Comments for Planning Application AWDM/2144/21

1 message

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

21 December 2021 at 17:09

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 21/12/2021 5:09 PM from Ms Paula Mitton.

Application Summary

Address:	Telecommunication Mast 3212 South East Of 9 Commerce Way Lancing Business Park Sompting West Sussex BN15 8TA
Proposal:	Application for Prior Approval for replacement proposed 20.0m Orion V2 Monopole (5G) to be installed on new root foundation,,existing 1no. 0.3m dish to be relocated from old pole to new proposed pole, proposed 3no. antenna on upper spine and 3no. antenna on lower spine, existing equipment cabinet to be internally refreshed for proposed upgrade. proposed 1no. cabinet to be installed on root foundation, proposed 2no. bollards to be installed
Case Officer:	Gary Peck

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name:	Ms Paula Mitton
Address:	29 The Drive, Worthing, West Sussex BN11 5LN

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Other - Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	I object to the proposed mast and the fraudulent claims made by the applicant, particularly with regard to claims made on matters of safety. It is impossible to properly evaluate the safety of the proposed mast without the relevant technical information, which is missing from the application, such as details of the power and frequencies emitted. All phone masts have an 'exclusion zone' which gives an area of 'no access' and an area of 'worker only' access (maximum 8 hour continuous exposure). The 'worker only access area is usually 50 metres from the mast. No exclusion zone is shown on the diagram and there are buildings that fall within 50m of the proposed mast. The exclusion zone may exceed the ICNIRP guidelines. I object to the mis-information given in the applicant's document 'Health and Mobile Phone Base Stations'. It quotes the Stewart Report which was published in 2014, however plenty of other research has been carried out which has found adverse health effects from high frequency pulsed, non-ionising radiation, such as that emitted by 5G masts. The International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) is a self-selecting body and is compromised by members having interests in Telecoms. In addition members of Public Health England have also sat on the ICNIRP board so true

independent inquiry is not guaranteed.

The main research which counteracts this document:
IARC/World Health Organisation (2011) - radio-frequency electro-magnetic fields (including microwaves and millimetre waves) are potentially carcinogenic and should be classified as a Class 2B carcinogen.
The 10 year US National Toxicology Program (published in 2018) - showed that there is a significant increase in the incidence of brain and heart cancer in animals from radio-frequency radiation below ICNIRP levels.
The European Ramazzini Foundation (2018) - confirmed the effects found in the above study in that brain and heart tumours were found in animals exposed to a radio-frequency field representative of a 1.8GHz base station.
As a result scientists are calling for this type of radiation to be re-classified as a Class 1 carcinogen.

A full literature review of the health risks caused by non-ionising radiofrequency radiation used in 5G technology has been carried out by Professor Tom Butler of University College, Cork for the legal case Action Against 5G:

Prof-Tom-Butler-Submission-on-5G.pdf [redacted]

He concludes that governments and policy-makers may be misled by the body setting the standards, ICNIRP, whose guidelines are based on thermal effects only and do not take into account other non-heating effects, such as oxidative stress and free radical damage. They are based on the heating of a model for no more than 30 minutes and do not take into account real life situations.

The applicant's 5G Background Information document quotes paragraph 116 of the NPPF saying that Local Planning Authorities should not set health safeguards different from ICNIRP. The NPPF is guidance, not law and the Government is using this to guide decision makers away from health considerations. There are other considerations that may override this, for example: 1) With Material Planning Considerations health issues can be brought in; 2) The European Electronic Communications Code 2018 says that it is imperative that the competent authority ensures that citizens are not exposed to electromagnetic fields at a level that is harmful to health; 3) a letter from DLA Piper, the UK solicitors for Public Health England, to Leigh Day solicitors, dated 8th August 2019 said that a public body must determine how much weight to put on Public Health England guidance and also consider other evidence from interested parties and members of the public.

In the Radio Planning and Propagation document trees are classed as 'clutter' as they have 'signal absorption and shadowing effects'. The photograph shows a large tree close to the site of the proposed mast - this tree may be in danger of being chopped down if it is considered to attenuate the signal.

A final consideration. The mast falls on Council land - does the Council benefit from a rental payment for the mast?

Kind regards