

Objecting to a Planning Application (v9) - short version

from Ian Jarvis & a 5G Action Group (all volunteers)

for support requests <mailto:general.enquiries.and.mentors@gmail.com>

to receive notifications and/or attend the zoom meetings: irj-4-wifi@outlook.com

We are happy for this to be shared in any way.

Please buy us a coffee at <https://www.buymeacoffee.com/stop5g>

or transfer to Smile Bank 08-92-88 / 12147113

This is the shortened version, suitable for most people and most applications;

the full one is on our website, <http://www.ianjarvis.co.uk/>

I suggest that you choose your favourites (4 or 5 are enough) from the selection below - start with ones about **siting** (eg too near a school) and **visibility/appearance** (eg It will tower over all other nearby structures and trees) as Case Officers will take more notice of those.

Add anything personal and site specific from local knowledge. Discussing this with friends and neighbours will give you ideas for that. Many of the suggestions here can be used for any planned mast. Do make any modifications as appropriate.

Don't write about green fields though if it's in a crowded city centre! (or vice-versa)

Good Basic Objections

These will be appropriate for many mast applications

1. Here are two to use whenever you are not local to the propose site:
 - **Anyone** can comment or object to a planning application - see the Planning Practice [Guidance on Consultation](https://tinyurl.com/25t94zn3), <https://tinyurl.com/25t94zn3> (important to use when you are not local)
 - **Telecoms** is a national project even if not so designated. All the masts will eventually be connected so they will all affect all of us.
2. The mast and cabinets will ruin the aesthetic or character of the area. You must consider both the mast AND the cabinets together. I know that the telecom companies have development rights on the cabinets but they would not put up either without the other.
3. There is very little street furniture (lights etc) and this would have an enormous, aggressive and incongruous visual impact
4. This would result in unnecessary visual clutter introducing a prominent, obstructive, incongruous and alien feature to local amenities.
5. The mast is highly visible, ugly and is in no way camouflaged nor designed specially for this place.
6. It is too close to nearby homes, hospital, hospice, care home etc.
(*There may be something in the Local Plan about that.*)
7. Who has the right to decide on the appearance and the addition of this monopole other than local people. You have not considered us. You take the opinion of the telecom company when probably none of them has been here.

8. The consultation to put this mast up was NOT thorough enough. **The Council should place at least one notice near the site where people will be walking and write to nearby residents.** (see the PPG on Consultation, and the case law Gunning Principles)
9. The cabinets are an obstruction to the pavements (by the shops) and will make it difficult for people with prams and pushchairs and people using wheelchairs.
10. Cabinets attract graffiti; and give off a noisy hum which is deliberately and knowingly creating noise pollution.
11. The cabinets will reduce visibility especially for children attempting to cross the road & for drivers who may not see them.
12. There are also many other obstructions on the path this will add one more and make negotiating them more difficult especially so if you are visually impaired, in a wheelchair etc.
13. **A refusal statement you can use directly:** *"The cabinets will cause a potential obstruction for pedestrians with disabilities and visual impairments. As such, the proposed development is considered to be unacceptable on grounds of pedestrian safety."*
14. This is an area of very high footfall with (eg as appropriate) local shops and supermarkets, a library. Many people will be exposed unknowingly to the EMF radiation.
 1. The same can be argued in a popular nature spot or walking area.
15. The cabinets will create further obstructions and have dangerous high voltages according to notices on some of them. Sited close to the road gives an added danger - suppose a lorry hit one?
16. Many cabinets have warning notices from the telecom company about high voltage or high levels of radio frequencies (EMF). How can these be safe when they have warning notices?
17. The cabinets proposed will block the pavement or eg "my children enjoy walking along the grass verge right where you plan to put them" or *"The mast and cabinets would be overbearing and visually obtrusive additions that unnecessarily clutter the street scene."* **Quoted from a refusal.**
18. The cabinets will narrow the pavement to an unacceptably narrow passage. **To quote from an LPA refusal,** "The proposed siting of the mast, cabinets and all ancillary development is such that it would reduce the width of the footway to an unacceptable width. The footway would be reduced from roughly 2.3m to 1.3m and this is contrary to guidance on footway width requirements."
19. The 5G mast so close to our homes it will devalue the sale price of our property and may put people off buying houses in the area. This shows people don't want these near their homes and are concerned about potential harms.
20. The council cannot disregard any concerns around safety and health. I and many neighbours **have fears for the effect on our health** and that of our children especially in the medium and long term. and many European countries and scientists have a variety of concerns. (eg France banned wifi in primary schools and in 2025 Hawaii specified a minimum distance from homes of 600ft/190 metres)
21. Also see this from Cyprus <https://ehtrust.org/cyprus-issues-decree-banning-wireless-kindergarten-elementary-school-classrooms/>

22. It is worrying that these are going up around our city and many people have serious concerns over the constant high EMF radiation. It will create stress and mental health issues among the people when your primary function is for the health of them.

What insurance cover is held for any damage or health harms that **may** occur as a result of the erection of this structure?

23. Improving air quality is a stated aim of Councils. These masts will irradiate the air and add positive ions both of which are scientifically considered a form of air pollution.

24. There will be no place in the region that is free from major sources of RFR/EMF. Every new structure adds more, increasing electrosmog.

25. What is the **need** (as claimed by the applicant) for this monopole? We all have a reliable service for both broadband and mobile devices. Inside homes we connect via our router if necessary. No Problem.

26. The applicant has not proven that there is an 'acute need' (or anything similar) for any 'improved service' or 'benefits'. I have a perfectly satisfactory broadband service currently and speed is no problem.

27. The applicant has not described, with evidence, what are these claimed 'benefits' socially, in education and economically?

28. The Council should be prioritising fibre cable.

29. The mast will consume a large amount of electrical power (about 2 to 4 times more than a 3/4G one). Earlier ones did not have cabinets but these are being built with at least three and some with 8. This cannot be in line with your sustainability and environmental objectives nor any climate emergency?

30. In addition to power, the mast and cabinets create excess heat; the cooling fans can be heard and they make a loud noise. With the climate emergency which you keep stressing in your documents and policies, how can this make any sense? The slight rise in temperature around every structure will add to summer heat and we are hearing the BBC warning of heatwaves even without considering this extra source. Such warnings from The BBC and from the Council cause much mental anxiety.

31. it's well known that urban areas are warmer than rural (heat islands) the mast will increase this.

32. The site has a heavy footfall being adjacent to a library, local shops, bus shelter, community hall, gym etc

Some ideas for site specific objections or ones needing a little more knowledge

33. No long term health studies on 5G have been completed as the industry confessed to Senator Blumenthal in a USA Congress meeting. <https://tinyurl.com/3hft6y>

34. There is no **evidence** provided for the claimed benefits. There should be evidence shown for **any** planning application no matter what.

35. "**Perceived harm**" is a legitimate argument to prevent an application; actual harm does not have to be proven. Thus you can write that you **fear** harm to your health from the EMF or that you '**perceive risks**', for example to the environment (animals, birds, insects and plants) and your family. Mention any current health issues, for

example if someone in your home has a pacemaker or metal from reconstruction after an accident. Ask for proof that it will not affect any of those and proof of their insurance.

36. In 2003, **Swisscom AG** a telecom company wrote in a patent application among other issues, *"The influence of electrosmog on the human body is a known problem."* <https://tinyurl.com/4wtpve43> for the whole document
37. If there are any shops or businesses nearby ask what the Council has done to advise them on health and safety (legal) regulations and who to contact should there be any incident that could be related to the presence of the mast. Visit the shops and speak to the owners; leave some leaflets at the shop so customers can take them. All business owners, CEOs etc must have in place adequate H&S standards and procedures. The Council is introducing equipment that will affect them and about which employees have **a legal right to be fully informed**. The Council is the only authority that can give or refuse permission to a new mast and may be liable.
38. Any school or nursery in the vicinity should have been consulted. Ask to see evidence; both the letters and replies. **Have the potential dangers been explained sufficiently for the school authorities to respond intelligently?** (If a school has wifi then the children will be exposed for (say) 5 hours on each school day. Over their school and college career that makes a lot of hours. Schoolchildren have been described as "sensitive receptors". Does this make sense?)
39. Where there are other masts near and their signals will overlap with this new one, it renders the location unsuitable. What investigation has the council done to ascertain the complex effects caused by crossing of these multiple waves? Please reply with the details, including the technical specification to all the masts involved.
40. **Hospitals:** For a telecom structure near to a hospital or similar such as a Nursing Home the Council should take note of exclusions in the ICNIRP 2020 guideline. This would also be very important to a maternity ward because of the extra vulnerability of a foetus and a newborn baby and the likely high use of EMF within the hospital itself. Ask if the hospital has been consulted and if the potential dangers have been fully explained. Ask for copies.
ICNIRP states: *"Medical procedures may utilize EMFs, and metallic implants may alter or perturb EMFs in the body, which in turn can affect the body both directly (via direct interaction between field and tissue) and indirectly (via an intermediate conducting object)."* and continues **that such issues are outside the scope of the guidelines**. Do patient-facing staff know that?
NOTE: I have written a short paper especially for hospitals and other medical services. It can be downloaded from our website or email for a copy.
41. **Trees:** If there are trees near the mast, ask if the Council has consulted with their 'Tree Officer' or with a local 'tree warden'. (Many places have one or more volunteer wardens in such a role.) Excavation for cabinet bases and for cabling etc will damage the tree roots nearby and likely lead to the death of at least one tree. The following is quoted from a refusal. (Wolverhampton)
the mast *"risks presenting a detrimental harm to the adjacent protected trees. No supporting arboricultural impact assessment or details of the proposed excavation (including the root area) have been provided. The proposal's position within the root protection area of a mature beech tree, risks presenting significant harm to the tree's health. The beech tree together with the surrounding trees provide a positive*

contribution to the public realm. Subsequently, potential harm to this tree, with no evidence to prove otherwise, is contrary to saved UDP policies”

*One Council (**Solihull**) placed a protection order on a tree to prevent the applicant from lopping it.*

42. **Conservation area:** If the mast is within a conservation area (or any other designation, eg SSSI, PSI, AONB) that will give more possibilities to object. Particularly for example “the telecommunications mast and ancillary equipment cabinets are considered to present an unacceptable impact on the character of the scene in this Conservation Area”.

In planning there is a phrase “incompatible and inappropriate/unacceptable” use of land” which can be used in this context as well as others.

Note; Councils are mostly very protective of their conservation areas.

43. The mast site is within (eg) 500 metres of a children's play area in the local park. The radiation is particularly dangerous for children and babies and *I as a parent am afraid for their health.*
44. The New Hampshire Commission has decided on 500m distance from schools and homes and the State of Hawai'i has legislated in Bill 24 for ~183m and if the application is given an exemption it must be at least 1.2 times its height from the nearest building so it cannot fall on it.
45. The site is home to (eg) *newts/ frogs/ bats, rare orchids and* will be affected by the radiation. (We have found wildlife conservation organisations pretty useless as a help.) *(The argument is more effective if it is a protected species, a SSSI or PSI) and here is a compelling (2022) observational study you might send:*
<https://tinyurl.com/2jdeujkc>
46. The site is within (eg) 500 metres of a school / education facility, care home, over 60s flats etc where there are vulnerable people.
(See also an earlier point as the logic applies there also. You can ask if it has been tested for effects on medical equipment such as a pacemaker, it hasn't.)

END