Gmail

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

5G Tower Objection

1 message

James Witt [redacted] 7 August 2024 at 14:04
To: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk

Planning Application
AWDM/0894/24
Objection from
James Witt
14 Old Salts Farm Road
Lancing
BN15 8JD

TUE 06 AUG 2024

Subject: AWDM/0894/24 - objection

Dear Sir / Madam,

I am writing to object to the installation of a 20m mast + 6No. Antennas 2No. 300 diameter Dishes + 2No. Cabinets + associated ancillary works to include 5g technology on the Land South Of Car Park Old Shoreham Road LANCING West Sussex BN15 0QT

The park already has masts installed and I have experienced negative side effects when playing football near them and walking my dogs.

The mast is due to be installed a grassy verge on the busy A27 in front of a car park in a residential area of Shoreham. Mast for VM02. Noah's Ark Nursery.

The applicant cannot have the surname Cornerstone as stated on Application form.

ICNIRP Cornerstone & WHP Telecoms

As a frequent visitor to the area, I object to this proposal for a new mast and cabinets, as follows:

Appearance and Siting:

- This is new proposal for 20m pole and cabinets on a grassy verge on the busy A27 in front of a car park set in a mainly residential area of Shoreham.

- It should be treated as a Prior Approval application should be fully adjudicated as any other planning application under GPDO of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. According to 'Changes to permitted development rights for electronic communications infrastructure: technical consultation' of 7 March 2022, paragraph 10, new ground based masts: All new masts still require the Prior Approval of the Local Planning Authority, and consideration of community representation. https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/changes-to-permitted-development-rights-for-electronic-communications-infrastructure-technical-consultation/outcome/changes-to-permitted-development-rights-for-electronic-communications-infrastructure-government-response-to-the-technical-consultation

- Telecommunications base stations (phone masts) are intrusive and overbearing and they degrade the aesthetics in both urban and rural areas. A mast would not be in keeping with the buildings and skyline in this vicinity. This is a proposal for an ugly, stark, alien, industrialising, feature that would greatly impact the local visual amenity. It is likely to cause visual disturbance to road users.

- It is contrary to Code of Practice S.22 and 28, and the NPPF (2023) paras 128 & 131 with the siting of the proposed mast representing a discordant, intrusive feature to the prevailing residential area.

- It is in close proximity to businesses, residences and Noah's Ark Nursery school, where children aka 'sensitive receptors' would be involuntarily subjected to high levels of harmful radiation beaming from this mast throughout the day and night. www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0013935122011781.

- This is a mast for a single operator VM02. Where applicants are unable to share masts with other operators, separate masts need to be erected for each operator. By granting permission for an application, the LPA could

inadvertently be affording the applicant a monopoly over 5G coverage in the area. This would be in conflict with Paragraph 119 of the NPPF (2023) which states that LPAs should seek to keep telecommunications base station installations to a minimum and ensure they are sympathetically designed and camouflaged. This proposal has no screening or camouflage.

Environment, Biodiversity, Sustainability, Climate and Carbon targets:
Local authorities are expected to safeguard the quality of the local environment and some have a statutory duty to help conserve biodiversity and species protection as part of the planning process. Councillors are in a position to help preserve the natural environment for the benefit of future generations and to promote sustainability.

Environmental Impact Assessment:
- None is available on the portal. Under Environmental Law and the recent ruling against Surrey County council that emphasised the importance of public participation in environmental decision making, which is an objective not only of the EIA Directive but also central to the Aarhus Convention; the Court identified two issues in relation to public participation, namely: increasing the democratic legitimacy of environmental decision, and serving an educational function. An EIA should include the effects of the radiation emitted from all the antennae on the proposed mast (which can be regarded as effluvia or as a pollutant) on public health. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0013935118300161?via%3Dihub Please supply the EIA for this application

Sustainability:
- Can this be considered Sustainable development? According to many sources, it is a power-hungry technology, creates a huge carbon footprint; requires the mining of many rare earth minerals, often using child labour; and would release vast amounts of greenhouse gases. An EIA should consider the implications of this infrastructure from extraction, processing, usage and disposal of the materials for masts and devices.

BioDiversity Net Gain:
- How does this fit with Councils BioDiversity Net Gain targets? Research shows manmade radio-frequency radiation RFR & EMFs have detrimental effects on wildlife, trees and the ecosystem, especially our pollinating insects. see the following articles https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/ https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0048969720384461 https://www.emfdata.org/en/studies/detail&id=566

The British Ecological Society has identified RFR as one of the top emerging issues that could affect global biological diversity and conservation. https://www.cell.com/trends/ecology-evolution/fulltext/S0169-5347(17)30289-6

Climate & Carbon footprint:
Carbon footprint: Each 5G mast requires approximately 3 x more power than a 4G mast (as much as 73 typical homes). www.spectrum.ieee.org/5gs-waveform-is-a-battery-vampire
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 - www.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.

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

Health Concerns:
- There are NO studies of safety for humans or other life forms for exposure to this form of radiation all day, every day over a lifetime.

- All masts have an "exclusion zone" within which the radiation can exceed the levels which the ICNIRP suggests are acceptable. Ofcom's code of best practice dictates that these zones should be marked with warning signs. Please note that exclusion zones are much wider for 5G than 4G, as highlighted here: https://www.fwi.co.uk/business/business-management/health-and-safety/how-to-manage-radiation-exclusion-zones-for-phone-masts The proposal does not include any exclusion zones on the diagrams indicating they are not specific enough in detail to be able to fully outweigh the benefits and risks of the proposal. Please supply.

- The ICNIRP sets a safe distance as roughly 50m from a 5G mast, but the ICNIRP does not take into account biological effects whereas the New Hampshire Commission recommendation of 500m accounts for the large body of evidence showing harm within 500m. The year-long New Hampshire Commission of scientists, doctors and experts in experts in physics, toxicology, electro-magnetics and epidemiology concluded unanimously that both the laboratory science and epidemiology converge are conclusive; all residents within 500m are vulnerable to these harmful effects. The Commission also point out that Electrohypersensitives, (3-5% of the UK population) are likely to suffer harmful effects even beyond this distance. The full transcript with 15 recommendations can be downloaded here:

[redacted]

https://www.gencourt.state.nh.us/statstudcomm/committees/1474/reports/5G%20final%20report.pdf

- There are many studies showing evidence of harm. Related industries acknowledge this with the Insurance sector viewing this technology as a risk and so will not underwrite any insurance against claims against harms to health; while the Telecoms companies set aside funds for exactly such claims.

- The vital public health safeguard, the ICNIRP certificate is intended to show adherence to a set of guidelines specifically excluding those people with metal implants. Such implants are many and various, leaving many people unprotected by any ICNIRP certificate.

The Application documents:
- The Application shows the applicant with a surname of Cornerstone. This is incorrect, making it contrary to the requirements of the GDPO 2015 (as amended) and Code of Practice which states applications should be clear, accurate and complete.

- The ICNIRP certificate is in the name of companies Cornerstone & WHP Telecoms. Neither of these are the mobile network operator, what about VM02? Which of these would be liable in the case of a fire or harm? There are inadequate company details supplied on the ICNIRP certificate. According to Companies Act 2006, any and every document produced by a company, including electronic ones must carry certain information, eg company legal name, Companies House registration number, registered address and VAT number.

- Might the liability fall to the Council should they grant permission? Does the Council have insurance to cover liability for a possible fire or harms to health from the radiation emissions?

Legal matters:
- It contravenes Article 8 of the Human Rights Act: the right to respect of one's private and family life would be curtailed due to fear, anxiety and distress from the harmful effects of radiation and the oppressive nature of this hideous proposal. https://phiremedical.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/2020-Non-Ionising-Radiation-Consensus-Statement.pdf

- Please apply NPPF (2023) para 2 that states ‘Planning policies and decisions must also reflect relevant international obligations and statutory requirements’ by applying the EECC Recital (105): ‘Improving facility sharing can lower the environmental cost of deploying electronic communications infrastructure and serve public health, public security and meet town and country planning objectives’ and EECC Recital (106) ‘Where mobile operators are required to share towers or masts for environmental reasons, such mandated sharing could lead to a reduction in the maximum transmitted power levels allowed for each operator for reasons of public health, and this in turn could require operators to install more transmission sites to ensure national coverage. Competent authorities should seek to reconcile the environmental and public health considerations in question, taking due account of the precautionary approach set out in Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC (32).’ The Recitals/Articles must be enacted by 'competent authorities', and as the UK Government relies upon local Councils to control RFR exposure through planning policy, Councils must be 'competent authorities' for the purpose of Recitals106.

- By virtue of the harm, injury and nuisance to the local residents, to the local area and to the environment from current and next generation wireless technology, being sufficient to outweigh the benefits of the development, the application should be refused. This proposal represents an incompatible and unacceptable use of land and must be evaluated as such as a material planning consideration when assessing the siting of the mast.

- Overall it cannot be concluded that the benefits of this proposal are adequately evidenced to outweigh the risks.

Please log my objection to this mast. I already feel that there are too many in this locale including the ones on the 3G football pitches inside lancing manor which cause me to feel nauseous when I am playing next to them and trigger my tinnitus. My EMF readings show that despite the hoarding around the existing post the frequencies permeating into the pitch are still higher than should be permitted. Given the fact cancers including childhood cancers are on the rise we must look to the correlation between these rising figures and the increased use of 5G technology. This mast is far too close to the local children’s nursery, as such the council must err on the side of caution and reject this proposal.

Regards,

James Witt

[redacted]