

Planning Application WD/D/14/002423 - Installation of 20m MIP telecommunications mast, ground based cabinets and ancillary development (Full) at East Farm, Abbotsbury

Objections to this Application

Introduction to the objection statement

My name is Andrew Green. I am 58 years old and live at 13 Market Street, Abbotsbury. I am a web designer and writer, have a degree in Mathematics & Computer Science, and have worked in IT for all my working life.

In short, I am no Luddite: I use technology every day of the week and rely on it for my work.

I am married with twin 20-year old sons in their 2nd year at University. We have lived in the village since January 1995.

My contact details are as follows:

Web: www.andrewgreen.tk

Email: info@andrewgreen.tk

Phone: 01305 871561

Twitter: https://twitter.com/andrew_j_green

My objections to the erection of this mast are on the following grounds –

1. Planning Policy Guidance Note 8 - Telecommunications - August 2001 (PPG8) (paragraph 10) states that there should be “Pre-application discussions”. There were none held in Abbotsbury.
2. There are grave and substantial material inaccuracies in the Application.
3. No data has been provided to support the applicant’s contention that there are areas in Abbotsbury without mobile phone coverage (so called ‘not spots’).
4. The erection of the mast would cause severe despoliation of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (‘AONB’).
5. The ‘benefits’ of installing the mast which are listed by the applicant are invalid and/or unquantified and/or too vague and/or actually turn out to be benefits of using mobile phones in general, rather than benefits of being able to use them in more locations within Abbotsbury.
6. The installation of the mast is very likely to have moderate to severe health effects for the population of the village.
7. Installation of the mast is likely to have dramatic health implications for farm animals/livestock.
8. Installation of the mast is likely to have dramatic health implications for wildlife.
9. Installation of the mast is very likely to cause moderate to severe health effects for those people who have Electro-sensitivity (‘ES’, sometimes called Electrohypersensitivity, or ‘EHS’), which is likely to be up to 8% of the village population. ES people meet the criteria for disability and are, therefore, protected from discrimination under UK Law. Installation of the mast will discriminate against these people.
10. Installation of the mast will, under the terms of the European Convention on Human Rights and Fundamental Principle, violate the human rights of village residents.

There is no proven need for this mast. The application attempts to put forward a case for this unnecessary, dangerous and wholly inappropriate structure, by listing a veritable plethora of absurd

supposed hypothetical benefits. The benefits listed in this application – none of which has any validity – are a blatant, cynical and arrogant attempt to make a complete mockery of the planning process.

What we are looking at here is a proposal that would make life slightly more convenient for some people in the village – but I'm sure that the Planning Department does not feel that any application should go ahead, simply because the proposed development might make life slightly more convenient for what would probably amount to only a handful of people.

A comparison might be with a proposal to extend the M27 to Exeter, past Abbotsbury. This would undoubtedly be convenient for the residents, but offset against this would be the massive disadvantages.

The 7 alternative sites listed (section 4.18 in the applicant's Statement in support of the application) are absurd - in particular, a supposed consideration of siting the mast on the cricket pitch, in the village car park or at Furlong's Homestead (an exposed area in the village beside the footpath up to the Chapel). I would contend that these supposed alternative sites were deliberately – and cynically - chosen to make it seem like the proposed siting is really the only sensible alternative.

But I live in the very centre of the village and the proposed site is only 5 minutes walk away (0.3 miles – see attached screenshot from Google Maps – 'screenshot1') – it is, to all intents and purposes, actually in the village. I have been to many many small villages all over Britain and never have I seen a mobile phone mast in a village. Why is Abbotsbury – one of the most beautiful villages in the country, in a spectacular rural setting and visited by thousands of tourists from all over the world simply because of that beauty and setting – being singled out for this appalling treatment: riding roughshod over what really makes Britain stand out as a country worth living in?

I am not suggesting that the village should be preserved in aspic, as an interesting historical relic; a museum piece, where visitors can peer in through our windows and marvel that we have toasters and televisions just like they do! But we do need to consider that all technology is not always good; that progress might not be of real benefit to us. We must see a proven need, with proven real benefits for the residents of this village.

I would like to see a survey undertaken to determine exactly what proportion of residents feel that the installation of this mast would make a substantial improvement to their lives or livelihoods.

1. Pre-application discussions

Planning Policy Guidance Note 8 - Telecommunications - August 2001 (PPG8) (paragraph 10) states: "Pre-application discussions should also be carried out by the operator with other organisations with an interest in proposed development, such as residents groups, parish councils or amenity bodies".

In this case, the only discussions there have been was a meeting of the Chesil Bank Parish Council meeting on September 1st, held in Portesham. At that meeting, a Mr Coomb promised that there would be a similar presentation for the residents of Abbotsbury.

No such meeting or discussions have taken place in Abbotsbury, with the result that very few residents are even aware that a Planning Application has been made for this landscape despoiling and potentially health-threatening structure. We only found out about the application by happening

to read a very short piece about it in the October issue of the local magazine (*The Chesil*) which does not have a very widespread readership.

Having spoken to many other people in the village, I can confirm that hardly anybody here is even aware of the planning application.

It is outrageous that the applicant was so arrogant that they thought they could get away without consulting the residents of the village over the proposed installation of a mobile phone mast less than 500 metres from the village centre!

It is, therefore, clearly the case that PPG8 has been ignored and that, therefore, the Planning Application should be refused and the applicant invited to reapply when such discussions/presentations have taken place.

I refer also to paragraph 5.3 of the applicant's Statement in support of the application which, referring to the general national planning policy background within the NPPF, states:

"Best practice encourages a consultative approach ..."

Clearly 'best practice' has not been followed here. We need to know why the Applicant chose not to consult the residents of Abbotsbury.

2. Material inaccuracies in the Application

2.1 Section 13

To quote from the Application –

13. Biodiversity and Geological Conservation

To assist in answering the following questions refer to the guidance notes for further information on when there is a reasonable likelihood that any important biodiversity or geological conservation features may be present or nearby and whether they are likely to be affected by your proposals.

Having referred to the guidance notes, is there a reasonable likelihood of the following being affected adversely or conserved and enhanced within the application site, OR on land adjacent to or near the application site:

- a) Protected and priority species - No
- b) Designated sites, important habitats or other biodiversity features - No
- c) Features of geological conservation importance - No

It appears that the applicant had no idea that Abbotsbury and Portesham are within the area covered by the South Dorset Ridgeway Landscape Partnership Conservation Action Plan. This is yet another indication of the sloppy – if not arrogant – nature of the entire application. One gets the distinct impression that the whole application is simply cut-and-pasted from other unrelated applications. The applicant clearly thought that simply droning on at great length about Abbotsbury being in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (and 'AONB') would satisfy anyone who was concerned with the natural landscape.

These bland and dismissive 'No' answers need to be substantiated by a full biodiversity and geological conservation study, in order for the applicant to prove that there will indeed be none of the possible effects listed in that question.

Given that the applicant clearly had no idea about the vital conservation significance of the area, it is difficult to see how they could provide that proof.

In my view, the possible effects on all protected species and geology in the area need to be fully investigated before this application is even considered. I have briefly discussed potential effects on wildlife in Section (5) and (6) below, particularly sub-section 6.2, which refers specifically to birds

>> Further, it seems to me that the Portesham application also must be deferred, pending the provision of similar information.

Supporting material for this specific objection –

South Dorset Ridgeway Landscape Partnership
SDR LP Landscape Conservation Action Plan - Statement of Significance

The following information is from the above document. **Both Abbotsbury and Portesham are within the SDR LP area.**

Where appropriate, my emphases are in bold type.

Attractions like those at Abbotsbury, on the south western boundary of the Ridgeway, attract an estimated 200,000 each year giving an insight into the scale of visitor influx to parts of the Ridgeway.

Wildlife and Biodiversity importance

A trip from north to south across the Ridgeway uncovers an exceptional variety of wildlife that you would not expect to see in such a short distance. The land rises from the South Winterbourne, a beautiful example of a chalk stream – home to otter and water vole – on to the arable downland, enjoyed by immense flocks of corn bunting and the more elusive grey partridge. Beyond the downland is the exposed heath of Black Down, where nightjar and sand lizard may be found nestled amongst the heather and bilberry. Beyond Black Down, the very steep scarp slope has never been touched by plough. On these slopes in spring, there are carpets of flowers, including the wonderful pyramidal orchid; the 'eggs and bacon' look of the bird's-foot trefoil and green-winged orchid too. The chalk grassland will be awash with butterflies, including the rare Chalk Hill Blue and Adonis Blue. Back down in the clay ridge and vales below the Ridgeway, deer, hare and kestrel can all be found in the fields and hedges.

Dorset is at a juncture between the ranges of northern Arctic species and southern Mediterranean species – creating a hotspot of wildlife richness that the South Dorset Ridgeway runs right through.

Abbotsbury is surrounded by 4 areas of lowland calcareous grassland 'Priority Habitats' which have been selected because they meet one or more of the following criteria:

- The UK has an international responsibility.
- The habitat is at risk
- The habitat is important for species of conservation concern.

Arable plants & birds

In contrast to the scarp slope, the largely arable nature of the chalk dip slope has resulted in a suite of arable plants of national significance that occur in the area, including the prickly poppy *Papaver argemone*, shepherd's needle *Scandix pecten-veneris*+, narrow-fruited corn-salad *Valerianella dentate* and field woundwort *Stachys arvensis*. Also associated with the arable landscape are a number of farmland birds that are taken as a wider indicator of the health of the farmed environment. Of these, the lapwing *Vanellus vanellus*, grey partridge *Perdix perdix*++, yellowhammer *Emberiza citrinella*, linnet *Carduelis cannabina*+, corn bunting *Miliaria calandra*+ and skylark *Alauda arvensis*+ can all be found on the South Dorset Ridgeway.

Skylarks, in particular, are visible above the fields just the other side of Hands Lane.

In addition, both buzzards and kestrels are frequently visible perching beside or hunting on Hands Lane.

The skylark, buzzard and kestrel are fully protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, which makes it an offence to kill, injure or take an adult bird, or to take, damage or destroy an active nest or its contents. The only exception is legitimate farming practices that cannot be reasonably delayed, although farming methods can often be modified to reduce the impact on the skylarks.

Butterflies

Perhaps one of the most important group of species found along the Ridgeway are the butterflies. The common blue *Polyommatus icarus*, Adonis blue *Lysandra bellargus*+, small heath *Coenonympha pamphilus*, dark green fritillary *Argynnis aglaja* and wall brown *Lasiommata megera* can be seen on a regular basis but they all have limited flight seasons. The Lulworth skipper *Thymelicus acteon* may be found from Sutton Poyntz to Osmington, as well as the more common skippers.

Heathland species

At Black Down, owing to its unique geology, a number of heathland species can be found including the nightjar *Caprimulgus europaeus*+, sand lizard *Lacerta agilis*++ and adder *Vipera berus*.

And rounding up other species of note that can be found along the South Dorset Ridgeway, also found are the brown hare *Lepus europaeus*+ in the arable landscape and otter *Lutra lutra*++ and water vole *Arvicola terrestris*++ along the South Winterbourne.

Of the species mentioned, those marked with a + are UK Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Species, and those marked with ++ are specifically protected under English and European legislation, particularly the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and Conservation (Natural Habitats etc) Regulations 1994.

Note that SSI SY58/001 Abbotsbury Blind Lane is only 1/3 mile away from the proposed site.

Source for the above - South Dorset Ridgeway Landscape Partnership
SDR LP Landscape Conservation Action Plan - Statement of Significance [with some of my own additional information in italics]

Geological and archaeological importance

The South Dorset Ridgeway is perhaps best known as an ancient ceremonial landscape. This is not without reason – it is home to a remarkable concentration of prehistoric monuments forming an important source of information about past Neolithic and Bronze Age communities.

This range of prehistoric monuments includes eight Neolithic earthen long barrows, three stone circles and four magnificent Iron Age Hillforts but is particularly remarkable for its concentration of Bronze Age barrows. “There are only two other areas of comparable barrow density in England and these are both in Wiltshire, around Avebury and Stonehenge.

In the nine miles around Avebury, there are about 10 barrows per square mile, and in the 12 miles around Stonehenge, the figure is about 25. The whole area shown on the Ridgeway map – some 45 square miles – has an average density of 10 barrows per square mile, but one which is one mile wide gives a density of 40 barrows per square mile. (RCHM 1970 II pt3 427)2.

The importance of the South Dorset Ridgeway Landscape Partnership area for historic sites is evidenced by the sheer number of sites protected for national importance. The project area’s 126km2 includes 38.4% by number and 17% by area of the entire County of Dorset’s Scheduled Ancient Monuments. The designations cover 393 sites and 313.29 hectares.

Source for the above - South Dorset Ridgeway Landscape Partnership
SDR LP Landscape Conservation Action Plan - Statement of Significance [with some of my own additional information]

2.2 Section 15

To quote from the Application –

15. Trees and Hedges

Are there trees or hedges on the proposed development site? No

And/or: Are there trees or hedges on land adjacent to the proposed development site that could influence the development or might be important as part of the local landscape character? No

If Yes to either or both of the above, you may need to provide a full Tree Survey, at the discretion of your local planning authority.

Referring to the attached photographs –

- Photograph ‘photo1’ shows that the proposed site is right next to a substantial hedge (on the photograph, the proposed site is the low, plastic-covered mound next to the barn).

- There is a line of trees and hedges on the other side of the field next to the proposed site. In terms of these trees being “important as part of the local landscape character”, the *Long Bredy, Portesham, Chickerell, Abbotsbury and Langton Herring Conservation Area Appraisal* [published in December 2007 as a document that supports conservation area policies in the West Dorset District Local Plan (Adopted 2006)], when talking about important natural features in the village, refers to these trees: “Trees also follow the course of the former railway, as far as the station site and the approach lane off the Weymouth Rd.” [Relevant sections of this document are included as Appendix A to my report] Photograph ‘photo2’ shows one end of the line of trees, in relation to the proposed site in the left foreground, whilst ‘photo3’ shows the full extent of the tree line.

The Application therefore has material inaccuracies and should be refused and the applicant invited to reapply with these inaccuracies corrected.

The applicant should also be required to explain why they either –

1. Deliberately lied on the Application or
2. Undertook a site survey which was so sloppy that they did not even notice the hedge and trees.

It looks to me like (1) above is the case, since the applicant’s Statement in support of the application states, in paragraph 5.15: "In addition, the proposed development will be sited adjacent to some natural vegetation" and the Site Map clearly shows the hedge to the right of the proposed site.

It is quite scandalous that a company engaged by the UK Government to install mobile phone masts throughout the country has no compunction in lying on a Planning Application!

This serves to call into question the probity of the applicant and the veracity of every single statement which they make.

If nothing else, this should serve as grounds for refusal of this Application.

3. No investigation carried out to identify actual so-called ‘Not spots’

The applicant’s Statement in support of the application attempts to justify the application on the grounds of eliminating these ‘not spots’.

>> The following are quotations from the Statement. My comments in red follow.

2.3 The not spot areas do not even have the equivalent of a 1G service and so are becoming increasingly disadvantaged. This is a serious social and economic issue ..

2.10 The MIP seeks to remedy this position in not spot areas, which being generally in remote locations, may already be disadvantaged through other locational factors and lack of economic choice and opportunity.

4.1 A new base station is needed as part of the MIP to help provide mobile coverage over a number of not spots that affect the village of Abbotsbury and surrounding area.

4.3 The Government has, with the co-operation of Ofcom, the industry regulator, and the MNOs, identified the geographical areas where no signal can be reliably obtained from any

mobile network – i.e. areas that suffer from a total not spot in coverage. The Government has then prioritised the areas that contain settlements for the purposes of the MIP project.

5.18 The development complies fully with this policy:

In respect of criteria (1) and (vi), the sole purpose of the MIP is to provide mobile network coverage in locations where coverage is absent

And, in the Supporting Technical Justification:

1.1. This document has been prepared to support the planning application to develop a base station ... to provide coverage to a number of locations in the UK that presently have no mobile coverage at all. These areas are known as 'not spots'.

Unbelievably, no survey of any sort has been carried out to identify the number, location or size of these supposed 'not spots'.

The only point at which we see a figure is in Appendix A of the Supporting Technical Justification: "Predicted Coverage - 22 Not Spots covered". But on what data is this "prediction" (or guess) based? And there is still, in that Appendix, no data on size or location of these 'not spots' which will be supposedly "covered"

Our own experience is as follows -

- Five years ago, in order to obtain a mobile signal, we used to have to either drive for a mile or so up to the *Bishop's Limekiln* picnic area, or walk half way up Chapel Hill. Now, however, we can obtain a signal in our garden or across the other side of the road.
- Today, we walked through the village, obtaining a satisfactory signal in nearly every place we stopped.
- From our kitchen window overlooking the main street (Market Street, right in the centre of the village), we see visitors all year quite happily using their mobiles in the village.

We can see, from the paragraphs quoted above, that the elimination of 'not spots' is deemed to be the primary and fundamental reason for the installation of this mast.

In the absence of any data or evidence at all on these 'not spots', I contend that the Application should be refused, since no evidence of need has been provided.

Referring to the information I have listed above, we are clearly obtaining a signal from an unseen mast, presumably from the 5 non-TETRA masts [2012 data] in Portland (around 10 miles away – Portland is visible from many locations in Abbotsbury).

Therefore, my suggestion is that we should wait for the installation and commissioning of the mast in Portesham which, located in the motor scrap yard, which is only 2.4 miles from the centre of Abbotsbury (see attached screenshot from Google Maps – 'screenshot2').

I strongly suspect that the Portesham mast will provide a full mobile signal to a large part of Abbotsbury and also to the neighbouring villages of Rodden and Langton Herring (in fact, these 2 villages probably already obtain a signal from Weymouth or Portland).

A full door-to-door survey by the applicant can then be undertaken, in order to determine whether there actually is a need for the Abbotsbury mast. This information can then be included when the applicant reappplies.

If nothing else, the idea of siting 2 masts in rural area only 2 miles away from each other seems quite extraordinary!

I refer also to paragraph 5.3 of the applicant's Statement in support of the application which, referring to the general national planning policy background within the NPPF, states:

"The key way to minimise environmental impact is to avoid the unnecessary proliferation of new radio masts and sites."

This is indeed the case, which is precisely why this Application should be refused and the applicant be invited to reapply when data can be provided to demonstrate whether the proposed mast is necessary or unnecessary.

4. Despoliation of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty ('AONB')

The applicant's Statement in support of the application states, in the Executive Summary:
"The site chosen falls within an AONB where the Dorset AONB Policy Framework regarding Natural Heritage and Beauty and the guidance in section 11 'Conserving and enhancing the natural environment' of the NPPF applies. All reasonable steps have been taken to minimise any perceived visual and environmental impact whilst having regard to the need to provide the required level of mobile coverage. Good practice guidance requires careful consideration of the siting and design to minimise appearance and to ameliorate potential visual impact."

The Statement refers to this consideration repeatedly and at length throughout the document, (commenting particularly on the "undulating" nature of the landscape and how "sensitive" the proposed development will be).

>> The following are quotations from the Statement, with my comments in red.

5.3 The general national planning policy background found now within the NPPF can be summarised as follows:

- Government policy is to keep the inevitable environmental impact associated with electronic communications development to the minimum;
- The key way to minimise environmental impact is to avoid the unnecessary proliferation of new radio masts and sites;
- Great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in certain specified designated landscapes, e.g. National Parks, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Conservation Areas, etc.;
- The emphasis on minimising environmental impact is greater according to the sensitivity of the site. The emphasis on exploring and utilising site sharing opportunities is consequently higher in these circumstances;
- Best practice encourages a consultative approach and one that seeks to minimise potential visual impact.

5.15 Contained within the West Dorset District Local Plan (2006), policy SA1 seeks to protect the natural beauty of the Dorset Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) stating that development that harms the natural beauty of the AONB will not be permitted. This is expanded upon further in policy SA3, which states that development must be in keeping with the landscape character of the area.

In review of policy SA1 and SA3, firstly it must be recognised that the development comprises of engineering operations, not major development and so is not considered unsuitable development in the AONB. Secondly, careful consideration has been given to the siting of the proposed development to limit the impact upon the special features of the landscape, bearing in mind the specific operational and technical constraints of the project. This has been achieved by siting the proposed development close to existing development which helps to minimise the visual impact on the wider landscape. In addition, the proposed development will be sited adjacent to some natural vegetation which will assist in screening the lower sections of the mast from local public viewpoint e.g. road network. Further, the undulating landscape will provide screening to the site from other public vantage points.

5.17 Policy IN7 provides more detailed criteria based guidance and states that:

“Planning permission for telecommunications masts or antennas and associated equipment will be granted provided that:

- III. The operational and technical considerations of the proposal outweigh any conflict with the other landscape and conservation policies in the Local Plan;
- IV. The proposal will not have a significant adverse impact on the amenities of surrounding areas;
- VI. For sites within the AONB, applicants will be required to demonstrate that no suitable alternative locations are available”

5.19 ... Utilising existing natural and topographical [sic] features of the landscape will minimise any the impact on the AONB whilst striking an acceptable balance between the localised visual impacts and the wider economic and social benefits of providing a vital service to the wider rural community. Thus, the proposal is considered to comply with the relevant policies of the Management Plan.

5.20 Careful consideration has also been given to the ‘Conserving Character Landscape Character Assessment & Management Guidance for the Dorset AONB’ (DAONB, 2008), as produced by the Dorset AONB Partnership. This document sets out that vertical elements should be carefully sited and the number restricted to avoid clutter and further interruption of the characteristic open views. As previously stated in section 4, the proposal has been chosen following a comprehensive site search to utilise existing topographical [sic] and natural features to alleviate the visual impact on the landscape and the historic environment, in compliance with these policies.

5.22 In summary, the sensitive way the development proposed has been brought forward accords with best practice ... The development proposed is therefore considered acceptable in principle and as reviewed below it also accords with the more detailed guidance expressed in local policy.

Despite the multiple, breezy assurances in those quoted paragraphs, nothing can serve to contradict the definitive statements in the *Long Bredy, Portesham, Chickerell, Abbotsbury and Langton Herring Conservation Area Appraisal*. Following public consultation, WDDC adopted this Appraisal in December 2007 as a document that supports conservation area policies in the West Dorset District Local Plan (Adopted 2006) [Relevant sections of this document are included as Appendix A to my report].

WDDC were required by Section 71 of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to formulate and publish proposals for the preservation and enhancement of Conservation Areas. This requirement is achieved through such Conservation Area Appraisals.

The following are quotations from the Appraisal report –

- Conservation Areas are areas of special architectural or historic interest, the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance.
- Abbotsbury has a dramatic site, at the foot of the Ridgeway scarp and sheltered from the nearby coast by Chapel Hill.
- Although Abbotsbury is a large village, of great architectural and historical interest, it has an overall coherence and homogeneity.
- ... the myriad of details that produce such a high quality environment ...
- Key Views and Vistas
The important interplay between the village and the surrounding landscape means that views in (especially from higher ground); views out of the village; and views within the built environment are all of importance.
- The views from the surrounding countryside are significant:
 - From St Catherine's Chapel looking north and NE over the village to Wears and White Hills, with the Church tower and Tithe Barn particularly prominent and, behind to the south, extensive views of The Swannery, Fleet and Chesil Beach;
 - From the slopes of White Hill behind West and Back Sts: with good views of the heart of the village, the Market Square, Church Tower, roofs and trees, with a distant view of St Catherine's Chapel and the coast;
 - From the southern approach from New Barn Rd, just to the north of Chesters Hill, looking NW past The Swannery, with the village set amongst trees in a deep declivity between Chapel Hill and White Hill;
 - From the slopes of Wears Hill, looking SE on the B3157: the classic view, much photographed and used in publicity material, of the sweep of the escarpment, Chapel Hill and Chapel, coast as far as Portland and Weymouth Bay, and the village tucked into its undulating terrain;
- There are a number of landmarks in the Conservation Area: the Church tower (within the core, appearing between roofs or down Market St to the south); the Tithe Barn (down the lower part of Church St, from the Abbey site and from the southern approach from the Swannery); St Catherine's Chapel (from gaps in development on West St, on Church St and from the lanes south of the core, as well as in splendid wider views from the top of Wears Hill); and, within the core, the twin focal points of the Ilchester Arms and Strangways Hall on the Market Square.
- Green spaces are of major importance to the setting of the village and the separation of some of the historical components. The White Hill escarpment and the green mass of Chapel Hill dominate the immediate landscape, showing up in many of the significant views. Chapel Hill is a popular destination for walkers and architectural enthusiasts, being accessible by a footpath. Other large green spaces of visual importance are the pasture, cricket ground and playing fields south of West St to Seaway Lane and beyond up to the slopes of Chapel Hill. This sweep of undeveloped space gives a firm definition to the western ribbon of the village and is complemented by fields and thick planting at the eastern end behind the Manor (Broad Garden) and Abbey Dairy Houses, where the stream runs south towards the Swannery. The churchyard is another important green space with views and it has a wildlife garden portion at its eastern end. The slopes down from Abbey House south to and including the village pond are visually important, as a setting for the Church and Abbey remains and as a partially accessible public area. The eastern main road entry has an undeveloped southern side up to The Swan and there is a fine sweep of pasture down to the stream and group of buildings around the Tithe Barn. The allotments, between Back St and Rodden Row are a rather hidden important green wedge within the village, affording a view of the Church tower through the Yard of the Dandel Gallery.
- Definition of the Special Interest of the Conservation Area

- A superlative landscape setting, within the Dorset AONB and adjacent to the Dorset and East Devon Jurassic Coast World Heritage Site, with dramatic topography, woodland, glimpses of the sea and important trees and hedges;
- Groups of and individual trees providing a termination to views, visual incident in townscape progressions and a foil to groups of buildings;
- Strong gateways into the Conservation Area, marked by a clean transition between countryside and village, trees and hedges and, apart from one exception, well-defined boundaries elsewhere;
- A variety of fine views into, across and out of the village;
- A tradition of sensitive stewardship by the major landowner and current development policies that attempt to balance conservation with social and economic considerations;
- Large coherent groups of consistently good buildings, walls, trees, spaces and many other details: the whole village reads as an enjoyable visual and cultural experience;
- Some examples of sensitive infill and development that reflect local traditions.

Every single one of these positive features will be marred or destroyed if this mobile phone mast is erected. Therefore, the Application should be rejected on these grounds alone.

Otherwise, what was the point of Section 71 of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 legally requiring the District Council to formulate and publish proposals for the preservation and enhancement of Conservation Areas?

Is the Town and Country Planning Act to be completely ignored, in the interests of mobile phone operators and can, therefore, UK Law simply be brushed aside to make way for the erection of a mobile phone mast which has no proven justification or benefits?

At the end of the Appraisal document, a number of Conservation Area issues are listed, notably –

- Conservation Area Issue
The contribution of trees & the landscape setting to the character & appearance of the conservation areas.
- Proposed Action
Contribution to be perpetuated as far as possible ...

Far from “perpetuating” “The contribution of trees & the landscape setting to the character & appearance of the conservation areas”, the erection of a mobile phone mast will completely destroy this landscape setting for ever.

This Application should be rejected on the following 4 counts:

- 1. The proposed mast will be visible from all high points surrounding the village, including Chapel Hill (part of one of only 27 UNESCO World Heritage Sites in the UK) and the South Dorset Ridgeway (which contains 11 SSSIs).**
- 2. The near-pristine rural character of this AONB will be permanently ruined by the erection of this mast.**
- 3. The substantial amenity value of the whole area will be permanently marred or destroyed.**
- 4. The proposed development is in absolute and complete opposition to virtually every point made in the Conservation Area Appraisal.**

There is also a list of ‘Detrimental Features’: “The 1973 Appreciation highlighted a number of eyesores and other physical problems. The Estates and local community have addressed some of

these (with notable successes at the village pond and surrounding area and the creation of a landscaped car park off Rodden Row)”

These ‘detrimental features’ include “Large, multi-coloured, reflective plastic signs”; “a surfeit of signs and flags that clutter an attractive façade”; “a wheelchair ramp with insensitive metal rails”; “A clutter of signs opposite the Swan Inn, on the eastern approach”; “Disused sheds and electricity switch gear at the Hands Lane/ Rosemary Lane/Back St junction”.

If apparently minor points such as the above are seen as features which are detrimental to the character of the village, a 20 metre high mobile phone mast less than 500 metres from the centre of the village has to be viewed as so massively detrimental that the erection of it should never even be suggested, let alone being actively considered in a Planning Application!

6.11 The mast is set against an undulating landscape, which will help mitigate its impact in views from some public vantage points nearby. The use of a lattice tower, which is a relatively open and light permeable structure, will allow views through the mast, thereby helping to minimise its visual impact.

Can I really believe what I am reading here? The mast is apparently OK because you can see the countryside through it? Can this really be a valid reason for allowing the construction of a 20 metre tower in an AONB? Presumably, then, if I wanted to erect a complex of large glasshouses for horticultural use, I could breezily state that they would be fine because you could see the landscape through them?

At ground level, the compound will be set amongst existing built and natural screening that will minimise its visual impact.

See attached photographs – the mast would be erected beside a (at its apex) 10 metre high barn and beside a 3 metre high hedge. I don’t feel that this can be honestly described as being set “amongst” anything. And in what way, exactly, will the 10 metre high barn and the 3 metre high hedge serve to “screen” the mast when viewed from the West Dorset Ridgeway high above it, from Chapel Hill to the south or, come to that, from anywhere in this beautiful and hitherto substantially unspoilt village?

In addition, the applicants themselves have clearly stated that the mast will be visible: quoting from the Supporting Technical Justification:

2.2. The main function of the mast, or the host building or structure, is to *elevate the antennas and dishes above obstacles such as tall trees, buildings, or valley sides* that would otherwise block radio signals and prevent coverage or the ‘line of sight’ transmission links from being provided. [my emphasis in italics]

6.12 The above approach to siting and design should help to minimise the appearance of the development proposed. In addition, the local topography and natural features should also help to minimise views. Insofar as the mast and compound may be visible they should look straight forward in appearance and reflect their function. To that extent they should in time become accepted features of the local environment as with other forms of communications networks and essentially public utility infrastructure, such as roads and railways.

I am no expert on Planning Law and have read very few Planning Applications but never, ever have I read one where the applicant attempts to justify the proposed structure on the basis that it will “become [an] accepted feature of the local environment”.

This alarming and outrageous statement alone brings into question the probity, veracity and reliability of the applicant and should serve alone to cause the rejection of this application.

This statement tells me that the applicant thinks that planning rules don't apply to them. When a new road is planned, is it sufficient for the applicant to say that, over time, it will become an accepted feature of the local environment, like a railway or a mobile phone mast? If I wanted to build a house in a field in the village, would it be sufficient to breezily say: "it's just a house, there are loads of them; over time, it will become an accepted feature of the local environment"?

Of course the answer to these questions is a simple No.

Why, then, does the applicant think that this argument is valid here? This looks to me suspiciously like the applicant arrogantly assuming that this proposal will be nodded through by the Committee, so it really doesn't matter what nonsense they say.

Perhaps they should have tried applying to have the transmitters on the village church tower - after all, over time, they would become an accepted feature of the local environment, wouldn't they?

5. Non-existent benefits

The applicant's Statement in support of the application goes on, at very great (and repetitive) length about what are supposed to be the benefits of installing a mobile phone mast in Abbotsbury. However, in all cases, these 'benefits' are insufficiently expanded or quantified and/or not valid, and/or actually turn out to be benefits of using mobile phones in general, rather than benefits of being able to use them in more locations within Abbotsbury.

In addition, they could have – with a certain degree of effort – interviewed a selection of households and businesses, in order to obtain real, quantified data for their bland assertions. They chose not to, presumably – again – because they assumed they didn't need to bother, since the Application would be approved anyway.

>> The following are quotations from the Statement, with my comments in red.

2.4 Public demands and service expectations have also grown immeasurably as the handset manufacturers and software engineers produce an increasing array of innovative devices and services ... Mobile services and applications now also offer the means to advertise in a very targeted way.

Can the erection of this mast really be justified on the basis that, for example, companies want to send (often spammy) text messages to our mobiles or Facebook or Google want to show us targeted advertising on our smartphones? There may indeed be some limited benefits of erecting this mast (although I have read none in this document), but increasing the profits of enormous multi-national companies can definitely not be considered to be one!

This is not a valid benefit.

The young population in particular expects to be connected at all times as mobile devices are their main or only means of accessing popular social network sites.

I dare say that they do, but it would be difficult to justify the erection of this mast because young people "expect" to be able to check their Twitter accounts whilst sitting at home! In any case, my 20 year old twin sons are quite happy to use their laptops (connected via Ethernet, not WiFi) to check facebook, Twitter, etc.

This is, therefore, not a valid benefit.

2.5 The ability to keep in contact or call emergency services immediately is also something that many rely on. This has implications for both the extent and quality of coverage. Long gone are the days when people were pleased if they could place a call standing in their garden.

The assumption here is that nobody has landlines any more, so they cannot make a phone call without using a mobile. This is simply not true! In any case, there is an operational public phone box in the centre of the village and a mobile phone signal is already available along most roads in the village.

This is, therefore, not a valid benefit.

More importantly, long gone are the days when car crash victims in the middle of the night were reliant on the help from a passing car or finding a nearby farmhouse from where to call the emergency services.

I would like the applicant to identify exactly how many “car crashes” there are in Abbotsbury every year. Living in the centre of the village, on the B3157 (a road which drivers habitually speed on late at night), I can remember only 3 crashes in the 20 years I have lived here. In 2 of these cases, the driver crashed in to my car! We called the police from our landline. In any case, there is an operational public phone box in the centre of the village and a mobile phone signal is already available along most roads in the village.

This is, therefore, not a valid benefit.

2.9 Whilst most of the UK population can take mobile services for granted, coverage is not universal and for those without coverage the disadvantages become greater over time, increasing the digital divide between those with connectivity and those without.

Again, the assumption here is that nobody has landlines any more, so they cannot make a phone call without using a mobile. In order for this supposed benefit to be considered, the applicant needs to state exactly what are these supposed “disadvantages” which families in Abbotsbury suffer through sometimes not having a mobile signal.

In the absence of this information, this is not a valid benefit.

(In reality, this phrase “digital divide” smacks of being a simple buzzword phrase which sounds good but is almost entirely meaningless.)

3.2 Having regard to the Government’s three key dimensions for sustainable development within the NPPF, mobile communications will assist in a number of ways. With reference to, and in addition to the examples of the many benefits of mobile communications, sustainable objectives will be supported in the following ways:

- An economic role - modern communications in all their different and emerging forms, including mobile communications, help maintain high and stable levels of economic growth and employment. Hence, the UK Government’s continued commitment to the growth and development of modern electronic communications. **Very vague – needs quantifying and expanding. In the absence of further information, this is not a valid benefit.**
- A social role - modern communications, including mobile communications, aid social progress, which recognises the needs of everyone. **Again, very vague, and the examples do not provide sufficient justification.** This manifests itself in a number of ways as illustrated by the following examples:
 - Extending economic opportunity through faster and more flexible means of communication capable of handling large volumes of data. **In what way does the ability to “handle large volumes of data” extend economic opportunity? Is the applicant suggesting that being able to download films to your mobile has some mysterious economic benefit? In any case, we must keep in mind here that, according to the applicant’s own Supporting Technical Justification, the proposed**

mast will only “provide basic voice and data network coverage to the not spots, which is akin to that provided by the second-generation (2G) mobile services”. Such services cannot handle any data at all! This is, therefore, not a valid benefit. This is particularly important to those who live in remote areas, where economic opportunities might be more limited particularly amongst the more socially disadvantaged, with poorer access to transport. I fail to see what relevance this statement has to the preceding one.

- Enabling flexible forms of working that provide opportunities to working parents or carers and help them achieve a better work life balance with both family and community benefits. My wife and I both run our own businesses from home – I am a web designer and she is an artist. We use our landline. This is, therefore, not a valid benefit.
- By providing means of communication that improve convenience and enhance personal safety and security. This is especially important to vulnerable groups who may otherwise feel unable to participate in certain activities. Very vague – needs expanding. In the absence of further information, this is not a valid benefit.
- By aiding social inclusion through connectivity with friends and family, including use of social networking sites. Social networking sites can be used equally well – in fact far more efficiently – on a desktop or laptop computer. As I write this, I can see 8 Twitter tabs and 3 Facebook tabs open on my browser – this would be impossible on a mobile phone. My wife uses her laptop to access Facebook and my 20 year old twin sons (when they are home from University) use their laptops or desktops In any case, a mobile phone contract with sufficient data usage to access social networking sites on a regular basis would be extremely expensive and out of reach of many socially disadvantaged people. This is, therefore, not a valid benefit.
- An environmental role - modern communications, including mobile communications, provide effective protection of the environment by helping reduce the need to travel by enabling modern working practices such as greater home working. Such practices reduce the need for travel and can alleviate the pressure for new commercial development such as offices, through more efficient and flexible use of existing accommodation. For the same reasons, modern communications, including mobile communications, help ensure the prudent use of natural resources. Very vague – needs quantifying and expanding. In the absence of further information, this is not a valid benefit. It is, in addition, highly dubious to aver that, in some mysterious way, installing a mobile phone mast in Abbotsbury will help ensure the “prudent use of natural resources”!

A.3 The principal benefits may not be obvious, can be categorized under sub – headings, with examples (which overlap to some extent) as follows:

Economic Benefits

- Mobile communications, especially high speeds can help extend business opportunities into peripheral areas, both directly and indirectly. I dare say but, according to the applicant’s own Supporting Technical Justification, the proposed mast will only “provide basic voice and data network coverage to the not spots, which is akin to that provided by the second-generation (2G) mobile services”. Such services are not “high speed”. This is, therefore, not a valid benefit.
- An example of a direct benefit would be a business reliant on mobile communications being able to establish within an area, so creating local employment opportunities. What type of business do they have in mind? In the absence of further information, this is not a valid benefit.

- Indirect benefits, might include visitors to the local area being able to search and make reservations or bookings at local restaurants or hotels. If the “local area” means West Dorset in general, visitors will have an adequate mobile phone signal in most areas. If the “local area” means visitors who are actually in Abbotsbury, I can state quite categorically that, from our kitchen window overlooking the main street (Market Street, right in the centre of the village), I see visitors all year quite happily using their mobiles in the village. Plus, according to the applicant’s own Supporting Technical Justification, the proposed mast will only “provide basic voice and data network coverage to the not spots, which is akin to that provided by the second-generation (2G) mobile services”. So the proposed mast will do nothing to enhance the signal required to do such “searching”. In addition, this really is quite a small village and visitors might well prefer (I know I would) to actually walk around for a few minutes and actually look at places before deciding to use them. Note also that there are no “restaurants” or “hotels” in the village – there are tea-rooms, cafes, 2 pubs, self-catering cottages and B&Bs. This indicates that this paragraph (and, we have to assume, the rest of these supposed “benefits”) is a copy and paste job from a previous application in another area. In other words, we are not looking at a document detailing the benefits of installing a mobile phone mast in Abbotsbury, but a generic document used on a ‘that’ll do’ basis. It seems to me to be supremely arrogant for the applicant to think that he does not even need to visit the village or consider its particular features before blithely running off this set of generic “benefits”. This is, therefore, not a valid benefit.
- Local tradesmen and others who provide services such as doctors and vets can provide a more responsive and flexible service, which can save costs. Very vague – needs expanding. In the absence of further information, this is not a valid benefit.

Improving Social Well – Being

- Mobile communications can help social well – being by simply ending or reducing a sense of isolation. Very vague – needs expanding. In the absence of further information, this is not a valid benefit.
- Mobile communications can bring about far greater personal convenience and security, for example, teenagers can keep in parental contact when out in the evening. Teenagers (like our sons) will normally be “out in the evening” in Weymouth, Dorchester or Bridport. These 3 towns all have good mobile phone coverage, so contact can easily be maintained between the young person and his/her parents via their own mobile phones and the parents’ home landline. This is, therefore, not a valid benefit.
- Mobile communications can access a range of applications to benefit people’s lifestyle and interests
- Mobile communications can provide much greater freedom to carers, who can remain in contact in case of emergency. Very vague – needs expanding in relation to Abbotsbury. By inference, I am assuming that the applicant has 2 possible scenarios in mind: the first is that an Abbotsbury resident needs to contact a carer, in which case the resident can use his/her landline to ring the carer’s mobile phone, which may or may not have a signal. But since, in this scenario, the carer is not in the village, the possible absence of a signal is irrelevant to whether or not there is a signal in Abbotsbury. The second scenario would be if the carer were attending a resident in Abbotsbury, in which case he/she could be contacted via the resident’s landline. In the absence of any further information, this is not a valid benefit.
- Mobile communications are required to enable people to remain connected and to access social networking sites. For young people in particular this is important so that they can feel included amongst their peer group. It would be very difficult to justify the erection of any mobile phone mast on the basis of people’s requirement to “access social networking sites”. As human beings, we have certain basic requirements; the ability to check your Facebook

messages or Twitter retweets is not one of them! In any case, this appears to be a benefit of the use of mobile phones in general, rather than a benefit of erecting a mast in Abbotsbury. In addition, if children want to use their phones indoors (where there might not be a mobile signal), the parents can simply switch on the WiFi on their router. The children can use *WhatsApp* to message their friends and look at Facebook, etc via the Wifi. This is then the householder's own choice to subject his/her family to the Wifi radiation from the router, for a limited period of time, rather than having no choice at being subjected to mobile phone radiation for 24 hours a day, every single day. This is, therefore, not a valid benefit.

- Mobile communications can help parents interact with children far away, for example, a divorced father can play a game on line [sic] with a son many miles away. This is an utterly bizarre example! Are we being told that the erection of a mobile phone mast in Abbotsbury is necessary so that 2 people can play games on their phones? This really is beyond belief! In any case, according to the applicant's own Supporting Technical Justification, the proposed mast will only "provide basic voice and data network coverage to the not spots, which is akin to that provided by the second-generation (2G) mobile services". A 2G service does not support playing of games on a phone. This is, therefore, not a valid benefit.

Encouraging Sustainable Lifestyles

- Mobile phones can help minimise unnecessary journeys, so increasing productivity and reducing travel demands. I dare say but, yet again, this appears to be simply a benefit of using mobile phones in general. Rather than driving in my car 10 miles to Weymouth, for example, in order to talk to someone, I could simply phone them on my landline, as could someone wanting to talk to me. If the potential problem is that I might have to drive because I can't reach someone on their own mobile phone (because they don't have a signal), then the lack of a signal (not in Abbotsbury) is unrelated to whether better mobile phone signals are required in the village. This is, therefore, not a valid benefit.
- Mobile phones can help facilitate modern forms of working, including greater homeworking. This can bring about an improved balance between home and working life. At the same time, it can help minimise private car movements and so help reduce peak period congestion and pollution. This is a particularly important benefit when transport policy to reduce travel and CO² [sic] emissions seems to be failing. As noted above, my wife and I both run our own businesses from home – I am a web designer and she is an artist. We use our landline. And is the seeming "failure" of "transport policy to reduce travel" really a valid reason to abandon such transport policy objectives and erect mobile phone masts all over the country, hoping that that might, in some mysterious way, serve to reduce CO₂ emissions? It really is amazingly tortuous logic to use 'climate change' to justify the erection of a mobile phone mast! This is, therefore, not a valid benefit.

Improving Health and Safety

- Most 999 calls in the UK, including requests for Coastguard assistance and Mountain Rescue are now made using mobile phones. Agreed, but there is an operational public phone box in the centre of the village and a mobile phone signal is already available along most roads in the village. This is, therefore, not a valid benefit.
- On an average day in the UK 11 people are killed on our roads. A far greater number are saved from fatal or permanent injury through prompt paramedical assistance in the critical early period following an accident. This is made possible by 999 calls placed almost immediately following an accident. There is an operational public phone box in the centre of the village and a mobile phone signal is already available along most roads in the village. In addition, in a small close-knit village, in the event of a car accident, people would be rushing

to help and would be able to call the emergency services from their landlines. This is, therefore, not a valid benefit.

- Mobile phones can be used to summons [sic] assistance from the breakdown services in the secure environment of a locked car. This is particularly important to the vulnerable. A mobile phone signal is already available along most roads in the village. In any case, Abbotsbury is not Mombasa or Johannesburg, such that anyone needs to be afraid to get out of their "locked car". On the contrary, residents would be only too willing to provide assistance themselves. This is, therefore, not a valid benefit.

In addition, a large number of the supposed benefits which the applicant so laboriously listed, relate to 3G (or 4G) enabled smart phones, as specifically stated in paragraph A2:

"A connected and modern smart phone is now able to access thousands of applications, which means that it is almost impossible to now quantify or specify all the potential benefits."

But, according to paragraph 1.3 of the applicant's own Supporting Technical Justification, the proposed mast will only

"provide basic voice and data network coverage to the not spots, which is akin to that provided by the second-generation (2G) mobile services that are now commonplace across most of the UK."

6. Health considerations

In the Supporting Technical Justification, the applicant states:

8.1. Section 5 'Supporting high quality communications infrastructure' of the National Planning Policy Framework for England provides the following guidance to local planning authorities on health safeguards and base station development:

'46. Local Planning authorities must determine applications on planning grounds. They should not seek to prevent competition between different operators, question the need for the telecommunications system, or determine health safeguards if the proposal meets International Commission guidelines for public exposure.'

This statement is incorrect, as follows -

The Government directive on phone mast planning applications was effectively overturned by the then Deputy Prime Minister and First Secretary of State, the Rt Hon John Prescott.

On 26 September 2003 a High Court Judge signed a Consent Order that finalised the quashing of a Planning Inspectorate appeal decision. The decision, to allow an Orange mobile phone mast to be erected in Grove Way, Chorleywood, was over-turned on the basis of the Inspector's "failure to adequately consider the weight to be given to the health concerns of the claimant in his decision letter".

The case in question is *Yasmin Skelt -v- The First Secretary of State and Three Bridges District Council and Orange PCS Limited*.

In the words of previous High Court rulings, such guidelines must not be allowed to "fetter the decision-maker's discretion" in the planning process. The 2003 Ruling makes it crystal clear how that principle should operate in practice.

This Decision makes it very clear that slavish adherence to PPG8 and unquestioning reliance on ICNIRP certification, is not sufficient to ignore health concerns.

PPG8 is guidance. From that point, PPG8 was no longer (and should never have been) 'carte blanche' for masts to go up anywhere and everywhere with a total disregard for legitimate public health concerns.

This ruling has not since been overruled. Therefore, LPAs are legally required to consider the health implications of mobile phone masts when making a decision on planning applications for such masts.

(see <http://www.mast-victims.org/forum/index.php?action=vthread&forum=2&topic=4881>)

The conclusions and/or results of the following reports and studies therefore need to be taken into consideration in the decision as to whether or not to allow the installation of the mobile phone mast in Abbotsbury [where appropriate, my emphases are in bold type] –

6.1 The 2011 IARC (WHO) Report

From May 24th to 31st 2011, a Working Group of 31 scientists from 14 countries met at the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), an agency of the World Health Organisation, in Lyon, France, to assess the potential carcinogenic hazards from exposure to radiofrequency electromagnetic fields.

The IARC Monograph Working Group discussed and evaluated the available literature on the following exposure categories involving radiofrequency electromagnetic fields:

- occupational exposures to radar and to microwaves;
- environmental exposures associated with transmission of signals for radio, television and wireless telecommunication; and
- personal exposures associated with the use of wireless telephones.

Their conclusion was as follows -

Dr Jonathan Samet (University of Southern California, USA), overall Chairman of the Working Group, indicated that "the evidence, while still accumulating, is strong enough to support a conclusion and the 2B classification [my note - uprated from a group 3 classification]. The conclusion means that there could be some risk, and therefore we need to keep a close watch for a link between cell phones and cancer risk."

My notes on grouping of health dangers

- Group 2B - 'Possibly carcinogenic to humans'; Note that other substances classified as Class 2B include diesel exhaust, chloroform, jet fuel, lead and DDT.
- Group 3 - 'Not classifiable as to its carcinogenicity to humans'

My note – in other words, radiation from mobile phones and masts (“personal” and “environmental” exposure) has been internationally recognised for the past 2½ years as a possible carcinogen.

WDDC need to decide who will be liable for damages should low-level electromagnetic radiation from a mobile phone mast which they have allowed to be erected be proven to have caused these ‘possible’ cancers.

Has the District Council made suitable arrangements to deal with such claims? As a Council Tax payer, I require the legal position regarding liability on this issue to be clarified.

It is very telling that many insurance companies are now excluding Public Liability cover in respect of telecommunications masts.

Source – http://www.iarc.fr/en/media-centre/pr/2011/pdfs/pr208_E.pdf

6.2 The Stewart Report

In May 2000, the Independent Expert Group on Mobile Phones, under the leadership of Professor Sir William Stewart, presented their government-sponsored report ("Mobile phones and health") to the nation. This study of the possible health effects of mobile phones, base stations and transmitters adopted an evidence-based approach. That is to say, it conducted an extensive review of the literature and then asked for evidence from experts, members of the public, representatives of government, interest groups and the industry.

There were nine conclusions published in the report. They are:

1. The use of mobile phones will continue to increase.
2. Evidence to date does not suggest a general health risk.
3. **Some scientific evidence shows that radio-frequency (RF) radiation may affect biological function. It is not possible to say, therefore that exposure to RF radiation, even at levels below national guidelines, is totally without potential adverse health effects.**
4. **A precautionary approach should be adopted until more detailed information becomes available.**
5. Emissions from masts will be many times less than emissions from handsets.
6. **Some people's well-being may be adversely affected by the environmental impact of mobile phone base stations (masts) sited next to houses, schools or other buildings, as well as by fear of perceived direct effects.**
7. All base stations, including those under 15 metres, should have permitted development rights revoked and the siting of all new base stations (masts) should be subject to the normal planning process.
8. The use of mobile phones while driving is dangerous.
9. The widespread use of mobile phones by children should be discouraged.

Unfortunately, the Government always 'cherry pick' the Stewart Report to add their own 'spin' to the claims about the safety of any new mast or network. The Government and the mast companies always quote conclusions 1, 2, 5, 8 and 9 (usually only 2). They never quote conclusions 3, 4, 6 or 7.

The Government announced, in April 2001, that planning controls over new masts would be improved. But the sting in the tail was a statement that "concerns over health may not be considered as a legitimate planning issue when approving new phone mast sites". This first appeared in a press release dated 16 March 2001 from the then Planning Minister Nick Raynsford. This 'health' statement contradicts conclusions 4, 6 and 7 from the Stewart Report. Why?

Stewart is very clear on the value of a precautionary approach: No masts near schools; No masts where the beam of greatest incidence (intensity) falls on a school. And, as a logical extension of this, no masts near the homes of children or other vulnerable people.

The Stewart Report lines up with Human Rights and other legislation, as follows: the Human Rights Act (1998) and the Precautionary Principle (Maastricht Treaty 1993) are very strongly supported by Stewart's conclusions numbers 3, 4 and 6. It is very likely that, in the future, UK legislation will have to fall into line with European legislation: the UK is bound by treaty to this, and yet the UK government has not yet incorporated the Precautionary Principle into environmental planning policy or guidance. The Human Rights Act is of course already embodied in British Law.

Author - Mike Barratt July 2001.

(source - <http://www.mastsanity.org/campaign-information.html>)

6.3 Case study: the village of Wishaw, near Sutton Coldfield (Birmingham)

After 7 years of exposure to radiation from a mobile phone mast erected in the village in 1994, 77% of the population became ill with sleep problems, headaches, dizziness and low immune system problems, the likely cause being radiation from the mast.

Among those living in the 18 houses within a 500-yard radius of the mast there were 20 cases of serious illness, including cancers of the breast, prostate, bladder, lung and motor neurone disease. A horse nearby had blood problems, with continuous treatment needed by the vet.

[My note – see screenshot 'screenshot3' for a map of Abbotsbury showing a 500 yard radius from the mast which, as can be seen, includes a large part of the village. Extending by only another 200 yards would include virtually all the village].

One extraordinarily important fact is that since the Wishaw Mast was pulled down in November 2003, many of the residents reported a restored feeling of well-being, an improvement in their sleep patterns and increased energy levels. The headaches and dizzy symptoms have also disappeared. The village also saw something of a baby boom with three babies born in the village: one of the women had previously had treatment for pre-cancer cervical cells, another had previously suffered a miscarriage.

The residents also noted a return of wildlife in the area and the horse has since recovered and is now strong and healthy and no longer needs treatment.

Author: Eileen O'Connor

Trustee for the EM Radiation Research Trust: www.radiationresearch.org

1st October 2005

(source: <http://www.canceractive.com/cancer-active-page-link.aspx?n=970>)

6.4 The Naila Study

The Naila Study, (Germany, November 2004), conducted over 10 years, was released by The Federal Agency for Radiation Protection, Germany. Medical doctors compiled case histories since 1994 - 2004, looking at heightened risk of taking ill with malignant tumours. **They discovered a threefold increase after five years exposure to microwave radiation from a mobile phone mast transmitter for up to 400 metres distance, compared to those patients living further away.** [My note – see screenshot 'screenshot3' for a map of Abbotsbury showing a 500 yard radius from the mast (slightly more than 400 metres) which, as can be seen, includes a large part of the village. Extending by only another 200 yards would include virtually all the village].

Author: Eileen O'Connor

Trustee for the EM Radiation Research Trust: www.radiationresearch.org

1st October 2005

(source: <http://www.canceractive.com/cancer-active-page-link.aspx?n=970>)

6.5 The Wolf Study, Kaplan, Israel and others

A study carried out by Ronni Wolf MD and Danny Wolf MD, of the Kaplan Medical Centre in Israel (April 2004) discovered a **fourfold increase in cancer within 350 metres after long-term exposure to microwave radiation from a mobile phone mast and a tenfold increase specifically among women, compared to patients living away from the mast.**

Other short-term mobile phone mast studies have also found significant health effects such as headaches, dizziness, depression, fatigue, sleep disorder, difficulty in concentration and cardiovascular problems.

Author: Eileen O'Connor

Trustee for the EM Radiation Research Trust: www.radiationresearch.org

1st October 2005

(source: <http://www.canceractive.com/cancer-active-page-link.aspx?n=970>)

6.6 The Freiburger Appeal

In October 2002 a team of German medical doctors started the Freiburger Appeal. **After seeing a dramatic rise in severe and chronic diseases, they had noted a clear temporal and spatial correlation between disease and exposure to microwave radiation.** The appeal has since been signed by thousands of doctors.

"Since the living environment and lifestyles of our patients are familiar to us, we can see, especially after carefully-directed inquiry, a clear temporal and spatial correlation between the appearance of disease and exposure to pulsed high-frequency microwave radiation (HFMR), such as: Installation of a mobile telephone sending station in the near vicinity....

What we experience in the daily reality of our medical practice is anything but hypothetical! We see the rising number of chronically sick patients also as the result of an irresponsible "safety limits policy", which fails to take the protection of the public from the short- and long-term effects of mobile telephone radiation as its criteria for action.

Instead, it submits to the dictates of a technology already long recognized as dangerous. **For us, this is the beginning of a very serious development through which the health of many people is being threatened.** We will no longer be made to wait upon further unreal research results - which in our experience are often influenced by the communications industry, while evidential studies go on being ignored. We find it to be of urgent necessity that we act now!"

(source: http://www.laleva.cc/environment/freiburger_appeal.html)

6.7 Case study : the village of Benajarafe, Spain

The residents of the Spanish village of Benjarafe had long feared that a mobile phone mast has been causing cancer in their village. They have now scored a massive victory by having it removed.

After a two year battle, Vodafone has been ordered to take down the controversial transmitter. The locals are adamant that the mast, which stands just metres from their houses was the reason for a high incidence of recent cancer deaths. **Of the nearly 400 residents there have been a staggering 50 cases of cancer with more than 30 people dying in recent years.**

Many others claim to have been suffering from insomnia, headaches, depression and memory disorders due to the mast. Following numerous protests Velez Malaga Town Hall issued a municipal order in 2009 to have it taken down as its construction 16 years ago was not licensed. After Vodafone lost an appeal against the order, the town hall received notification that it could be removed.

(source: <http://www.theolivepress.es/spain-news/2012/01/25/cancer-mast-finally-comes-down-in-spain/>)

6.8 Study reported in Clinical Biochemistry journal

Case Report - Egypt

How does long term exposure to base stations and mobile phones affect human hormone profiles?

Objectives

This study is concerned with assessing the role of exposure to radio frequency radiation (RFR) emitted either from mobiles or base stations and its relations with human's hormone profiles.

Design and methods

All volunteers' samples were collected for hormonal analysis.

Results

This study showed significant decrease in volunteers' ACTH, cortisol, thyroid hormones, prolactin for young females, and testosterone levels.

Conclusion

The present study revealed that high RFR effects on pituitary–adrenal axis.

Highlights

This study is concerned with assessing the role of long-term exposure to high radio frequency radiation emitted either from mobile phones or from base stations and its relations with human's hormone profiles. All volunteers were followed for 6 years and blood samples were collected regularly every 3 years for time intervals of 1 year, 3 years and 6 years for hormonal analysis and the blood samples were taken at 8.0 a.m. This study showed reduction in volunteers' plasma ACTH, serum cortisol levels. Also, they showed decrease in the release of the thyroid hormones especially T3. In addition, each of their serum prolactin in young females (14–22 years), and testosterone levels significantly dropped due to long-term exposure to radio frequency radiation. Conversely, serum prolactin levels for adult females (25–60 years) significantly rose with increasing exposure time.

In conclusion, the present study revealed that high radio frequency radiation effects on pituitary–adrenal axis represented in the reduction of ACTH, cortisol, thyroid hormones, prolactin in young females, and testosterone levels.

Clinical Biochemistry -
Volume 45, Issues 1–2, January 2012, Pages 157–161

Authors: Emad F.Eskander, Selim F. Estefan, Ahmed A. Abd-Rabou Hormones
Department, Medical Research Division, National Research Centre, Cairo, 12622, Egypt. Fax:
+ 20 2 33370931.

Copyright © 2011 The Canadian Society of Clinical Chemists.

(source: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0009912011027330>)

6.9 Non-ionising radiation from mobile phone masts – health issues and the body’s negative feedback mechanisms

People living close to mobile phone masts (base stations) frequently report symptoms of electromagnetic hypersensitivity such as dizziness, headaches, skin conditions, allergies and many others, the mechanisms for which are only just beginning to be understood. There is also growing anecdotal evidence for cancer clusters forming around them. However, we are regularly told by the mobile phone industry that these base stations are safe because their microwave radiation falls off rapidly with distance and is far too low to generate significant heat. Sadly, this is not true. It is based on the false assumption that it is only their heating effect that can cause damage and a serious misunderstanding of the ways in which living organisms use negative feedback to respond to changes in their environment, including the metabolic insults from mobile phones.

There are hundreds of scientific papers in peer-reviewed scientific journals showing biological effects from non-ionising radiation that may be hundreds or thousands of times below the levels that cause significant heating. Furthermore, these non-thermal effects include many independent and well-replicated studies showing that the radiation from mobile phone handsets can cause serious damage to the DNA of living cells in less than 24 hours, so we cannot regard these handsets as being safe for anything other than short-term use.

Because of the extreme sensitivity of at least some cells to mobile phone radiation, it is likely that the much weaker radiation reaching people living or working close to base stations will also suffer adverse effects. Claims by the mobile phone industry that the base stations are safe because the radiation falls off rapidly with distance are flawed. Although the radiation level does indeed fall off as they say, the biological response will remain more or less constant over a wide range of signal strengths due to the ways in which living cells routinely use ‘negative feedback’ to compensate for changes in their environment.

Living cells have a range of negative feedback mechanisms that sense non-thermal radiation damage and use it to trigger various defence systems. These systems are expensive in energy and resources and also reduce metabolic efficiency. The object therefore has to be to keep this damage within ‘tolerable’ limits rather than to eliminate it. They do this by cutting in only when they approach the limits of toleration. The effect is to keep the damage at or close to these ‘trigger points’ over a wide range of radiation levels, ranging from that due to a mobile phone handset held close to the head, to that from a mast, which may be hundreds of metres away.

The radiation from a handset may actually be less damaging since it is used only intermittently and the body has a chance to recover in between times. **However, continuous irradiation from mobile phone base stations, DECT phone base stations and Wifi routers may not allow adequate recovery time, so chronic irradiation from these sources could be far more damaging and more likely to result in cancer, allergy-related conditions and electromagnetic hypersensitivity. There is an urgent need for further research in this area, since the assumption that the only biological effects of non-ionising radiation are due to heating, and fall off rapidly with distance, no longer fits the facts.**

Author - Andrew Goldsworthy BSc PhD is an Honorary Lecturer in Biology at Imperial College London. March 2008

(source - <http://www.hese-project.org/hese-uk/en/niemr/cellfeedback.php>)

6.10 Non-ionising radiation from mobile phone masts – research into health issues

Masts produce microwaves, we all know what these do, they defrost our bread, warm up our food, cook our dinners, we know they HEAT. The emissions from these masts are the same except much lower so they do not heat the body up quite so much, though it still has an effect on our bodies, but none considered to be a problem by many Government bodies. So as long as masts produce emissions below a set level they say its okay. However heating is not the only effect of microwaves. The non-heating effects that scientists have now proved change the cell and how it works are NOT regulated in this country so there is no measure, no control and no research - except on the population of Great Britain! Many eminent scientists argue that there is a link between cancer/leukaemia and the siting of these masts. Cancer involves the mutation and duplication of cells - cells change – it has been proved that pulsing microwave emissions cause changes in living cells. We are all intelligent enough to come to our own conclusions!!

The radiation is known to affect systems in the brain influencing it in a way that can cause headaches and also memory problems, two of the most widely reported side effects. It also shortens the duration of REM sleep and the secretion of a substance called melatonin decreases. Both of these effects are consistent with reports of sleep disruption. It's also a fact that during the 'Cold War', the same emissions that come from masts were used (successfully!!) by the Soviets to induce serious adverse health effects in the staff and children of Western Embassies in Eastern Bloc countries!

Due to the diversity of people and the way each person's body reacts to external influences, not all people are affected and the severity of reactions will vary from person to person, according to the robustness of their immune system. This makes the occurrence of non-thermal effects more difficult to predict and therefore more difficult to regulate and control, this does not mean however that they should be ignored.

Children are particularly susceptible because they are still growing (so their cells are dividing at a faster rate) and their nervous system is still developing. On top of that their immune systems are also weaker than adults and their skulls are smaller and thinner causing them to absorb substantially more radiation than adults. The electrical brain wave activity does not settle into a stable pattern until the age of 12 so below this age their brain waves are more susceptible to interference from the microwave emissions - similar to radio interference.

Mobile phone masts do not give off the same emissions as TV/Radio transmission. Television and radio emissions from other telecommunication units have continuous waves, mobile phone emissions PULSE. The frequency at which they pulse closely resembles the frequency of the electrical pulses of the brain. It is believed that this is why there are increased reports of epilepsy, depression, headaches, migraines, etc. in communities and schools that have masts.

The telecommunication companies and the Government agencies CANNOT categorically say that occurrences of cancer and leukaemia, especially in children, are not directly associated with the siting of masts, maybe in the school grounds, maybe on top of a block of flats. These masts are everywhere and most people don't know they're there. You might be suffering from one of the known problems and not realise why.

(source - <http://www.hese-project.org/hese-uk/en/niemr/cellfeedback.php>)

6.11 Adverse Health Effects on Humans

Documenting the health hazards of this Wireless Age, The World Health Organization (WHO), International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), in 2011, announced that Radiofrequency (RF) Electromagnetic Fields (EMFs) can possibly cause cancer, "based on an increased risk for glioma, a malignant type of brain cancer, associated with wireless phone use."

The microwave (MW) radiation emitted from Wi-Fi and devices such as smart meters closely resembles that of cell and cordless phones, according to Dr. Carpenter and Dr. Olle Johansson, and therefore are possibly cancerous as well, with children absorbing "as much as twice the microwave radiation as adults." Children's risk from exposure to a carcinogen and neurotoxin, like RF/MW, increases "as age decreases," L. Lloyd Morgan testified in Oregon's U.S District Court.

The effects of RF electromagnetic radiation (EMR), specifically microwave radiation, have been documented for some time. In the 1950's, thousands of workers were suffering after the implementation of microwave technology developed during World War II. In an effort to study and treat those affected, clinics were established in Moscow, Leningrad, and other cities in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe for the new occupational disease – Radio Wave Sickness – presenting symptoms such as:

"Insomnia, headaches, dizziness, nausea, memory loss, difficulty concentrating, irritability, respiratory illness (bronchitis, sinusitis, pneumonia), flu-like illness, asthma, fatigue, weakness, pressure or pain in the chest, increase in blood pressure, altered pulse rate (usually slowed), pressure behind the eyes, other eye problems, swollen throat, dry lips or mouth, dehydration, sweating, fever, shortness of breath, muscle spasms, tremors, pain in the legs or the soles of the feet, testicular or pelvic pain, joint pain, pains that move around the body, nosebleeds, internal bleeding, hair loss, digestive problems, skin rash, ringing in the ears, impaired sense of smell, pain in the teeth (especially with metallic fillings)," Arthur Firstenberg wrote in his Radio Wave Packet.

Many of these people developed anxiety, depression, or emotional instability, and upon physical exam presented unequal pupil size, altered reflexes, heart arrhythmias, EKG and EEG abnormalities, and, in advanced stages, signs that the heart and brain were being deprived of oxygen. "Most clinicians reported that about 15% of microwave workers developed symptoms of radio wave sickness, and that about 2% had to permanently cease working... Workers were exposed to microwave radiation during work hours only, and to levels of radiation less than what the general

public is exposed to currently for hours per day, or even all the time, from cell phone and wireless Internet technologies."

In her book, *Electromagnetic Fields: A Consumer's Guide to the Issues and How to Protect Ourselves*, B. Blake Levitt wrote:

"The Soviet Union did some interesting RF/MW research on behavioral aberrations that is unparalleled in the United States. It has been known for many years that low-intensity EMFs produce adverse effects on the autonomic and central nervous systems of humans and animals in strengths far too low to cause tissue heating. For years U.S. researchers dismissed much of the Soviet research, partly for political reasons but also because they could not replicate many of the studies because the Soviets (for security reasons of their own) left out important details. With the end of the Cold War, some of these gaps have been filled and American researchers have been able to replicate some Soviet work."

Physicians today, like Dr. Klinghardt, say the main symptom in every patient we see is, "loss of zest." People are still living, but more of a half-life, with a loss of "enthusiasm, sex drive, and joy." This is consistent with the findings of his colleagues in other practices in the U.S., Canada, and Europe. "What is it that has changed in the last 15-20 years? ...What we discovered is very simple - it's the exposure to electromagnetic fields."

Researchers today are correlating symptoms, "such as sleep disturbance, fatigue, memory loss, headaches, depression, dizziness and tremors—the same symptoms reported by Soviet doctors half a century ago — with either intensity of cell phone use or proximity of homes to communication towers."

The American Academy of Environmental Medicine (AAEM) says many studies, reported in the peer-reviewed scientific literature, demonstrate the harmful biological, non-heating effects of RF exposure, including:

- Genetic damage – chromosomal instability, gene mutations, altered gene expression, DNA structural breaks and fragmentation found in neurons, sperm, red blood cells, blood lymphocytes, hematopoietic tissue, epithelial and lung cells, and bone marrow;
- Neurological damage – "increase in blood-brain barrier permeability and oxidative damage, which are associated with brain cancer and neurodegenerative diseases" such as Parkinson's, Alzheimer's, and Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis (ALS). Headaches, tremors, dizziness, autonomic nervous system dysfunction, decreased attention, memory, and reaction times, visual disruption, and sleep disturbances have been reported;
- Nervous system dysfunction, immune system dysfunction, cognitive effects, protein and peptide damage, kidney damage, reproductive defects, developmental effects, and cancer.

In *Electromagnetic Fields: A Consumer's Guide to the Issues and How to Protect Ourselves*, B. Blake Levitt wrote:

"In humans, EMFs in various frequencies have been found to adversely affect calcium binding at the cell surface, DNA synthesis, and cell division; to alter circadian rhythms, affect or alter some important enzyme activities, and affect specific glands like the pineal and the hypothalamus area of the brain as well as the production of certain neurotransmitters, like serotonin and dopamine production; to increase the permeability of the blood-brain barrier; to create artificial stress responses; to overstimulate the immune system initially, then suppress [it] and decrease T-lymphocyte production; and to promote malignant tumor

growth with particular concentrations in the central nervous system, in the blood and skeletal systems, and in glandular tissue. The eyes, the brain, and the testes seem to be especially prone to abnormal effects from the RF frequencies. The eye serves to amplify some RF/MW frequencies, which is probably why increases in posterior cataracts have been observed in some microwave workers. (Microwaves are also known to increase drug sensitivity in people taking glaucoma medication). The testes are very close to the body's surface, which is probably why increases in testicular cancer have been reported in law-enforcement officers who have rested functioning radar guns in their laps."

One study by the University of Athens, showed over an of eight month period 143 proteins in the brain were affected by the Radiofrequency radiation of a cell phone or DECT portable phone, "including proteins that have been correlated so far with Alzheimer's, glioblastoma, stress, and metabolism... This study is anticipated to throw light in the understanding of such health effects like headaches, dizziness, sleep disorders, memory disorders, brain tumors, all of them related, to the function of the altered brain proteins."

An increasing number of people are becoming hypersensitive due to electromagnetic radiation. Studies on Electromagnetic Hypersensitivity (EHS) began in earnest in the 1990's; they found that "the EMF involved was usually within the non-ionizing range of the electromagnetic spectrum," the same part of the electromagnetic spectrum utilized by cell and cordless phones, Wi-Fi, smart meters, etc.

The AAEM says EHS "has been documented in controlled and double blind studies with exposure to various EMF frequencies," with pulsed frequencies shown to "consistently provoke neurological symptoms in a blinded subject..."

"A collection of scientists and physicians recently conducted a double-blinded research study that concluded that EMF hypersensitivity can occur as a bona fide environmentally-inducible neurological syndrome (McCarty et al., 2011)" County of Santa Cruz Health Officer said.

Using radio frequency meters, Canadian researcher, Dr. Magda Havas, demonstrates the biological effects of Wi-Fi, and "how wireless household appliances such as portable phones, Wi-Fi base stations and DECT baby monitors broadcast constant microwave radiation that are similar in intensity a few hundred meters away from a large cell phone tower.

(source: <http://meansforchange.org/Health-Effects/Adverse-Effects-on-Humans>)

7. Health implications for farm animals and livestock

Abbotsbury is predominantly a farming community. Any negative effects on the health of farm animals could, therefore, have grave implications to the economic security of the whole village. In addition, many householders keep chickens and sell the eggs, forming a small but valuable source of additional money for people on a low income. There are also a number of beekeepers in the area, who rely for part of their income on the sale of honey.

The land in and around the village has been farmed for many centuries and forms a fundamental part of the existing land use in the area. **The proposed development is likely to cause severe potential disruption to this existing land use and should, therefore, be rejected on these grounds alone.**

Animal studies are of great importance as biological effects on animals cannot be written off as 'psychological' effects.

The conclusions and/or results of the following reports and studies need to be taken into consideration in the decision as to whether or not to allow the installation of the mobile phone mast in Abbotsbury [where appropriate, my emphases are in bold type] –

7.1 Bavarian State Government Study – impact on cattle and sheep

A study, funded by the Bavarian State Government in Germany, was set up in response to reports of adverse health effects in dairy cattle, after a Telecoms mast had been erected for TV and cell phone transmission. **Scientists documented a significant drop in milk yield and behavioural disorders** in some of the cows that related to the microwave transmissions from the mast.

When the cattle were moved to a farm 20 km away, their milk yield and behaviour returned to normal within days. When the cattle were returned to the mast environment their symptoms returned as well.

Fodder analysis and the amount of feed could not account for the changes among the cattle. Analysis of aborted foetal material did not find any pathogens causing the abortion based on microscope and cultural examination and on serological tests. **Autopsy of dead cows reported acute heart and circulatory collapse with internal bleeding from several organs.**

Exposure to RFR at the stable entrance was 80microW/cm with the highest reading reported on the farm near the barn being 350microW/cm. These values are much lower than the FCC guideline of 1000 microW/cm.

(source: http://www.electromagnetic-pollution.com/main/page_biological_effects_animal_effects.html)

Because of the ubiquitous usage of electric power and the increasing spread of high-frequency transmitters for mobile communication and TV & Radio broadcasting, humans and animals in highly industrialized countries are these days exposed to electrical and magnetic fields to a degree which exceeds the natural tension levels of relevant fields by a magnitude and presents a new influencing quantity in the evolutionary history of humans and animals (Katalyse 1994).

For a long time the possibility of an influence of weak electrical and magnetic fields on the well-being of humans and animals has simply been ignored. The limits were only relating to acute cases of health impairment which can occur at some workplaces under extremely high exposure rates. The ever increasing knowledge of the biological effects of even weak electrical and magnetic fields as well as numerous epidemiological studies with the focus on a possible increase in the risk of cancer through field exposure have, however, led in the last ten to fifteen years to an altered discussion of the possible risk potential of such fields (Adey 1993; Hendee and Boteler 1994; Katalyse 1994; Meinert and Michaelis 1996; Robert 1993; Savitz 1995; Shaw and Croen 1993; Sobel et al. 1996; Wertheimer and Leeper 1994).

As one can be protected well from electrical fields in contrast to magnetic fields, the effects of such fields on human and animal health are rarely the focus of scientific research. In comparison, low-frequency magnetic fields can practically penetrate any matter without being slowed down, and high-frequency electromagnetic fields and waves can cause biological effects - even in greater

distance from their source – which are possibly connected to health risks (Katalyse 1994). Fields of this type which are a necessity of civilisation and have certain health effects are commonly known as "Electrosmog".

The question of a possible risk of cancer, which today cannot be discounted mainly because of numerous findings based on experiments with animals (Liburdy and Löscher 1997; Löscher and Mevissen 1994), occupies the foreground of public debate about possible health risks through exposure to low-frequency magnetic or high-frequency electromagnetic fields. In addition, there are extensive indications of interactions of magnetic fields with the hormonal balance, biorhythm, immune system, nervous system, behavioural patterns and psychological functions, interactions which can have a detrimental effect on health (Katalyse 1994; Liburdy u. Löscher 1997; Löscher u. Liburdy 1998). In this connection it is often forgotten that not only humans but also pets and farm animals who are exposed can suffer such impairments to their health because of field exposure, for example in the vicinity of high tension pylons or transmitting antennas (Marks et al. 1995). Similarly to epidemiological studies on humans with field exposed workplaces the risk of breast cancer for hundreds living in apartments with high flux densities of low-frequency (60 Hertz) magnetic fields was seven times higher in comparison with animals that were not exposed (Reif et al. 1995), a finding that can be explained by the "Melatonin Hypothesis" of magnetic field effects (Löscher and Mevissen 1997).

A series of earlier studies looked at the effect of magnetic fields on farm animals. Lee et al. (1997) **discovered that sheep which had been grazing in close proximity to a high tension mast, showed an impaired immune system. Examinations of dairy cows that had been exposed to magnetic fields resulted in inconsistent findings which ranged from no influence at all to a reduction in milk yield, changed milk composition and fertility problems** (Algen and Hultgren 1985a, b, 1987; Amstutz and Miller 1980; Angell et al. 1990; Burchard et al. 1996; Marks et al. 1995; Martin et al. 1986).

A recently publicized study discovered a significant increase of micronuclei in erythrocyte in the blood of cattle grazing on a farm near a transmitting facility. This is an indication of a genotoxic effect of the exposure (Balode 1996).

(source: <http://www.whale.to/b/loscher.html>)

7.2 Impact on bees

Bees have clusters of magnetite in the abdominal areas. Colony collapse disorder (CCD) was observed in beehives exposed to 900 MHz for 10 minutes, with sudden disappearance of a hive's inhabitants, leaving only queen, eggs, and a few immature workers behind. With navigational skills affected, worker bees stopped coming to the hives after 10 days and egg production in queen bees dropped drastically to 100 eggs/day compared to 350 eggs (Sharma and Kumar, 2010). Radiation affects the pollinators, honeybees, whose numbers have recently been declining due to CCD by 60% at US West Coast apiaries and 70% along the East Coast (Cane and Tepedino, 2001). CCD is being documented in Greece, Italy, Germany, Portugal, Spain, and Switzerland. Studies performed in Europe documented navigational disorientation, lower honey production, and decreased bee survivorship (Kimmel et al., 2007). EMFs from telecommunication infrastructure interfere with bees' biological clocks that enable them to compensate properly for the sun's movements, as a result of which, may fly in the wrong direction when attempting to return to the hive (Rubin et al., 2006). Bee colonies irradiated with digital enhanced cordless communications (DECT) phones and mobile handsets had a dramatic impact on the behavior of the bees, namely by inducing the worker piping signal. In natural conditions, worker piping either announces the swarming process of the bee colony or is a signal of a disturbed bee

colony (Favre, 2011).

Review Article Biology and Medicine, 4 (4): 202–216, 2012

Impacts of radio-frequency electromagnetic field (RF-EMF) from cell phone towers and wireless devices on biosystem and ecosystem – a review

Authors: S Sivani*, D Sudarsanam, Department of Advanced Zoology and Biotechnology, Loyola College, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India.

*Corresponding Author: sivani.padmakumar@gmail.com

Accepted: 3rd Dec 2012, Published: 6th Jan 2013

(source:

http://www.biolmedonline.com/Articles/Vol4_4_2012/Vol4_4_202-216_BM-8.pdf)

Non-ionising radio frequencies can affect important pigments; for example, Ritz and co-workers (Nature, Vol. 429, 13th May 2004) showed that they affect the normal functioning of cryptochrome.

Birds, bees and other animals use cryptochrome to sense the direction of the earth's magnetic field for navigation, and radio waves can interfere with this. In fact, the cryptochromes are a family of pigments, present in virtually all animal and plant cells, where they also form a vital part of the biological clock that senses time. In animals that use the sun for navigation, an accurate sense of time is important because it enables them to compensate for its changing position throughout the day.

In the case of bees, which can use either magnetic or solar navigation, radio waves from mobile phone masts will leave them with little or no sense of direction. This is probably the main contributory factor to the so-called colony collapse disorder in which foraging bees simply do not return to the hive. The bees are clearly severely disturbed by this sort of radiation since, if you place an iDECT cordless phone base station (emitting non-ionising radiation similar to that emitted by a mobile phone mast) next to a hive, **the bees leave and do not return. These effects now threaten the very survival of the bee population, which in turn threatens us because many of our crops depend on them for pollination.**

(source: http://www.electromagnetic-pollution.com/main/page_biological_effects_animal_effects.html)

The potentially disastrous decline in bees, a vital pollinating element in food production for the growing global population, is likely to continue unless humans profoundly change their ways, from the use of insecticides to air pollution, according to a United Nations report released today.

“The way humanity manages or mismanages its nature-based assets, including pollinators, will in part define our collective future in the 21st century,” UN Environment Programme (UNEP) Executive Director Achim Steiner said. **“The fact is that of the 100 crop species that provide 90 per cent of the world’s food, over 70 are pollinated by bees.”**

UN report - 10 March 2011

(source: http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=37731#.VGOurXoa_zR)

The electromagnetic waves emitted by mobile phone towers and cellphones can pose a threat to honey bees, a study published in India has concluded.

An experiment conducted in the southern state of Kerala found that a sudden fall in the bee population was caused by towers installed across the state by cellphone companies to increase their network.

The electromagnetic waves emitted by the towers crippled the "navigational skills" of the worker bees that go out to collect nectar from flowers to sustain bee colonies, said Dr. Sainuddin Pattazhy, who conducted the study, the Press Trust of India news agency reported.

He found that when a cell phone was kept near a beehive, the worker bees were unable to return, leaving the hives with only the queens and eggs and resulting in the collapse of the colony within ten days.

Over 100,000 people in Kerala are engaged in apiculture and the dwindling worker bee population poses a threat to their livelihood. The bees also play a vital role in pollinating flowers to sustain vegetation.

If towers and mobile phones further increase, honey bees might be wiped out in 10 years, Pattazhy said.

(source: <http://phys.org/news170920128.html#jCp>)

7.3 Impact on horses

Horses are kept –

1. in the adjacent field directly to the south of the proposed site;
2. in the fields directly across the road, to the west and north-west;
3. in many other areas within 200-500 metres of the proposed site.

Horse riding is an important part of both leisure and economic activity in the village. As such, any potential ill effects on horses need to be taken into account, in terms of both existing land use and amenity value. Any ill effects on horses could have severe effects on both amenity and economic activity in the village.

Sub-section 7.1 (above) refers to the known effects on cattle and sheep, which can be extended to horses. Sub-section 6.3 (above) also refers *in passim* to effects on horses: "A horse nearby had blood problems, with continuous treatment needed by the vet."

7.4 Impact on pheasants

The rearing of pheasants for shooting forms an important part of the economic life of the village, with many people's livelihoods relying on this.

Sub-section 8.2 (below) refers to the known effects on storks, which can be extended to pheasants.

8. Health implications for wildlife

The conclusions and/or results of the following reports and studies need to be taken into consideration in the decision as to whether or not to allow the installation of the mobile phone mast in Abbotsbury [where appropriate, my emphases are in bold type] –

6.1 Bats

There are many nesting bat colonies in Abbotsbury, including in the eaves of the building opposite our own front door. It is well known that mobile phone mast emissions affect the sonar of these animals and therefore carry a very real threat to them. **All species of bats are endangered and therefore are protected under British and International Law. Significant consideration must be given to this issue when making the planning decision, since any harm to bats as a result of radiation from the mast will be a legal offence.**

Rowena Varley, of Cornwall Wildlife Trust's bat group, said: "The scientific evidence we've received suggests that bats ... might well suffer biological damage through emissions from these masts."

Although the Government has made repeated assurances that people are at no health risk from the phone masts, it is suspected that the electromagnetic radiation which they emit may have a detrimental effect on bat colonies. Research on the effects of mast emissions has found that they cause DNA damage in the brain cells of rats. Wildlife groups fear that prolonged exposure could cause similar damage in bats.

Ms Varley said: "It's likely that transmission of signals within the range of frequencies used by bats for echo-location might interfere with their ability to feed and navigate." Bats are not believed to use their echo location system in areas with which they are familiar, and it is feared they may fly into new masts and be killed or injured.

(source: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/1350096/Telephone-mast-threat-to-bats-in-the-belfry.html>)

A review on the impact of radiofrequency radiation from wireless telecommunications on wildlife is presented. Electromagnetic radiation is a form of environmental pollution which may hurt wildlife. Phone masts located in their living areas are irradiating continuously some species that could suffer long-term effects, like reduction of their natural defenses, deterioration of their health, problems in reproduction and reduction of their useful territory through habitat deterioration. **Electromagnetic radiation can exert an aversive behavioral response in rats, bats and birds such as sparrows. Therefore microwave and radiofrequency pollution constitutes a potential cause for the decline of animal populations** and deterioration of health of plants living near phone masts. To measure these effects urgent specific studies are necessary.

Electromagnetic radiation can exert an aversive behavioural response in bats. Bat activity is significantly reduced in habitats exposed to an electromagnetic field strength greater than 2 V/m [73]. During a study in a free-tailed bat colony (*Tadarida teniotis*) the number of bats decreased when several phone masts were placed 80m from the colony

In the light of current knowledge there is enough evidence of serious effects from this technology to wildlife. For this reason precautionary measures should be developed, alongside environmental impact assessments prior to installation, and **a ban on installation of phone masts in protected natural areas and in places where endangered species are present.** Surveys should take place to objectively assess the severity of effects.

Pathophysiology-589

Electromagnetic pollution from phone masts. Effects on wildlife

Author: Alfonso Balmori

Dirección General del Medio Natural, Consejería de Medio Ambiente, Junta de Castilla y León, C/Rigoberto Cortejoso,
14, 47014 Valladolid, Spain
Received 10 August 2008; received in revised form 28 August 2008; accepted 30 January 2009

(source: <http://www.wifiinschools.org.uk/resources/Balmori+2009.pdf>)

6.2 Swans

Abbotsbury Swannery is the world's only managed colony of nesting mute swans

Recent evidence suggests that wildlife near mobile phone antennas may be affected by radio frequency radiation. White storks nesting within 200m of a cell phone antenna were compared to those nesting more than 300m away. Nesting, breeding, and hatching success were significantly reduced for those birds near the cell phone antenna. The number of young per pair for nests near the antenna was significantly lower than for those farther away (0.86 vs. 1.6, ~50% decrease, $P=0.001$). Nests with no chicks increased from 3.3% (reference population) to 40% within 200 m of the antennas. Near the antennae, the nesting pairs were more aggressive with each other, were less successful at building nests, and had more chick deaths in the early stages. Level of radio frequency exposure was not provided.

(source: http://www.electromagnetic-pollution.com/main/page_biological_effects_animal_effects.html)

6.3 Badgers

Badgers are endangered and therefore are protected under British Law. Significant consideration must be given to this issue when making the planning decision, since any harm to badgers as a result of radiation from the mast will be a legal offence.

Abbotsbury is home to a very large number of Badger setts, including a major one just north of the junction between Back Street, Rosemary Lane and Hands Lane, which is some 200 metres to the west of the proposed site.

“In the light of current knowledge there is enough evidence of serious effects from this technology to wildlife. For this reason precautionary measures should be developed, alongside environmental impact assessments prior to installation, and **a ban on installation of phone masts in protected natural areas and in places where endangered species are present**. Surveys should take place to objectively assess the severity of effects.”

Pathophysiology-589

Electromagnetic pollution from phone masts. Effects on wildlife

Author: Alfonso Balmori

Dirección General del Medio Natural, Consejería de Medio Ambiente, Junta de Castilla y León, C/Rigoberto Cortejoso,
14, 47014 Valladolid, Spain

Received 10 August 2008; received in revised form 28 August 2008; accepted 30 January 2009

(source: <http://www.wifiinschools.org.uk/resources/Balmori+2009.pdf>)

7. Electro-sensitivity – discrimination against people with a disability

There is a very real possibility that it could be argued that ES victims are suffering from a disability. If so, it would be illegal under UK Law for any public body to discriminate against them - including allowing the installation of a mobile phone mast and thus causing their symptoms to worsen.

The following information need to be taken into consideration in the decision as to whether or not to allow the installation of the mobile phone mast in Abbotsbury [where appropriate, my emphases are in bold type].

Electro-sensitivity (ES) is a condition which can develop when people are exposed to things like computers, cordless phones, low energy lighting, mobile phones, mobile phone masts, powerlines, smart meters, substations and WiFi.

Anyone can develop electrical sensitivity, at any age, including children. Studies show that a small number (under 1%) of people are badly affected, 3-8% moderately sensitive, and up to 30% are slightly sensitive.

Electromagnetic (EM) fields and radiation from electrical and wireless appliances, at home, at work and outside, can provoke ES. The most common symptoms are head/ear pain when using a mobile phone, headaches and sleep disruption when living near a phone mast or WiFi, sleeplessness, lethargy, miscarriages and depression living near powerlines, or redness and burning on the face or arms when using a computer. Other symptoms include nose bleeds, tinnitus, poor focus/attention, dizziness, anxiety, skin tingling, burning sensations, concentration and memory problems, muscle and joint pains, cardiac palpitations, fatigue, irritability and erratic high blood pressure.

Unfortunately, ES is often progressive. The sufferer may become sensitive to a wider range of frequencies, or their symptoms may become more severe. They may react to chemicals or develop other allergies.

Cordless and mobile phones, phone masts, powerlines, smart meters, low energy lighting and WiFi are NOT safe? The World Health Organisation's International Agency for Research on Cancer classifies powerline and radio frequency radiation as class 2B possible cancer agents. Some scientists say they should now be class 2A probable or class 1 certain. Hundreds of scientific studies show increased risk of Alzheimer's disease, brain tumours, cancer, cardiovascular effects, damage to DNA, depression, fertility problems, leukaemia and miscarriages.

Unfortunately, the UK government still follows poor and outdated advice from Public Health England (PHE) and its Advisory Group on Non-Ionising Radiation (AGNIR). This protects the public only from acute heating effects, although these high limits are obsolete according to the European Parliament.

The current scientific consensus accepts that long-term, low-level EM exposure is harmful and that some people are more sensitive to it than others. Some other countries and their courts now recognise that ES exists, that mobile phone masts and WiFi cause ES symptoms, and that mobile phones can cause brain tumours.

Source - Electrosensitivity UK leaflet

Sweden now has a medical register of 285,000 people who are sensitive to non-ionising radiation and California 700,000. We believe these figures are underestimated, since many people are not aware that their symptoms are connected to a condition known as electro-sensitivity or hypersensitivity (EHS) people. However, if the same figures apply to the UK this could indicate over 2.1 million people are knowingly or unknowingly affected.

The Irish Doctors' Environmental Association believes that a sub-group of the population are particularly sensitive to exposure to different types of electro-magnetic radiation. The safe levels currently advised for exposure to this non-ionising radiation are based solely on its thermal effects. However, it is clear that this radiation also has non-thermal effects, which need to be taken into consideration when setting these safe levels. The electro-sensitivity experienced by some people results in a variety of distressing symptoms which must also be taken into account when setting safe levels for exposure to non-ionising radiation and when planning the siting of masts and transmitters.

Author: Eileen O'Connor

Trustee for the EM Radiation Research Trust: www.radiationresearch.org

1st October 2005

(source: <http://www.canceractive.com/cancer-active-page-link.aspx?n=970>)

A world full of wireless technology is illegally discriminating against ES victims. ES victims should be protected under UK law. **It would appear that ES victims meet the criteria for disability rights under all sections listed within the law.**

Governments throughout the world and authorities such as WHO, ICNIRP and the UK Health Protection Agency are ignoring the voice of objection from independent scientists and members of the public worldwide as they continue to encourage the proliferation of wireless devices. The world has created an invisible under-class who are denied the opportunities available to everyone else. ES victims are often unable to use their talents and capabilities to earn a living through denial of access to transport and places most people take for granted.

With other forms of disability, society has taken the view that such a situation is unacceptable and as legislated to ensure equal access and equal opportunity. It is offensive, inhumane and wholly unacceptable to force people out of society to live in the wilderness and allow this sort of discrimination.

Discriminating and ridiculing people who are disabled goes against the UN 22 Standard Rules on the Equalisation of Opportunities for People with Disabilities - since 2007 upgraded into The UN Convention on Human Rights for Persons with Functional Impairments.

ES people should be granted disability rights and protection under UK law. We question the legality of the current system as it is discriminating against ES people.

(Source - <http://archive.radiationresearch.org/legal.asp>)

6. Violation of human rights

When referring to human rights legislation, I am referring to the European Convention on Human Rights and Fundamental Principle rather than the Human Rights Act, since the Act itself only implements the Convention into domestic law. There are potentially 2 areas of the convention which the implementation of the mast might violate: Article 8 and Article 1 of Protocol 1, for differing reasons.

Article 8 relates to the right to a respect for a private and family life, home and correspondence. In relation to phone masts this comes directly into being in relation to the quality of life that is potentially destroyed by the development and could also relate to the value of houses in the village, if they are appreciably depreciated by the development.

In the Rayner case (Powel & Rayner v UK (A 172 - 1990)) the applicant argued that the intensity and persistence of aircraft noise interfered with his rights to respect for the private life and home. The Government took the view that the claim fell outside Article 8(1) altogether, but the Commission took the view that it covered - 'indirect intrusions which are unavoidable consequences of measures directed against private individuals .. considerable noise nuisance can undoubtedly affect the physical well-being of a person and thus interfere with his private life'. Although this case was actually lost, nevertheless the point is made that, on environmental grounds the effects of developments can infringe a person's private life. In particular, the potential health aspects of phone masts, not simply the physical, but the mental state of those affected by this type of development.

This would be particularly relevant to the protection of younger members of the community, where they might be exposed for long periods due to the closeness of the antennae to bedrooms and schools. There may very well be a case to argue that those affected had such fear that their whole fabric of life has been destroyed, forcing them to lead a lifestyle that would otherwise be alien to them. A simple example might be that those who are keen gardeners, abandon their gardens and take up a life of seclusion, afraid to step forth from their homes for fear of the effects of irradiation.

This may very well seem at first fanciful, and over the top, but reality is that it is more common than might be imagined, with at least one very recent instance coming to our attention, of a man from St Helens, who had a pacemaker fitted, and refused to leave the home for fear that the mast he would have to pass would cause his pacemaker to malfunction.

This basic argument is also brought home in the Lopes Ostra case (Lopes Ostra v Spain (A 303-C - 1994)), where the applicant was successful in claiming that the State's failure to act to prevent, or to protect her from serious pollution (fumes from a waste disposal plant) constituted a failure to respect both her home and her private and family life. Another instance of the disruption of family life may be where parents refuse to allow their children to visit their grandparents that live in close proximity to a mast.

The context of home in the property sense is covered by Article 1 of the First Protocol. In as far as Article 8 is concerned, the issue is one of 'peaceful enjoyment', this is particularly important, as shown by the aircraft noise cases. Is then the fear of an adverse health threat from base stations such that it interferes with the peaceful enjoyment of one's home? I would argue strongly yes, if we are talking about the perceived fear of the inhabitants of that home, especially if children's bedrooms are close to, or in the path of, the beam of intensity.

Every natural or legal person is entitled to the peaceful enjoyment of his possessions. Thus states Article 1 of the 1st Protocol. This includes for our purposes the property that is your home and possessions within it. This might also affect businesses, where the value or trade of the business falls as a consequence of the development, example a restaurant, where people are reluctant to dine due to the close proximity of a base station, or a hotel, where guests are reluctant to stay.

(source: <http://www.planningsanity.co.uk/forums/masts/html/mastplan.php>)

Appendix A – extracts from the Long Bredy, Portesham, Chickerell, Abbotsbury and Langton Herring Conservation Area Appraisal

Following public consultation, WDDC adopted the *Long Bredy, Portesham, Chickerell, Abbotsbury and Langton Herring Conservation Area Appraisal* in December 2007 as a document that supports conservation area policies in the West Dorset District Local Plan (Adopted 2006).

The following is from the Appraisal -

Introduction & Executive Summary

Conservation Areas are areas of special architectural or historic interest, the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance. The District Council is required by Section 71 of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to formulate and publish proposals for the preservation and enhancement of Conservation Areas. This can be achieved through Conservation Area Appraisals.

The Planning Policy Context

Contained within the West Dorset District Local Plan (Adopted 2006), there are a number of planning policies relevant to one or more of the settlements:

- Safeguarding Assets, Policy SA1 seeks to protect the natural beauty of the Dorset Area of outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB); development must be in keeping with the landscape character of the area.

Abbotsbury is positioned along the B3157 and several back lanes and a minor route to the Swannery and Langton Herring. The village has a dramatic site, at the foot of the Ridgeway scarp (Wears/ White and Linton Hills, ranging from about 100m to over 215m AOD) and sheltered from the nearby coast by Chapel Hill (80m AOD).

Abbotsbury - Spatial Analysis

Although Abbotsbury is a large village, of great architectural and historical interest, it has an overall coherence and homogeneity, largely due to its historical land ownerships and building materials. The Conservation Area will be described as a whole.

The character and interrelationship of spaces

It may be easier to attempt to distil the physical character of the village, its building groups, spaces, topography and views, landscape and trees and hedges and the myriad of details that produce such a high quality environment by describing one route across it ...

Key Views and Vistas

The important interplay between the village and the surrounding landscape means that views in (especially from higher ground); views out of the village; and views within the built environment are all of importance.

The views from the surrounding countryside are significant:

- From St Catherine's Chapel looking north and NE over the village to Wears and White Hills, with the Church tower and Tithe Barn particularly prominent and, behind to the south, extensive views of The Swannery, Fleet and Chesil Beach;
- From the slopes of White Hill behind West and Back Sts: with good views of the heart of the village, the Market Square, Church Tower, roofs and trees, with a distant view of St Catherine's Chapel and the coast;

- From the southern approach from New Barn Rd, just to the north of Chesters Hill, looking NW past The Swannery, with the village set amongst trees in a deep declivity between Chapel Hill and White Hill;
- From the slopes of Wears Hill, looking SE on the B3157: the classic view, much photographed and used in publicity material, of the sweep of the escarpment, Chapel Hill and Chapel, coast as far as Portland and Weymouth Bay, and the village tucked into its undulating terrain;

Views out of the village include:

- Up Rosemary and Red Lanes, north to the escarpment;
- From the Pinion End south to the village pond, Tithe Barn and hills behind, with a glimpse of the sea;
- Half way along West St, looking west to Wears Hill;
- South from West St at several points to St Catherine's Chapel, including down Hannah's Lane;
- On Church St, from the churchyard and from the entrance to Abbey House west to Chapel Hill and the Chapel.

There are a number of landmarks in the Conservation Area: the Church tower (within the core, appearing between roofs or down Market St to the south); the Tithe Barn (down the lower part of Church St, from the Abbey site and from the southern approach from the Swannery); St Catherine's Chapel (from gaps in development on West St, on Church St and from the lanes south of the core, as well as in splendid wider views from the top of Wears Hill); and, within the core, the twin focal points of the Ilchester Arms and Strangways Hall on the Market Square.

Green spaces are of major importance to the setting of the village and the separation of some of the historical components. The White Hill escarpment and the green mass of Chapel Hill dominate the immediate landscape, showing up in many of the significant views. Chapel Hill is a popular destination for walkers and architectural enthusiasts, being accessible by a footpath. Other large green spaces of visual importance are the pasture, cricket ground and playing fields south of West St to Seaway Lane and beyond up to the slopes of Chapel Hill. This sweep of undeveloped space gives a firm definition to the western ribbon of the village and is complemented by fields and thick planting at the eastern end behind the Manor (Broad Garden) and Abbey Dairy Houses, where the stream runs south towards the Swannery. The churchyard is another important green space with views and it has a wildlife garden portion at its eastern end. The slopes down from Abbey House south to and including the village pond are visually important, as a setting for the Church and Abbey remains and as a partially accessible public area. The eastern main road entry has an undeveloped southern side up to The Swan and there is a fine sweep of pasture down to the stream and group of buildings around the Tithe Barn. The allotments, between Back St and Rodden Row are a rather hidden important green wedge within the village, affording a view of the Church tower through the Yard of the Dandel Gallery.

"Trees also follow the course of the former railway, as far as the station site and the approach lane off the Weymouth Rd."

Detrimental Features

The 1973 Appreciation highlighted a number of eyesores and other physical problems. The Estates and local community have addressed some of these (with notable successes at the village pond and surrounding area and the creation of a landscaped car park off Rodden Row) but the following are seen as detriments:

- The impacts of traffic, large vehicles in particular, in the village, notably at the sharp bend at the Rodden Row/Market St junction; here, also, traffic signs are visually obtrusive;

- Parked cars in the Market Square and Back St;
- Dead elms in the surrounding landscape and in areas like Back St;
- Large, multi-coloured, reflective plastic signs at the Tithe Barn, plus a clutter of small signs by the main entrance;
- The Post Office in Market St has a surfeit of signs and flags that clutter an attractive façade;
- The poor condition of the Old Vicarage;
- Need for positive use/repair of Old Dovecote; Granary; Piggery and Abbey Malthouse, near Abbey House;
- Several relatively poor quality buildings related to the Abbey Farm group, adjacent to the Granary;
- The public toilets in Back St have a wheelchair ramp with insensitive metal rails; the creation of the ramp unfortunately necessitated the loss of a length of stone walling, leaving the block even more exposed visually;
- A wide junction between Back St and the Market Square, combined with road markings, ubiquitous tarmac and parked vehicles; surely potential for a more uncluttered focal point with better materials and less parking restrictions;
- A clutter of signs opposite the Swan Inn, on the eastern approach; these, combined with casual car parking, do not provide a positive entry feature;
- Two visually poor garage blocks at West Yard and Rosemary Lane;
- A disappointing gateway into the village at Hands Lane, with some poor boundaries;
- Disused sheds and electricity switch gear at the Hands Lane/ Rosemary Lane/Back St junction;
- Highly visible uPVC windows on the rear elevation of a modern house near the Chapel Pottery; the original timber windows of some of the modern houses in Back St are beginning to be replaced by less attractive uPVC.

Definition of the Special Interest of the Conservation Area

- A superlative landscape setting, within the Dorset AONB and adjacent to the Dorset and East Devon Jurassic Coast World Heritage Site, with dramatic topography, woodland, glimpses of the sea and important trees and hedges;
- Groups of and individual trees providing a termination to views, visual incident in townscape progressions and a foil to groups of buildings;
- Strong gateways into the Conservation Area, marked by a clean transition between countryside and village, trees and hedges and, apart from one exception, well-defined boundaries elsewhere;
- A variety of fine views into, across and out of the village;
- A tradition of sensitive stewardship by the major landowner and current development policies that attempt to balance conservation with social and economic considerations;
- Large coherent groups of consistently good buildings, walls, trees, spaces and many other details: the whole village reads as an enjoyable visual and cultural experience;

Problems include the effects of traffic and parking; several historic buildings in poor repair or underused; some clutter produced by signage; the impact of Dutch Elm disease on village trees; and one relatively untidy gateway into the village.

Conservation Area Issue

The contribution of trees & the landscape setting to the character & appearance of the conservation areas.

Proposed Action

Contribution to be perpetuated as far as possible & support suitable schemes through availability of Countryside & Conservation Grant.