

# ICON TOWER INFO - Updated 15-AUG-2024 (ORIG for Weds Zoom)

## A few BASIC "FACTS"

- a. Icon Tower Ltd is a UK based company, headquartered in Lichfield, Staffordshire
- b. It does not operate a retail mobile network of its own
- c. Provides infrastructure sites and equipment
- d. It leases out infrastructure to MNOs  
("for the sole purpose of providing access to all wireless network operators on a shared basis").
- e. Parent Company = AP Wireless.
- f. It is an official Electronic Communications Code ('Code') Operator = on the OFCOM Register.
- g. OFCOM Register entry = Icon Tower Infrastructure Limited (formerly Radius BTS Limited)
- h. As stated in the SSSIs of applications: "The four MNOs in the UK (Three, Vodafone, O2, EE) + over 100 other smaller networks use Icon Towers infrastructure to deliver 2G, 3G, 4G, 5G mobile, fixed wireless broadband, emergency radio services, broadcast and local wireless services (some SSSIs now mention a future 6G and 7G)."
- i. **Typical ICON TOWER ICNIRP Certificate**

Icon Tower Infrastructure Limited, 1st Floor Adamson House, Towers Business Park, Manchester, M20 2YY

ICNIRP = "Icon Tower Infrastructure as a code infrastructure provider declares on behalf of the Mobile Network Operators (EE, Three, Vodafone and O2)"

## OBSERVATIONS

- a) Applications are usually for **GIANT LATTICE TOWERS** or **GIANT MONOPOLES**.
- b) We have seen them for 20m – 30m.
- c) Applications are usually SPECULATIVE. i.e. they do not actually have an MNO on board at the moment
- d) 2 example scenarios. MNOS currently on
  - o Existing mast/masts in the area
  - o Existing pylons
- e) Icon Tower is speculating that the MNOs will move over to their new lattice tower / monopole.
- f) They cannot build until an MNO has signed up. Eg. From SSSI: "as per GPDO Prior Approval legislation, an Operator must be present on the tower. As such, the proposed development, should it be approved, will only be implemented when an Operator applies to utilise the tower. The long-term impact of this is that the Icon Tower mast is expected to instigate the removal of existing base stations within the local area, as the Operators relocate their apparatus on to the new, future-proofed and over-engineered tower."
- g) Also, in SSSI: "For the avoidance of doubt, the proposed development will not be implemented until at least one Operator applies to Icon Tower to install apparatus on the mast. As such, the deployment of the approved apparatus will not lead to a proliferation of ground-based masts."
- h) In one SSSI: "Icon Tower are an independent infrastructure company and therefore they do not have visibility of the MNO's annual area wide information."
- i) In the SSSI for both **REIGATE and BANSTEAD 24/00748/TED** and **EPPING FOREST - EDF/0771/24** = "As the existing infrastructure is near capacity, it is unable to accommodate additional apparatus or sharers, and provide the next level of Operator coverage to the surrounding area."
- j) **LLANDUDNO - 0/51201** – THIS IS A VERY INTERESTING example. As per usual, the ICNIRP Certificate is declared on behalf of the 4 BIG MNOs. There are 2 objections from MNOs on the portal. One from MBNL (joint venture of EE and Three) and one from Cornerstone (joint venture of VM02 and Vodafone). Neither have been consulted about, or given any commitment to, the proposal (Cornerstone found out about this from the local press!). They have NO intention of relocating. They state that the proposal is SPECULATIVE, with no end users currently identified. They also state that they have the ability to upgrade, as well as improve coverage and technology without the need for moving. The proposal assumes existing masts are not capable of either. There is no assessment of whether there are any issues with coverage. Therefore, the proposal is misleading. The objections suggest that it is of no or little benefit to the public and would lead to the proliferation of masts.

## ICON TOWER INFO - Updated 15-AUG-2024 (ORIG for Weds Zoom)

Also worth noting is that in the ICON document “An Introduction to LPAs” (section 2.4, A Competitive Offering): “it is very obviously not feasible or practicable for one Infrastructure System provider to share with another as they are in direct competition with each other.” Cornerstone’s letter points out that this statement is inaccurate given that the four network operators have sharing agreements in place with each other”.

### **k) HULL, 24/00417/TEL ICON pole (Kingston Upon Hull HU9 1PL) withdrawn on 01-July-2024**

In this case, CELLNEX, owner of a base station located to the west of the application site, objected. They state that there have been NO discussions with them about this proposal, their current base station is not redundant and is capable of being upgraded to deliver improved 4G and 5G services. They state that the application is advanced on a purely speculative basis, with no reference to any customers that will use their mast, reinforced by the SSSI stating that the mast will only be built when an operator applies to use it.

### **l) NEW FOREST, 24/10314 ICON Lattice Tower (Fawley SO45 1GA) REFUSED**

In this case, CELLNEX, who provide coverage from pylons, objected. They state that they have not been contacted by ITIL or the agent, and also refer to the application as purely speculative. They also stress that “pylons are important, viable and suitable structures for accommodating electronic communications infrastructure” and that ITIL have been “disingenuous by trying to discredit the use of electron pylons”. They refer to statements in the application as “inaccurate and misleading” and “false claims”. The Officer’s Report states “Cellnex has lodged objections to a number of their applications as a competing operator”.

### **m) SUTTON, DM-024-00884 (Mitcham)**

CELLNEX Objection, similar to the NEW FOREST objection (pylons).

### **THOUGHTS / QUESTIONS / POINTS to make in OBJECTION**

Although ICON Tower does a lot of copy and pasting, wording can differ across SSSIs for different applications, so please do eyeball each SSSI to check exactly what they are proposing and what they are claiming. Select points from the list below which are RELEVANT to your particular application!

- SPECULATIVE application.
- If an MNO has not yet applied to use this, HOW can ICON TOWER guarantee future safety of the installation when fully operational (as it does on the ICNIRP certificate)?
- Who has performed the calculations? What calculations have been done? There is ZERO transparency.
- The declaration does NOT conform to what is laid out in the “Code of practice on mobile network development in England” (published Mar-2022) (Annexe C) / NPPF, which states that it should be declared by the “lead operator”. ICON is NOT a lead operator.
- Who are the MNOs using the current base-stations?
- ICON TOWER only declares on behalf of the big 4 MNOs (EE, Three, Vodafone and O2). What happens if another MNO applies instead, or long term? (That is then NOT covered by the ICNIRP certificate)
- If only one MNO applies or indeed if a smaller MNO applies (who currently does not have a presence in the area), does this mean existing base-stations will continue to be used? Hence there WILL be a proliferation of ground-based masts.
- How will the council ensure that there is NOT a proliferation of masts?
- How will the council ensure that old base stations are removed?
- Please consider application **LLANDUDNO - 0/51201**. Objections were raised by the MNOs currently operating in the immediate area (MBNL - joint venture of EE and Three, Cornerstone -joint venture of VM02 and Vodafone). Neither have been consulted about, or given any commitment to, the proposal. Nor had they any intention of moving to the proposed site. Both were fully capable of upgrading when necessary. Both objections stated the SPECULATIVE nature of the proposal and the inevitable proliferation of masts in the area.

## ICON TOWER INFO - Updated 15-AUG-2024 (ORIG for Weds Zoom)

- Similarly, **HULL - 24/00417/TEL**, CELLNEX, owner of a base station located to the west of the application site, objected. They stated that there had been NO discussions with them about the proposal, and that their base station was capable of being upgraded to deliver improved 4G and 5G services. They recognised the application as purely speculative, with no reference to any customers signed up to use the proposed mast.
- For **THIS** application, there is no evidence of consultation or commitment from any of the MNOs. No end users have been identified.
- There is no evidence / assessment of coverage issues or inability of the existing structures to upgrade, although the proposal claims that the “existing infrastructure is near capacity”.
- The ICNIRP certificate declaration on behalf of the big 4 MNOs indicates that they have been consulted. If not, this statement is highly misleading.
- “An Introduction to LPAs” (section 2.4, A Competitive Offering): “it is very obviously not feasible or practicable for one Infrastructure System provider to share with another as they are in direct competition with each other.” Cornerstone’s letter points out that “this statement is inaccurate given that the four network operators have sharing agreements in place with each other”.

### **INDEX of ICON TOWER applications << NOT UP TO DATE >>**

- **SOMERSET - 08/24/00017** - Prior approval for proposed installation of a 30m lattice TOWER, supporting 6no antennas, 2no. 600mm dish, reaching a maximum height of 30m | Plot H, Parrett Way, Bridgwater, Somerset, TA6 **APPROVED (Sedgemoor)**
- **TEIGNMOUTH - 23/02170/TEL** | Remove existing monopole mast and associated compound, installation of replacement base station and erection monopole e mast, 12 x 4G antennas, 18 x 5G antennas, 4 x 600mm dishes, 7 x cabinets | Trago Newton Abbot Trago Stower Newton Abbot TQ12 6JD **APPROVED**
- **SHROPSHIRE - 4/00218/TEL** | The installation of a new **26.2m-high telecommunications monopole** with headframe, supporting antennas and transmission dishes, plus ground-based equipment cabinets within a secure, fenced compound, and ancillary development thereto | West Of Coppice Green Lane, opps. Alder Road, Shifnal Shropshire **PRIOR APPROVAL NOT REQUIRED !!!!!!!!!!!!!!!**
- **LEEDS - 23/06632/DTM** | Determination for 5G 30m lattice tower supporting up to 12 antennas and up to 4 dishes, together with up to 5 ground based cabinets, 1 meter cabinet and ancillary development thereto including compound fencing | Land At Micklefield Mx Track Off Great North Road Micklefield LS25 5LQ **REFUSED**
- **TRAFFORD - 113082/TEL/24** | Installation of a 25m-high telecommunications lattice tower supporting 2no. headframes to accommodate antennas and transmission dishes, plus ground-based equipment cabinets within a secure, fenced compound; and ancillary development thereto. Notification for prior approval under Part 16 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015) | Site On Torbay Road, Urmston, M33 5QQ
- **REIGATE and BANSTEAD 24/00748/TED** - The installation of a new 26.2m-high telecommunications monopole with headframe, supporting antennas and transmission dishes; plus ground-based equipment cabinets within a secure, fenced compound; and ancillary development thereto | Telecom Mast At Netherne Community Sports Club Woodplace Lane Hooley Surrey. CR5 1NT (*Saved as SURREY – Hooley (ICON Tower) – 24-00748-TED*) (*SSSI was missing, but requested it – now added and **SEARCHABLE***)  
*“It should also be noted from the outset that, as per GPDO Prior Approval legislation, an Operator must be present on the tower. (Have yet to verify this) As such, the proposed development, should it be approved, will only be implemented when an Operator applies to utilise the tower. The long-term impact of this is that the Icon Tower mast is expected to instigate the removal of existing base stations within the local area, as the Operators relocate their apparatus on to the new, future-proofed, and over-engineered tower.  
For the avoidance of doubt, the proposed development will not be implemented until at least one Operator applies to Icon Tower to install apparatus on the mast. As such, the deployment of the approved apparatus will not lead to a proliferation of ground-based masts.”*
- **EPHING FOREST - EDF/0771/24** - The installation of a new 25m-high telecommunications lattice tower supporting 2no. headframes to accommodate antennas and transmission dishes; plus ground-based equipment cabinets within a secure fenced compound and ancillary development thereto. Southend

## ICON TOWER INFO - Updated 15-AUG-2024 (ORIG for Weds Zoom)

Farm, Epping Forest, Essex, EN9 3SE (SSSI was missing, [SEARCHABLE SSSI](#)) (Speculating on 3 existing masts => proposed lattice tower)

- **MID SUSSEX- DM/24/0880** The proposed installation of a shareable 25 metre high lattice tower supporting up to 12 no. antennas and up to 4 no. dishes, together with up to 6 no. ground based cabinets, 1 no. meter cabinet and ancillary development thereto including compound fencing. Land At Clearwaters Farm Clearwater Lane Haywards Heath West Sussex RH16 4RX (Speculating on MNOs currently on pylons => proposed lattice tower) (Non-searchable)
- **LEICESTER 24/0298/TEL** - 20m (orig 25m) lattice tower supporting up to 12 no antennas and up to 4 no dishes on 2 no headframes together with up to 5 no ground based cabinets, 1 no meter cabinet and ancillary development + fencing. Glenfield Parish Council Land Mill Lane Glenfield, **Leicester**, LE3 8JW (Speculating on MNOs currently on pylons => proposed lattice tower)
- **LEICESTER 24/0299/TEL** - 25 metre high lattice tower supporting up to 12 no. antennas and up to 4 no. dishes, together with up to 6 no. ground based cabinets, 1 no. meter cabinet and ancillary development thereto including compound fencing and proposed hedges. Glenfield Sports Ground Gynsill Lane Glenfield Leicester Leicestershire LE7 7AG (Speculating on MNOs currently on pylons => proposed lattice tower)
- **SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK - 24/01472/PA16** - 20m-high telecommunications lattice tower supporting an antenna headframe, plus ground-based equipment cabinets, all within a secure, fenced compound, and ancillary development, Land West of Westmeston Avenue, Saltdean, Brighton, BN2 8AJ
- **LLANDUDNO - 0/51201** - The proposed installation of a 25 metre high monopole, supporting up to 12 no. antennas and up to 4 no. dishes (overall height 26.2 metres), together with up to 6 no. ground based cabinets, 1 no. meter cabinet and ancillary development thereto including compound fencing. Land at Llandudno Football Club, Maesdu Park, Builder Street West, Llandudno, Conwy, LL30 1HH **Interesting article** = <https://www.dailypost.co.uk/news/north-wales-news/decision-plan-85ft-phone-mast-28634349>
- **HULL, 24/00417/TEL ICON pole (Kingston Upon Hull HU9 1PL) withdrawn on 01-July-2024**
- **NEW FOREST, 24/10314 ICON Lattice Tower (Fawley SO45 1GA) REFUSED**
- **SUTTON, DM-024-00884 (Mitcham)**
- 
- **HISTORICAL - BOLTON - 14368/22L** Applicant actually = Radius BTS Limited (22/07/2022) 30m monopole The installation of a 30m high, multi-user monopole, supporting 6no. antennas, 2no. 300mm diameter transmission link dishes, 6no. equipment cabinets, 1no. electricity meter cabinet in the fence line, a 2.1m high security fence, 2no. cable ladders and ancillary development, Century Mill, George Street, Farnworth, BL4 9QW. **APPROVED** (Picture supplied in SSSI for REIGATE and BANSTEAD 24/00748/TED. THIS might not be the actual MAST; Possibly only the original proposal (no antennae shown). This needs to be checked. Century Mill, as was, was demolished in mid-2023, and new housing has since been built. So, the mast could well be up by now??)

## ICON TOWER INFO - Updated 15-AUG-2024 (ORIG for Weds Zoom)



*Figure 3 – Aerial imagery of a 30m-high tower deployed at Century Mill, George Street, Farnworth, BL4 9QW and approved by Bolton Council in 2022 (Source: Applicants drone imagery)*

REFERENCE = 14368/22

BOLTON COUNCIL

Applicant = Radius BTS Limited (22/07/2022)