Comments:
This planning application proposes the installation of 3 new structures on top of Carrickstone Water Tower, attached to each will be an antenna and a transmission dish. A new equipment cabinet will be required at ground level. The equipment is required by the applicant to provide 3G (third generation) coverage to the Eastfield Road and Cumbernauld Village areas of Cumbernauld. The proposed antennas would be at a height of 21.6 metres (the tower has a height of 18.9 metres). A number of letters of objection have been received on predominantly health grounds and visual amenity. However the application complies with policy guidance contained in N.P.P.G. 19 and Pan 62.
It is considered that, despite the objections received, the visual impact will not be so significant as would justify refusing planning permission and the necessary ICNIRP Declaration regarding levels of emissions has been provided. The applicant has also provided the required information on possible alternative sites. Accordingly, this application is recommended for approval.

The Committee should note that the Local Member has requested that this application be considered at a site visit and hearing.

**Recommendation:** Grant Subject to the Following Conditions:

1. That the development hereby permitted shall be started within five years of the date of this permission.
   **Reason:** To accord with the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997.

2. That in the event that the equipment becomes redundant it must be wholly removed and the site reinstated within one month of the equipment becoming redundant.
   **Reason:** To ensure reinstatement of the site to a satisfactory standard, in the interests of visual amenity

**Background Papers:**

Application form and plans received 7th September 2004

Letter from The Radio Communications Agency received
Letter from Councillor Gordon Murray received

Letter from Mr John McCann, Secretary, Carrickstone Community Council, 16 North Berwick Avenue, Carrickstone, Cumbernauld, G68 0JQ received 8th September 2004.
Letter from Councillor Gordon Murray, PO Box 14, Civic Centre, Motherwell, ML1 1TW received 14th September 2004.
Letter from R Wallace & D J Wallace, 18 Glen Moriston Road, Cumbernauld, G68 0EU received 16th September 2004.
Letter from Mr David Mitchell, Carrickstonehill Cottage, 1 Portland Road, Cumbernauld, G68 0JN received 16th September 2004.
Letter from Mrs Catherine Millar, 26 Letham Grange, Westerwood, Cumbernauld, G68 0HZ received 28th September 2004.
Letter from Mrs Georgina Lee, 34 Letham Grange, Cumbernauld, G68 0HZ received 30th September 2004.
Letter from Fiona O'Neill, 47 Lansdowne Drive, Cumbernauld, G68 received 30th September 2004.
Letter from A W G Smith, 31 Letham Grange, Carrickstone, Cumbernauld, G68 0HZ received 30th September 2004.
Letter from Mrs Lorraine A Semple, 40 Cathkin Crescent, Cumbernauld, G68 0FB received 1st October 2004.
Letter from Mr Brian McCrossan, 85 Cawder Road, Carrickstone, Cumbernauld, G68 0BF received 1st October 2004.
Letter from Mrs Irene G Gilligan, 7 Portland Road, Carrickstone, Cumbernauld, G68 0JN received 4th October 2004.
Letter from J Riggans, 33 Cathkin Crescent, Cumbernauld, G68 0FD received 6th October 2004.
Letter from Mr & Mrs Davidson, 11 Lansdowne Drive, Cumbernauld, G68 0JB received 13th October 2004.
Letter from Mr James Tarrier, 13 Letham Grange, Westerwood, Cumbernauld, G68 0HZ received 13th October 2004.
Letter from Mr Martin Hamill, 76 Ranfurly Drive, Carrickstone, Cumbernauld, G68 0DS received 14th October 2004.
Letter from Mrs Sandra Hamill, 76 Ranfurly Drive, Carrickstone, Cumbernauld, G68 0DS received 14th October 2004.
Letter from Kenneth Boyle And Heather Boyle, 35 Letham Grange, Cumbernauld, G68 OHZ received 5th October 2004.
Letter from Lorraine Semple, 40 Cathkin Crescent, Carrickstone, Cumbernauld, G68 received 25th October 2004.
Letter from Mr & Mrs J Carberry, 59 Lansdowne Drive, Carrickstone, Cumbernauld, G68 received 25th October 2004.
Letter from Bill Keith, 5 North Berwick Avenue, Carrickstone, Cumbernauld, G68 received 21st October 2004.
Letter from Veronica Leonard, 57 Cawder Road, Carrickstone, Cumbernauld, G68 received 21st October 2004.
Letter from Elizabeth & Graham Wilson, 41 Lansdowne Drive, Carrickstone, Cumbernauld, G68 received 21st October 2004.
Letter from Mark Pitchford, 83 Cathkin Crescent, Carrickstone, Cumbernauld, G68 received 21st October 2004.
Letter from Allan Connal, 69 Cawder Road, Carrickstone, Cumbernauld, G68 received 25th October 2004.
Letter from Veronica Donohue, 7 Lansdowne Drive, Carrickstone, Cumbernauld, G68 received 25th October 2004.
Letter from Mr Paul Heron & Miss Fiona Kinsler, 26 North Berwick Avenue, Carrickstone, Cumbernauld, G68 0JQ received 21st October 2004.
Letter from Mark Vernal, 43 Cathkin Crescent, Carrickstone, Cumbernauld, G68 received 21st October 2004.
Letter from Mr Thomas Foley, 69 Cawder Road, Carrickstone, Cumbernauld, G68 received 25th October 2004.
Letter from Christopher Donohue, 7 Lansdowne Drive, Carrickstone, Cumbernauld, G68 received 25th October 2004.
Letter from Barbara Wilson, 55 Cathkin Crescent, Carrickstone, Cumbernauld, G68 0FD received 22nd October 2004.

Any person wishing to inspect these documents should contact Graeme Lee at 01236 616474.
APPLICATION NO. N/04/01602/FUL

REPORT

1. **Description of Site and Proposal**

1.1 Carrickstone Water Tower is a prominent landmark on the Cumbernauld skyline. The land surrounding the tower has been developed for housing, the most recent being the mixed development of houses and flats by Turnberry Homes on the land adjacent to the Portland Road. The inclusion of flats close to the tower has slightly lessened the visual prominence of the tower. At present there are a number of telecommunication structures on the top of the tower (6 in total) along with associated cabinets at ground level. The tower is 18.9 metres high and constructed in concrete. There is evidence of discolouration of the concrete.

1.2 The applicant proposes the installation of 3 new structures similar to those currently on the tower, attached to each will be an antenna and a transmission dish. A new equipment cabinet will be required at ground level. The equipment is required by the applicant to provide 3G (third generation) coverage to the Eastfield Road and Cumbernauld Village areas of Cumbernauld.

2. **National Guidance and Development Plan**

2.1 Of relevance in this instance is the guidance contained in NPPG 19, on Radio Telecommunications and PAN 62 on the Visual Impact of Telecommunications Development. The proposed development is considered to comply with this guidance. In terms of the precautionary approach, the applicant has provided the necessary ICNIRP Declaration stating that the proposal is well within recognised international safety standards in terms of electro-magnetic radiation. Also, the applicant has considered other sites, but has concluded that rather than using new base stations it would be more appropriate to site share. PAN 62 specifically highlights water towers as being one of the preferred structures on which to locate telecommunications apparatus.

2.2 The Cumbernauld Local Plan does not have a Telecommunications Policy.

3. **Representations**

3.1 Councillor Gordon Murray objects to the planning application and requests that it be considered at a site visit and hearing. His concerns regarding the proposed development are also shared by the majority of the other objectors and can be summarised as follows:-

- Scottish Water’s reluctance, over a lengthy period, to improve the appearance of the tower despite the considerable income they receive from this apparatus
- The tower is festooned with telecommunications apparatus and the addition of further masts should be refused on visual amenity grounds

**Comment**: Scottish Water was made aware of these concerns and has indicated that there are no immediate plans to upgrade the appearance of the tower. This is a matter for Scottish Water and is something that is beyond the control of the applicant. In securing the rights to site their apparatus on the tower they are complying with the advice contained in national guidance. There are already a number of similar masts on the tower and it is considered that adding further masts will not be so injurious to visual amenity as would justify refusing planning permission.

- Health concerns relating to a concentration of masts in the one location

**Comment**: The applicant has supplied the appropriate ICNIRP Declaration stating that the proposal is well within recognised international safety standards in terms of electro-magnetic...
radiation. This declaration covers not only the proposed installation but also the existing apparatus on the tower. The applicant has also provided information regarding an alternative sites survey, which concludes that the site under consideration is the most appropriate site for the intended coverage. It has been widely established that, although public perception of health risks can be a material planning consideration at planning appeal, health concerns are not sufficient on their own to justify refusing planning permission. Especially where it has been demonstrated that the proposed installation will comply with the ICNIRP guidelines.

- Scottish Water's rights of access over the access track are questioned. Scottish Water may not have rights to use this access track for telecommunication purposes.

**Comment**: This is a legal matter between Scottish Water and the owner of Carrickstone Cottage. Scottish Water advise that they are satisfied that they have appropriate legal rights to use the track.

3.2 Other points of objection are as follows:-

**Health**:

- The technology being used with these systems is not scientifically proven to be safe
- Next to open space where children play
- Concentration of signals to the detriment of those living around the site
- Masts are designed to operate at higher frequencies
- If granted NLC will be deliberately and recklessly endangering the health of local residents

**Comment**: As indicated above the applicant has supplied the appropriate ICNIRP Declaration stating that the proposal is well within recognised international safety standards in terms of electro-magnetic radiation

**Amenity**:

- The additional masts will have a negative effect on property values
- Additional masts will create an eyesore
- With recent developments, the masts are now in close proximity to a centre of a densely populated area
- Masts will look different to the existing
- The applicant should be encouraged to install the masts in an area which is not surrounded by residential properties

**Comment**: Is should be noted that there are currently 6 similar structures on the tower and many of these have existed for some considerable time. Indeed, the existing masts predate many of the surrounding dwellings. The proposed structures will look similar to the existing apparatus on the tower. It is unavoidable that the greatest demand for coverage is in urban areas and as a result it is not possible to avoid residential areas and maintain coverage. The applicant has looked at alternative locations, but has determined that, by siting the masts on the tower, greater coverage will be achieved meaning that there will be less need to install masts at other locations. It should be noted that the effect of development on property values is not a material planning consideration.

3.3 A number of proforma letters of objection (12 in total) were received and whilst they raised general health concerns in relation to the impacts on the health of those living around the tower the focus of the objection is related to so called TETRA masts. In this instance, the masts being installed are third generation (3G) masts which are compliant with the ICNIRP guidelines.
4. Planning Assessment and Conclusions

4.1 It is considered that the proposed development is acceptable in planning terms. The applicant has provided the necessary ICNIRP Declaration stating that the proposal is well within recognised international safety standards in terms of electro-magnetic radiation. Also, the applicant has considered other sites, but has concluded that rather than using new base stations it would be more appropriate to site share. It should be noted that the guidance contained in PAN 62 identifies water towers as being one of the preferred structures on which to locate telecommunications apparatus.

4.2 With regards to Carrickstone Water Tower, there are already 6 existing telecommunications structures on top of the tower. It should also be noted that another application (N/04/01525/FUL) is being reported to this Committee. That development involves the upgrade of existing structures on the tower by the addition of 3G equipment to them. Nevertheless, in terms of the impacts on visual amenity, it is not considered that three additional structures will be so significant as to justify refusing planning permission.

4.3 The tower itself could benefit from some upgrade, however this is beyond the control of the applicant. Scottish Water has confirmed that they do not have any immediate plans to upgrade the tower.

4.4 Despite the objections received, taking account of national planning policy guidance and the particular circumstances in this case it is recommended that planning permission be granted.

4.5 The Committee should note that the Local Member has requested that this application be considered at a site visit and hearing.