[redacted] [redacted]
Sent: 17 July 2024 14:02
To: Planning
Subject: Objection to Application Reference DC/24/0825

Categories: Comments Received

[redacted]
75 William Allen Lane, Lindfield, West Sussex RH16 2ST

I hereby inform you that I am registering my objection to planning application reference DC/24/0825.

In summary:

- there is no ICNIRP certificate to show that the radiation conforms to guidelines;
- there is no information as to whether this is 4G, 5G or millimetre wave radiation;
- the company North does not exist according to Companies House;
- the installation affects a conservation area in the historic town of Steyning;
- there is no independent evidence of poor signal connectivity locally so it is unclear if the proposed location of the masts would provide coverage improvement.

Regarding the lack of ICNIRP certificate, I would draw your attention to the following:-

Health concerns:

Public health effects: 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. ICNIRP standards are mainly based on acute warming effects, with more than one degree of temperature increase. In several thousand studies, biological effects such as DNA damage have been shown to occur at exposure levels FAR BELOW these standards. There are NO safety studies on the cumulative effects on health from exposure to these radiation emissions 24/7 over a lifetime. Studies show harm to people, wildlife and the environment. https://icbe-emf.org/ and https://www.orsaa.org/

The ICNIRP certificate is NOT sufficient to provide the necessary confirmation that the proposed masts would protect the health of people, AS FOLLOWS: The ICNIRP Guidelines state that people with implantable medical devices and metallic implants in the body are outside the scope of these guidelines; (as mentioned on page 2 of the 2020 ICNIRP Guidelines report) and therefore such people are particularly vulnerable and need to be afforded extra protection under the Councils obligations within the Health and Social Care Act 2012.

Upon consideration of these health concerns:-

1. Will Horsham District Council as LPA evidence their consideration of risks to those with metal implants?

2. How will Horsham District Council as LPA monitor and regulate the radiation emissions to ensure the levels are within the ICNIRP guidelines, the certification of which has not been evidenced in this planning application?

Sustainability and Environmental implications:

Is this a sustainable technology? Telecoms companies may claim it is, but the facts show differently.

Carbon footprint: Each 5G mast requires approximately 3x 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

https://www.meer.com/en/64080-green-5g-or-red-alert

Please apply NPPF (2023):-

• Planning policies and decisions should aim to achieve healthy, inclusive and safe places – section 8. para 96.
• Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment - section 15. para 180.
• The number of masts should be kept to a minimum and equipment should be sympathetically designed - section 10. para 119.
• Policies should prioritise full fibre connections (as these connections will, in almost all cases, provide the optimum solution) - section 10. para 118.

The evidence for harm to health and the environment from current and next generation 5G Telecom masts must be evaluated, under Prior Approval, as a material planning consideration when assessing the siting of the masts.

By virtue of the harm, injury and nuisance to the local residents and to the local area, being sufficient to outweigh the benefits of the development, the application should be refused.

Regards

[redacted]