Gmail

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

# AWDM/1560/23. 5G Mast extension opposite the Sunshine Day Nursery in Shoreham

1 message

[redacted] 14 December 2023 at 20:58

To: "planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk" <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>

Dear Planners,

I most strongly object to this planning application and request that you take into account the following:

**Site and Appearance**

This proposed antenna is located within Shoreham-by-Sea Conservation area.

It has multiple heritage designations within the surrounding area including Listed Buildings and the Marlipins Scheduled Monuments.

The Council has a duty to protect these designations under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990,

There is clear intensification and visual intrusion. The proposal is clearly an eyesore with a completely unacceptable impact on the neighbouring character.

Under NPPF para 206 only 'Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to the asset (or which better reveal its significance) should be treated favourably'

The 5G and apparatus will be an industrialising and incongruous feature and totally out of place.

Under NPPF 117. Applications must consult with organisations with an interest in the proposed development, in particular with the relevant body where a mast is within a statutory safeguarding zone surrounding an aerodrome.

**Brighton City Airport have not signed off on the safety of this proposal, as demonstrated by the applicants own evidence.**

**Health**

LPAs have a duty to protect public and environmental health. Elected representatives have a fundamental moral duty to consider the health of the constituents they represent.

There are peer-reviewed scientific papers confirming harm. This is located nearby a children's nursey.

The European Parliament's STOA Committee has recently issued a report calling for a halt to the 5G rollout, based on sufficient evidence of the adverse health effects of RFR microwave radiation. They describe 5G as an experiment on the population and state that the official safety guidelines (as provided by ICNIRP) do not protect the population.

Please see a recent planning case involving health considerations and siting:
https://rfinfo.co.uk/fishersgate-mast-in-brighton-quashed-at-judicial-review

There is no evidence that ICNIRP certificate submitted with the application has considered cumulative impacts from radiation. As with Brighton Fishersgate, inadequate ICNIRP certification may lead to a successful legal challenge.

[redacted]

Published research shows that health effects from living near masts can include: higher levels of cancer, cardiovascular problems, diabetes, depression, anxiety, headaches, sleep problems, memory problems and blurred vision.

Children are particularly at risk from RFR

Studies show children's' brains can absorb up to 10 times more non –ionising radiation than adults. This is one reason why the American Academy of Paediatrics (AAP) has long been asking the US Regulatory authorities to reassess EMF radiation standards specific to children.

In 2011 The Council of Europe report on "The Potential Dangers of EMF" recommended:

"concerning the protection of children:
8.3.1. develop within different ministries (education, environment and health) targeted information campaigns aimed at teachers, parents and children to alert them to the specific risks of early, ill-considered and prolonged use of mobiles and other devices emitting microwaves;
8.3.2. for children in general, and particularly in schools and classrooms, give preference to wired Internet connections, and strictly regulate the use of mobile phones by schoolchildren on school premises".

Ronald Melnick, Senior Toxicologist (retired) and former leader of the US National Toxicology Program's health effects and animal cancer studies of cell phone radio frequency radiation, has stated:

" I find it appalling that mobile phone emission standards do not adjust for children when it is well established that the absorption of radiofrequency radiation by the brain is greater in children than in adults; the developing brain is highly susceptible to tissue damaging agents; and the use of wireless devices is being actively marketed to children.

At a minimum, regulatory agencies need to make strong recommendations for consumers to take precautionary measures and avoid close contact with their mobile phones."

The exposure limits recommended by the voluntary and private association, the International Commission on Non-Ionising Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) do not give special protection for children and foetuses.

This is in contrast to the lower exposure limits for this vulnerable group (under 18 and foetuses) for exposures to ionising radiations eg from X Rays.
These lower exposure limits for ionising radiation have long been recommended by the more independent International Commission on Radiological Protection (ICRP).

ICNIRP's exposure limits are based essentially on just short term heating (thermal) effects from the high energy intensities of some EMFs. They therefore provide very little protection against the non-thermal effects of RF of lower energy intensities that are well below the ICNIRP recommended exposure limits and for which there are thousands of scientific papers pointing to health effects and harm to people, wildlife, and ecosystems.

I respectfully request that this planning application is refused and most particularly that the children in the Sunshine Day Nursery are spared from potential harm.

With kind regards

Sara De Siena
Staveley Mead, Buxton Road, Eastbourne, BN20 7LB
...

[redacted]

[redacted]