Gmail

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

AWDM/1057/23

1 message

[redacted] 31 August 2023 at 20:34
To: "gary.peck@worthing.gov.uk" <gary.peck@worthing.gov.uk>, "planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk" <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>

Dear Planners,

I strongly object to the above application for determination as to whether prior approval will be required for proposed 15m 5G telecoms installation: H3G street pole and additional equipment cabinets | Grass Verge OUTSIDE SUSSEX YEOMAN PUB East Of Roundabout Littlehampton Road Worthing, on the following grounds:

Siting: This proposed mast would be only 171.00 metres from the 5G mast recently approved on Yeoman Rd outside the Southern Water building. However, the NPPF 115 states:

"The number of radio and electronic communications masts, and the sites for such installations, should be kept to a minimum consistent with the needs of consumers, the efficient operation of the network and providing reasonable capacity for future expansion. Use of existing masts, buildings and other structures for new electronic communications capability (including wireless) should be encouraged. Where new sites are required (such as for new 5G networks, or for connected transport and smart city applications), equipment should be sympathetically designed and camouflaged where appropriate."

In close proximity to 'sensitive receptors': just 10 metres from the children's play area in the Sussex Yeoman beer garden!

Appearance:

Monopoles and their accompanying cabinets are hideous and unnerving, and for many people, cause anxiety and stress.

The impact of this proposal on the health and well-being of residents is a material planning consideration, which includes the fear and anxiety of harm.

Could reduce visibility and thus cause problems with road safety for pedestrians.

The cabinets will cause unnecessary clutter.

Many cabinets carry a warning notice from the telecoms company about high voltage or high levels of radio frequencies, so obviously are not deemed safe to be near to. How does this affect pedestrians passing by?

The mast may create a visual distraction to road users,

The proposed site is in close proximity (within 500 m) to residential property.

Immediately adjacent the Sussex Yeoman public house, where visitors and staff will be exposed to high levels of radiation beaming from this mast during open hours and could well have a detrimental effect on the success of the business as people become more and more aware of the health hazards of these masts.

[redacted]

In close proximity (within 500m) to 'sensitive receptors': Guildcare Haviland House - 337.03m, Guild Care, Bradbury Wellbeing Centre - 360.12m - where clients will be exposed to 5G radiofrequency radiation 24 hours per day - 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/

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.

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': Childrens' playground at Palatine Park - 323.52m - 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/

Additionally, The Erroneous ICNIRP Declaration Certificate:

The ICNIRP “safety” certificate is based on guidelines which categorically DO NOT apply to, or protect anyone with metal in their bodies. Here is the relevant statement from ICNIRP regarding its EMF safety guidelines: “However, some exposure scenarios are defined as outside the scope of these guidelines. Medical procedures may utilize EMFs, and metallic implants may alter or perturb EMFs in the body, which in turn can affect the body both directly (via direct interaction between field and tissue) and indirectly (via an intermediate conducting object)". www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPrfgdl2020.pdf

Please also note ICNIRP's disclaimer on their website. They even say they're not accountable for their guidelines: "ICNIRP e.V. undertakes all reasonable measures to ensure the reliability of information presented on the website, but does not guarantee the correctness, reliability, or completeness of the information and views published. The content of our website is provided to you for information only. We do not assume any responsibility for any damage, including direct or indirect loss suffered by users or third parties in connection with the use of our website and/or the information it contains, including for the use or the interpretation of any technical data, recommendations, or specifications available on our website."

The fact that the ICNIRP certificate does not apply to a large proportion of residents with any form of metal in their bodies is an acute safety issue which needs to be taken seriously and addressed. Doing so would NOT result in setting health safeguards different from ICNIRP (as per NPPF) but is in fact applying ICNIRP exactly as stated from a safety perspective.

There are many scenarios in which metal is used in the human body for medical reasons:

Surgical – metal pins, plates, rods, discs, screws e.g. scoliosis surgery and joint replacement of knees and hips. Urinary, gynaecological and intestinal repairs – e.g. mesh repairs and copper contraceptive coils. Cardiovascular – implantable heart loop recorders, stents and pacemakers. Implants to treat and monitor health conditions, deliver drugs or to restore bodily functions e.g. diabetes related products. Magnetic cerebral spinal fluid shunts. Cochlear implants for hearing loss. Dental work – braces, implants, metal crowns, pins, denture arches, mercury amalgam fillings. What about body piercings?

SEE: ICNIRP Guidelines: www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPrfgdl2020.pdf (2nd page under heading PURPOSE AND SCOPE - "The main objective of this publication is to establish guidelines for limiting exposure to EMFs that will provide a high level of protection for all people against substantiated adverse health effects from exposures to both short- and long-term, continuous and discontinuous radiofrequency EMFs. However, some exposure scenarios are defined as outside the scope of these guidelines. Medical procedures may utilize EMFs, and metallic implants may alter or perturb EMFs in the body, which in turn can affect the body both directly (via direct interaction between field and tissue) and indirectly (via an intermediate conducting object)."

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?

IMPACT on TREES

Radiofrequency radiation injures trees around mobile phone base stations (2016) www.researchgate.net/publication/306435017_Radiofrequency_radiation_injures_trees_around_mobile_phone_base_stations And www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27552133

A detailed long-term (2006-2015) field monitoring study of 120 trees was performed in the cities of Bamberg and Hallstadt (Germany) and demonstrated electromagnetic radiation from phone masts is harmful to trees.

Statistical analysis demonstrated that electromagnetic radiation from mobile phone masts is harmful for trees. These results are consistent with the fact that damage afflicted on trees by mobile phone towers usually start on one side, extending to the whole tree over time. Additional photos here (published Mar-2022) www.researchgate.net/publication/359481325_Tree_damage_caused_by_mobile_phone_base_stations_An_observation_guide_Photos_and_RF_measurements_by_Cornelia_Waldmann-Selsam_Additional_photos

I hope that you will take the above into consideration when reaching your decision.

With kind regards

Sara De Siena
Staveley Mead
Buxton Road

Eastbourne BN20 7LB

[redacted]