

**Notes from Cotgrave Town Council Public Meeting
17th August 2017**

Present : Councillors C Jeffreys (Chairman), K Chewings, M Chewings, S Gardner, W Handbury, J Mileham, I Shaw, A Wilkie and Y Wilson, also Simeon Lister and Peter Grant from Shared Access.

Apologies Approved: Councillors H Brumpton, R Butler, S Ellis, L Healy, P Pearson.

Absent : Councillor C Denham

In Attendance : The Clerk, Administration Team, Jane Pick & Kayleigh Bush (Cotgrave Town Council) PC Steve Mathias, PSCO Phil Evans (Cotgrave Police), and 17 members of the public.

The meeting was held at Cotgrave Welfare and started at 7.00 pm.

Public Meeting to Discuss the Proposed Mobile Telecoms Mast on Maddison Park

- 001 The meeting was opened and chaired by Councillor Jeffreys and she gave an introduction about herself and how Cotgrave is very important to her and all of the councillors.
- 002 Councillor Jeffreys had promised to hold a public meeting at the Extraordinary Meeting on 24th July, in September to allow the public to give their views about the proposed telecom mast, prior to the planning decision being made by Rushcliffe Borough Council.
- 003 The date of the meeting needed to be brought forward to mid- August, due to the permitted development planning application submitted by Shared Access to Rushcliffe Borough Council, will be closing for comments on 24th August 2017.
- 004 All the other Councillors and the two members from Shared Access introduced themselves to the members of the public.
- 005 Councillor Jeffreys asked Councillor K Chewings to give a report on how Council became connected with Shared Access.
- 006 Councillor K Chewings gave the following information.
- 007 Shared Access first made contact with Cotgrave Town Council in September 2016, to discuss placing a telecoms mast in Cotgrave at the Arthur Ridley sports ground on Colliers Way.
- 008 The Council, through the working party formed by Cotgrave Town Council, had a discussion with the local football team management, who play at the ground, to ask them how they felt about a mast in the area and would it inhibit the playing field. The football team management considered the mast and checked out information regarding the mast and informed Cotgrave Town Council they were not against a mast being placed on to the field.
- 009 The Council provided a copy of the sportsground lease to Shared Access and it was noted that Council could not put up a mast, due to a clause in the lease stating that we could not use the airspace above 5m.

- 010 The working group mentioned that Cotgrave Town Council owned a large field in the centre and Shared Access asked if it could be considered for the placing of a mast.
- 011 The Council gave Shared Access permission to look at the field and to identify if the site could be suitable for a mast.
- 012 A survey was conducted by Shared Access and the site was found to be a suitable site for the positioning of a telecoms mast and this information was given to Council.
- 013 The information was noted in the Council minutes from the initial visit in September 2016 and Council had asked for information at the presentation in October 2016, regarding the health and safety and risks from installing a mast in the area. Cotgrave Town Council had done its due diligence.
- 014 There has been a lot of misinformation provided on many social media sites, which have stated that Maddison Park, the football field and the allotments were going to be closed and could be sold off for the building of industrial units and/or housing, This has never been a consideration of Cotgrave Town Council and there is no futures plans to change the use of these areas of land.
- 015 Further misinformation in the social media has stated that the mast could be up to 25m high, this again is incorrect information, the permitted development application is for a single mast of 15m in height, placed inside the locked perimeter of the football field.
- 016 Shared Access have provided Cotgrave Town Council with all the current government guidelines regarding the health and safety of telecoms masts, but we are not experts and we have all had the opportunity to research the websites provided and do independent research on information surrounding masts.
- 017 Simeon Lister and Peter Grant of Shared Access gave information on their company.
- 018 They explained that they work for a company which identifies potential sites for mobile phone companies and then if a mast is installed, they manage the site for a period of time and they try to improve areas signal to a 4G signal strength, where there is a lack of good signal strength.
- 019 There is a lack of signal within Cotgrave and this is why this area has been identified as a potential site.
- 020 If an area is identified, Shared Access act as an agent between the provider and the landowner and try to reach an agreement, if an agreement cannot be reached, the phone provider can arrange for a mast to be located into the area, using the public footpath after getting the relevant permission.
- 021 If an agreement is reached with a landowner, this produces a payment, which in the interest of Cotgrave Town Council, this would be used as a community benefit. If no agreement is reached and a mast is placed on the public realm, no payment is made to any organisation.
- 022 The mast will has no provision for any CCTV and will not fitted with any and it is being considered only for the improvement of the signal.
- 023 The mast is to be placed 5.6m away from the football touchline, which is excess of any guidelines provided by the FA regulations.
- 024 Shared Access works in partnership with the FA on the English FA website.

- 025 Councillor K Chewings read out the questions and answers provided by residents prior to the meeting.
- 026 Questions requested by Councillor H Chewings are as follows.
- 027 [How many years would the mast be on Maddison Park?](#) The lease for the mast would be for 25 years and after that the lease would be terminated or it could be renegotiated.
- 028 [How much money will Cotgrave Town Council receive for siting the mast on Maddison Park?](#) The Council would receive a one off payment, which is still commercially sensitive.
- 029 [What will happen to money provided by the mast?](#) The money will be used for community projects and will be ring fenced for this use. All Cotgrave Town Council accounts are audited each year and open for scrutiny and all monthly payments are shown in the Cotgrave Town Council minutes and this information will be shown in the accounts.
- 030 [Would the mast, if provided, be able to provide a better coverage for more than the mobile companies stated on the planning application?](#) The two companies provided mentioned on the application, would be the only companies using this mast. The mast would provide an enhanced signal for O2, Vodafone provide O2 with Telefonica.
- 031 [Would the mast try to be blended into the surroundings, i.e. making it look like a tree?](#) The mast would be a galvanised pole and grey in colour. To try to blend the mast makes it more difficult to maintain if not a simple pole.
- 032 [If residents TV signals are affected by the mast, can Cotgrave Town Council give a guarantee that any reports or issues will be rectified within 48 hours, as not to leave people without TV?](#) If TV signals are affected, it would not be the responsibility of Cotgrave Town Council but the responsibility of Shared Access. Peter Grant of Shared Access, explained that there are special signal bands provided for mobile telecoms signals and these are not on any signal bands used for TV signals. All signal bands have to be purchased from The Government.
- 033 [When the contract for the mast has finished, who will be responsible for the removal of the mast and making good of the site?](#) Shared Access would be responsible for the removal of the mast and this would be checked by Cotgrave Town Council solicitor.
- 034 [Have other sites in and around Cotgrave been investigated, for the siting of a mast that are further away from any housing?](#) Shared Access have investigated other sites in the area, this is part of their due diligence and they have to prove that they have considered other options in the area.
- 035 The following question was requested by Miss T Fitzalan- Howard.
- 036 [My due diligence across submissions by Shared Access to Companies House leads to the controlling business being Shared Access LLC at 126 North Salem Street, Suite 206, Apex North Carolina 27502 United States of America. This address is occupied by Peak City Grill and Bar \(Google Street Maps February 2017\) and the controlling CEO apparently lives on a dirt road with no visible habitation. Should things go wrong \(which we hope they don't\) between you, me or even Cotgrave Town Council and its representatives, would litigation be made under US or UK laws and which Courts, i.e. would Cotgrave Town Council have to go to Raleigh State Courts in North Carolina to settle legal issues?](#) Shared Access are a company within the UK and therefore governed by UK law, whether the parent company is American.

- 037 The following question was requested by Ms D Howard.
- 038 The question is for Shared Access Ltd, to whom does the land known as Maddison Park or Fields belong? Does it belong to Cotgrave Town Council or Rushcliffe Borough Council or The Coal Board or you don't know? You have listed the location of Maddison Park in your planning proposal, where have you obtained the proof of ownership? Are you prepared to show us the written documented proof of ownership? What covenants have you found attributed to this land? Cotgrave Town Council is the owner of the land known as Maddison Park and we have the title deeds. The land at Arthur Ridley is leased from CISWO.
- 039 The following question was requested by Mr K Rhodes.
- 040 In spite of the very obvious objections for many obvious reasons, the Council seem extremely determined to install a telecoms tower on in the Maddison Park, can the public be assured that this action is not being pursued in order to facilitate a major change of use for the land, including the allotments, to say, industrial units or housing and further can each individual member of the Council categorically state that they have no vested or financial actual interest in such a change of use to the land in Maddison Park?
- 041 The land used as allotments and park space will not have a change of use and this Council have no future plans to consider changing the use of land for building of industrial or housing developments. No individual councillor has any financial or personal interests in the land or within this agreement, if the mast is permitted.
- 042 The following questions came from residents who attended the meeting.
- 043 Ms D Howard asked noted that we all want improved signals when using our mobile phones and that central government have given a large sum of money to improve signal strengths. Where are these masts being built? Shared Access is a company searching to find sites for mobile companies. It was noted that Shared Access had approached Cotgrave Town Council and Council were not looking at any other companies and that some mobile phone providers work directly with landowners. Shared Access and another company are private companies offering this service. Ayton is being provided with a mast today and the money the scheme has produced, has allowed them to improve their car park facility.
- 044 Miss T Fitzalan-Howard directed a question to Shared Access about their due diligence and where have they previously built any masts? Are you providing business for Pegasus and will Shared Access stay around after the mast is built? She said that Shared Access have not being paid their bills and that the company is £5m in debt. Have any masts been built? Shared Access will prove information on sites which have been built and work has been done with the English Football Association. As mentioned before Ayton, is a current site where a mast is being built and a list of other builds will be sent with pictures and information on each site.
- 045 Councillor K Chewings had already checked out the company, Shared Access, to prior to the meeting and validated the company. He informed that the company does have a charge made against them, which is perfectly normal with businesses.
- 046 Ms S Coulthard shared her concerns that allowing the mast to be built on the field, would allow for a future change of use and this could allow building of houses on the field. Councillor K Chewings informed that this Council has no plans to change the field from a field and the mast would only be a very small footprint on the field. Council cannot ever say somewhere in the future that this would not change. The permitted development application is only for the footprint of the mast.

- 047 Mrs Roberts asked if the field had a covenant on this land and would this allow for any building on this land.
- 048 This question was not answer because another resident interrupted and asked another question.
- 049 Ms S Coulthard asked if the mast only provides a signal for O2 users, what is the point? Will there be other masts allowed on the field to provide additional company signals provided through Shared Access? There are no plans for any other masts to be placed on to the field and different mobile companies do not normally share masts, to place any other masts anywhere, it would require a planning application. Vodafone provide O2 and the antenna is for O2. If it was to be a multiple was applied for, the mast would need to be considerably higher and masts must try to fit in to the surrounding environment. Most areas do not have multiple mast in one area.
- 050 The power supply will be fed from Thorntons Close and a resident noted there are areas of block paving and this could damaged during the works. The utility company would be aware of the block paving and would reinstate the area back to original state.
- 051 Land in Cotgrave was sold to Cotgrave Town Council and other Councils from NCB and Cotgrave Town Council own Maddison Park and lease other land from Rushcliffe Borough Council for the play areas.
- 052 The sites are identified through a radio planner.
- 053 Mr Rhodes asked why the mast is not being built at the sportsground on Colliers Way and now being considered for building on Maddison Park, the area between the sites is a considerable distance? Will the mast need to have a fence and does it meet FA regulations? The operator had checked the location at Maddison but not at the sportsground because of the issues with the land being leased. The FA regulations do not require the mast to be surrounded by a fence and it is not a structure which is easily climbed. There is some of these masts located on the public highways, there is a mast on the roadside at Edwalton.
- 054 Councillor Handbury noted pylons caused many concerns over the years and they are not fenced off.
- 055 Shared Access will include an anti-climb mechanism to the mast.
- 056 All the views shared by residents will be shared with all councillors and discussed and the outcome of the public meeting will be noted at the next council meeting, taking place on 13th September 2017.
- 057 Ms T Fitzalan-Howard noted that she felt that she had not been given enough information, starting from the initial discussion for placing a mast at the sportsground and then moving it to Maddison Park. She was shocked when she received a letter from Pegasus informing the residents that a mast may located in Maddison Park. She commented that the residents of Cotgrave had never asked for a mast to be placed in Cotgrave, in any of the Council minutes.
- 058 Councillor K Chewings responded that the initial discussions have been minuted in Council minutes from September 2016. Shared Access provided Council with display boards, which were placed in the library for the public to look at and make their views known. An article had been placed in the Summer 2017 edition of the Cotgrave Connections and was delivered in May 2017.

- 059 The mandate is from the mobile phone company and there has been a lot of comments made by residents other various social sites, complaining about poor signal within Cotgrave. The micro dishes need to be at a certain height and the mast must be able to see the next base station.
- 060 Comments made included that would a mast devalue the current value of resident's properties in the area of the mast and had every other site or option been investigated.
- 061 Would Council be sued if a rival company came forward to place a mast. Council has not been approached by any other companies and all masts where ever they would be placed, would need a planning application and it was clarified that Cotgrave Town Council could not be sued for installing an 02 mast.
- 062 Rushcliffe Borough Council are the planning authority and the final decision on the permitted development application will be made by them.
- 063 All residents can place an objection or support of the mast on the planning portal on the Rushcliffe Borough Council website.
- 064 [Ms D Howard asked all Councillors, if each individual Councillor would give their opinion of the mast?](#) The Chairman declined the question and reminded that the purpose of this meeting was to allow residents to share their views.
- 065 Cotgrave Town Council makes all decisions as a collective body.
- 066 Councillor Jeffreys informed the residents who attended the meeting that she had to contact a legal representative prior to the meeting and ask if she would be allowed to chair the meeting, following a complaint from a resident regarding her. The legal representative had informed Councillor Jeffreys that she was allowed to chair the meeting.
- 067 Councillor Jeffreys thanked all those residents who taken the time to attend the meeting and share their thoughts and views and wished all a safe journey home.
- 068 Meeting Closed at 8.30pm.
