Gmail

Planning - <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>

objection to AWDM/0580/23

1 message

David Smith [redacted] 5 June 2023 at 01:20
To: "planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk" <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>
Cc: [redacted]

dear

dear planning,

As a suffer of EHS (electro-hypersensitivity-see info at Phire Medical – Physicians' Health Initiative For Radiation & Environment) and visitor, I object to this on the following grounds. also pointing out that ICNIRP guidelines do not apply to vulnerable men/women (what the telecoms named 'sensitive receptors' in court) or the environment. Also that EMFs (which include RFRs) are class 2b possible carcinagens and as such proliferation should be halted as a precaution to protect lives and the environment until proof of safety is 100% proven.

Phire Medical – Physicians' Health Initiative For Radiation & Environment

Evidence for a health risk by RF on humans living around mobile phone base stations: From radiofrequency sickness to cancer



Evidence for a health risk by RF on hum...

(a peer reviewed science article)

Appearance: The proposed mast will be obtrusive, ugly and incongruous with the surrounding character and appearance, resulting in detriment to the visual amenities of the area, as well as a harmful impact to the outlook of residential properties, workplaces and businesses nearby.

The mast will have an imposing and overbearing impact on the amenity of the nearby area causing local residents unnecessary upset and anxiety, impacting the quality of the local area.

Site: The mast installation may create a visual distraction and impair visibility of road users, and its associated equipment cabinets would clutter and degrade the look and feel of the area.

In close proximity to 'sensitive receptors': Worthing Town Football Club - 348.40m, Northbrook Recreation Ground - 442.19m, Northbrook College - 481.74m - - Joshua Pearce in his 2019 document, "Limiting liability with positioning to minimize negative health effects of cellular

[redacted]

phone towers" recommends that telecoms companies site masts at least 500m away from schools.

Children are more vulnerable to microwave radiation than adults, see for example, Prof Tom Butler, "On the Clear Evidence of the Risks to Children from Non-Ionizing Radio-frequency Radiation" - www.radiationresearch.org/articles/on-the-clear-evidence-of-the-risks-to-children-from-non-ionizing-radio-frequency-radiation-the-case-of-digital-technologies-in-the-home-classroom-and-society/

In close proximity (within 500m) to 'sensitive receptors': Worthing Ambulance Station - 61.20m, Guildcare Haviland House Nursing Home - 247.79m and residences - There are NO safety studies on the cumulative effects on health from exposure to these radiation emissions 24/7 over a lifetime, while over 2,000 studies show harms and risks to human health, wildlife, and the environment. icbe-emf.org/ www.orsaa.org/

Transmitter density required for 5G means that more people will be exposed to radio frequency electromagnetic fields (RF-EMFs), and at levels that emerging evidence suggests, are potentially harmful to health, argues Professor Frank, University of Edinburgh. 5G uses much higher frequency radio waves than in the past and it makes use of very new—and relatively unevaluated, in terms of safety—supportive technology to enable this higher data transmission capacity, points out Professor Frank. www.bmj.com/company/newsroom/stop-global-roll-out-of-5g-networks-until-safety-is-confirmed-urges-expert/

In close proximity to 'sensitive receptors': residences within 500m of the proposed site, which will be subjected to high levels of radiation beaming from this mast throughout the day and night.

There is no robust evidence of a search for alternative sites.

This application should be refused based on NPPF (2020) para 130: Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:

(a) will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;

(b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;

(c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities);

(d) establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit;

(e) optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development (including green and other public space) and support local facilities and transport networks; and

(f) create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.

There are NO safety studies on the cumulative effects on health from exposure to these radiation emissions 24/7 over a lifetime.

Studies show harm to wildlife and the environment.

At a time when we are in an energy crisis - what is the level of power consumption and how does that fit 'sustainable' goals?

The findings of the 2021 New Hampshire Commission: The New Hampshire Commission To Study The Environmental and Health Effects of Evolving 5G Technology was formed through legislation by the state of New Hampshire to include 13 experts in physics, toxicology, electro-magnetics, epidemiology, biostatistics, occupational health medicine, public health policy, business and law. In their 2021 Final Report they state that wireless telecommunication antennas should be placed at least 500m from residents, parks, playgrounds, hospitals, nursing homes, day care centres, and schools. The report can be found here: www.gencourt.state.nh.us/statstudcomm/committees/1474/reports/5G%20final%20report.pdf (Page 13 and Pages 100-109 reference the 500m setback recommendation and the studies used to arrive at this recommendation.) The findings of the report are evidence-based and therefore globally applicable.

WILDLIFE:

Research shows that manmade RF radiation (RFR) may be seriously harmful to wildlife, including vital pollinators such as bees -
- www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0048969720384461?dgcid=author

- www.emfdata.org/en/studies/detail&id=566

- www.mdpi.com/2075-4450/12/8/716?&ml_subscriber=1772077450675623693&ml_subscriber_hash=s0w7

Please see this list of studies regarding potential harm to wildlife compiled by the Environmental Health Trust, a US foundation run by the Nobel lead author and eminent environmental oncologist Dr Devra Davis - ehtrust.org/science/bees-butterflies-wildlife-research-electromagnetic-fields-environment/

SUSTAINABLITY:

Carbon footprint: Each 5G mast requires approximately 3 x more power than a 4G mast (as much as 73 typical homes). spectrum.ieee.org/5gs-waveform-is-a-battery-vampire www.gsma.com/futurenetworks/wiki/5g-era-mobile-network-cost-evolution/

With 5G's greatly increased mobile traffic, electricity usage from telecommunications could create up to 23% of global greenhouse gas emissions by 2030; power demand would be the equivalent of 36 nuclear reactors or 7800 massive offshore wind farms worldwide. - www.mdpi.com/2078-1547/6/1/117/htm - wsimag.com/science-and-technology/64080-green-5g-or-red-alert

The France, Spain and California Green Parties, the France Climate Change Council, and Greenpeace East Asia have all warned of the climate footprint of 5G. - www.france24.com/en/europe/20201220-deploying-5g-will-lead-to-spike-in-co2-emissions-french-climate-council-warns

The French Climate Council states that an extra 7 billion tonnes of carbon dioxide could be released into the atmosphere by 5G - www.france24.com/en/europe/20201220-deploying-5g-will-lead-to-spike-in-co2-emissions-french-climate-council-warns

Legal firm Client Earth and telecoms consultants Strand Consult have expressed concerns about greenwashing by providers. - www.clientearth.org/media/wbglw3r3/clientearth-accountability-emergency.pdf

At a time when we are in an energy crisis - what is the level of power consumption for this proposed mast and how does that fit 'sustainable' goals?

ICNIRP:

The ICNIRP standards are mainly based on acute warming effects, with more than one degree of temperature increase. By now, in several thousand studies, biological effects such as DNA damage have been demonstrated to occur at exposure levels FAR BELOW these standards.

Criticism of ICNIRP by the Council of Europe: “Both the European Parliament (in its resolution 2008/2211(INI)) and the Council of Europe recommend lowering the exposure limits based on the ICNIRP opinions. The Council of Europe in its Opinion of 6 May 2011 on health risks associated with electromagnetic fields (12608):

• A group of scientists states that ICNIRP’s opinion and guidelines are unscientific and protect industry, not public health - www.emfcall.org/the-emf-call/

• PHE’s solicitors stated in 2019 that relevant parties should use their own discretion, based on available evidence, when making decisions regarding RFR. I am providing you with some of that evidence here.

• In 2020, the ICNIRP removed the ‘vulnerable groups’ section, which included children, from its guidance. Yet its 2002 guidelines stated that ‘vulnerable people, such as the sick, elderly and children, would need non-thermal limits below its heatings-only limits.’

EXCLUSION ZONE:

"NO ENTRY" zones are missing from the plan. Every mast has an area around the antenna which should be marked with NO ENTRY signs due to the effects from the radiation.

NO RISK ASSESSMENT HAS BEEN MADE:

A Risk Assessment needs to be made from a fully informed position, you will find if you weigh up all the evidence for biological harm, from 1000's of studies, that harm is caused at exposure levels down to at least 0.05 V/m, and compare that to the fact that the environmental levels and those within buildings from WiFi also exceed this low level by 100s of times.

ADDITIONAL OBJECTIONS:

GPDO - The proposed development would not comply with Condition A.3(4)(a) of Schedule 2 Part 16 of the General Permitted Development Order as the proposed development, by reason of its siting and appearance be an unsightly, bulky and incongruous addition to the character of the local area.

Our government has decreed that telecommunication companies must ensure the cumulative non-ionising exposure of these masts stay within ICNIRP limits. Who is policing that across all telecommunication companies and all installed masts? The safety of EMF technology is based on the premise that the ICNIRP guidelines are suitable safety limits. These guidelines do not safeguard against the biological effects of this technology. Numerous scientific studies demonstrate these EMF's cause cancer and other disease.

In 2008 the Head of ICNIRP, stated that ICNIRP Guidelines were technical and were not intended as medical or biological exposure guidelines. The ICNRIP is now being questioned worldwide as to its very credibility. The precautionary principle should be followed until there is concrete proof that this technology is entirely safe for all life on earth.

According to The National Planning Policy Framework :

• Planning policies and decisions should aim to achieve healthy, inclusive and safe places – section 8.91

• Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment-section 15.170

• The number of masts should be kept to a minimum and equipment should be sympathetically designed -section 10.115

• Policies should prioritise full fibre connections NOT wireless (as these connections will, in almost all cases, provide the optimum solution) - section 10-112

This application contradicts all of these.

thank you

david smith

21 wayford walk
nottingham
ng6 8la

***NOTE:** The ICNIRP Declaration submitted on this application has NOT been signed - see here - WHEREAS the NPPF states: "*Planning applications should also be accompanied by a **signed declaration** that the equipment and installation has been designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency (RF) public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP)*".