Fwd: AWDM/0375/23 | Application for determination as to whether prior approval will be required for the siting and appearance of proposed 15m 5G telecommunications monopole with two wraproundcabinets at base and associated ancillary works. | Land Opposite 214 Upper Shoreham Road Shoreham-by-sea West Sussex BN43 6TQ

1 message

Planning - <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk> 6 April 2023 at 12:27
To: Planning - <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>

-------- Forwarded message ------
From: **Andrew Kelleher** [redacted]
Date: Wed, 5 Apr 2023 at 23:33
Subject: AWDM/0375/23 | Application for determination as to whether prior approval will be required for the siting and appearance of proposed 15m 5G telecommunications monopole with two wraproundcabinets at base and associated ancillary works. | Land Opposite 214 Upper Shoreham Road Shoreham-by-sea West Sussex BN43 6TQ
To: <gary.peck@adur-worthing.gov.uk>

Dear Sir.
I am writing to express my objection to the planning application AWDM/0375/23 for the following reasons:

In close proximity (within 500m) 'sensitive receptors': Southlands Hospital - 112.59m, Ro-jo's Childcare - 281.26m , Elmcroft-Shaw Healthcare - 396.33m - Joshua Pearce in his 2019 document, "Limiting liability with positioning to minimize negative health effects of cellular phone towers" recommends that telecoms companies site masts at least 500m away from schools. www.pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31791710/

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 to 'sensitive receptors': residential homes on Upper Shoreham Rd, New Barn Rd, Longshore Drive, Greenways Crescent, Hammy Lane, Southlands Way, Royal George Parade, Monarch Way, Fairfield Close, Hammy Close, Crown Road - within 500m of the proposed site, which **will be subjected to high levels of radiation beaming from this mast throughout the day and night.** The impact of this proposal on the health (including mental health) and well-being of residents must be taken into account, and is a material planning consideration.

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/

APPEARANCE:
The proposed antenna and associated equipment will be obtrusive, ugly and incongruous with the surrounding character and appearance of the area, contributing to visual clutter

resulting in detriment to the visual amenities of the surrounding area, as well as a harmful impact to the outlook of residential properties nearby.

SITING:
The 5G equipment would result in 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.

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

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=17720774506756236 93&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

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 (as these connections will, in almost all

cases, provide the optimum solution) -section 10-112

This application contradicts all of these.

Kind regards

Andrew Kelleher
10 Buchanan Court
Borehamwood
WD6 5RB