

The Planning Inspectorate

COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

Appeal Reference: APP/W1715/W/22/3312540

DETAILS OF THE CASE

Appeal Reference APP/W1715/W/22/3312540

Appeal By CK HUTCHISON NETWORKS (UK) LTD

Site Address
Area of Grass Verge
Chandlers Ford
Eastleigh
Hampshire
SO53 3FJ
Grid Ref Easting: 443705
Grid Ref Northing: 119284

SENDER DETAILS

Name MR EDDIE STEVENS

Address
33 Wiltshire Road
Chandler's Ford
EASTLEIGH
SO53 3FB

ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?

- ☐ Appellant
- ☐ Agent
- ☒ Interested Party / Person
- ☐ Land Owner
- ☐ Rule 6 (6)

What kind of representation are you making?

- ☐ Final Comments
- ☐ Proof of Evidence
- ☐ Statement
- ☐ Statement of Common Ground
- ☒ Interested Party/Person Correspondence

☐ Other

YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE

Dear Sir / Madam

I would like to oppose the 15 metre 5G tower that would dominate the skyline outside my window, intrusive and overbearing and is not in keeping with existing aesthetics, as well as destroy the most beautiful old cherry tree that should absolutely have a tree preservation order in place.

I cant believe that the telecom company & now the secretary of state want to place this monster of a tower just feet away from the fence line to the garden of the vulnerable family that live on the corner of Belmont / Wiltshire rd & on the doorstep of many houses of the Valmore estate.

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.

According to the definitions from the Environmental Protection Act 1990 (EPA 1990), the Pollution Prevention and Control Act 1999 (PPCA 1999), and the EU Directive on Industrial Emissions (2010/75/EU, telecommunications base stations emit a toxic effluent and pollutant which is known to harm wildlife and humans.

Many countries have set guideline levels 100 times lower than here in the UK, including Italy, Poland, Russia, China, Italy, Switzerland, and most of Eastern Europe, Why is that?

Why are the British government-sanctioned guidelines for public exposure to wireless radiation based only on the thermal effect on the temperature of the skin and do not account for the non-thermal, non-ionizing, biological effects of wireless radiation?

It is unacceptable & dangerous that C K Hutchison Network (UK) Ltd self police & regulate their towers as safe.

Ofcom receive huge income from Telecoms form selling off the bandwidth for 5G. Is this a glaring conflict of interest?

How is it correct that Ofcom are responsible for regulation of licensees emission levels?

Ofcom also state "We are independent, and funded by fees paid to us by the companies we regulate".

PHE (Public Health England) are providing non legally binding "guidelines", this is implying regulation of safety but "taking the lead" and "providing advice" is not providing safety regulation of EMFs.

May I politely remind you as below ;

In relation to planning applications for masts, the NPPF (National Planning Policy Framework) states that: '

116. Local planning authorities must determine applications on planning grounds only. They should not...set health safeguards different from the International Commission guidelines for public exposure.' However, Section 2B of the National Health Service Act 2006 states that any local authority (including district and county councils) 'must take such steps as it considers appropriate for improving the health of the people in its area', including 'providing assistance (including financial assistance) to help individuals to minimise any risks to health arising from their accommodation or environment.'

To date, at least eleven UK Councils have called for moratoriums and the application of the Precautionary Principle regarding the deployment of 5G masts. These decisions come as a result of close scrutiny of the independent scientific evidence regarding RFR.

The Central Association of Agricultural Valuers (CAAV) is urging landowners to request information on radiation exclusion zones from operators of telecoms masts located on their land. Though non-ionising, significant levels of exposure to the radio waves emitted by base stations on telecoms masts can affect health, requiring exclusion zones to protect people.

<https://www.caav.org.uk/news/beware-dangers-of-telecoms-masts>

On the farmers weekly site

<https://www.fwi.co.uk/business/compliance/landowners-warned-to-be-aware-of-f-phone-mast-radiation-risk>

Landowners warned to be aware of phone mast radiation risk

Does our Council have obligations as an employer and a public body to mitigate biological hazards ?

C K Hutchison Network (UK) Ltd) has complained to the secretary of state on Eastleigh councils decision

As the secretary of state representing the UK Government is currently the object of two legal challenges, including one headed by Michael Mansfield QC, regarding its deferral to ICNIRP (International commission on non-ionizing radiation protection) guidance, surely it would be better to wait until the outcome?

The ICNIRP considers only short-term thermal effects of RFR as tested on a plastic dummy. It disregards the overwhelming body of science, amounting to several thousand studies, showing biological harm from RFR at non-thermal levels.

Even though the 2020 ICNIRP guidelines are being revealed as completely inadequate, may I request that we obtain full ICNIRP drawings and site-specific radio frequency plans so that the exclusion zone can be understood and to comply with legal obligations

May I take this opportunity to commend yourselves at Eastleigh Council for representing the Valmore residents refusing the installation of the 5G tower on the last attempt

Can I also politely remind you that the Government does not indemnify councillors against action taken against them for failure to safeguard the health and safety of citizens, which may conflict with duties outlined in Section 2B of the National Health Service Act 2006