

Comments for Planning Application 22/01531/Y

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/01531/Y

Address: Telecommunication Mast Adjacent To Gloucester Road Horfield Bristol BS7 0AB

Proposal: Application to determine if prior approval is required for a proposed telecommunications installation: Proposed 15.0m Phase 9 Super Slimline Monopole C/W wrapround cabinet at base and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Liam Fisher

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Sian Thomas

Address: 3 Western Rd Horfield Bristol BS7 8UP

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I am writing to object to application 22/01531/Y Prior Notification - telecommunications of a 15m Mast adjacent to Gloucester Road, Horfield, Bristol, BS7 0AB on the following grounds:

1. The mast would be opposite our house as the crow flies and therefore would be intrusive to the view of residential properties on the street. It also has the potential of significantly affecting the value of our property as a result of its erection. I do not understand why the council doesn't see this as a legitimate reason to object to the development. A quick google search reveals the possibility of "Estimates of the effect on property prices vary and no academic research has been carried out. However, Mast Sanity believes anecdotal evidence from its hotline indicates a mast will knock between 15 and 25 per cent off the value of a house, depending on how close it is and the size of the structure". <https://www.theguardian.com/money/2003/may/25/houseprices.uknews>

2. It would also be opposite Horfield Common - a rare green space used by many to sit on the park benches, walk dogs, and by young children and young adults to play and exercise. It would therefore be an eye sore and intrusive to a green space that is the site of a listed building and this eyesore would further spoil the aesthetics of the green space and the nature that lives in it.

3. It is also approximately 300m from Bishopthorpe playground, which is less than the 500m distance that is recommended by The New Hampshire Commission requires wireless telecommunication antennas to be placed at least 1,640 feet (500m) from residents, parks, playgrounds, hospitals, nursing homes, day care centres and schools. The 13-strong expert commission was formed through legislation to include experts in: physics, toxicology, electro-magnetics, epidemiology, biostatistics, occupational health medicine, public health policy,

business and law. This recommendation is evidence based, and such evidence is globally applicable. Transcript pertinent to the 500m setback Dr Kent Chamberlain: November 2021 <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DWK74ie7krc>

4. As the safety and health impact of such masts on humans and insects and wildlife are still under scientific investigation and we are all awaiting such research outcomes in the UK, it seems prudent to be cautious and to keep such developments away from green spaces, play parks, schools and residential areas.

5. I currently have 2 children, one of which suffers from migraines and I also suffer from sensitivity to buzzing noises. We are already close to an electricity generator and have many electricity cables that emit sound at times and already disturb us. As well being disturbed by frequent ambulances I feel this area has enough potential pollution effects that the last thing it needs is further risk of pollution. And studies have found a correlation as quoted below.

Lopez et al - What is the radiation prior to 5G? March 2021. A correlation study between measurements in situ and in real time and epidemiological indicators in Vallecas, Madrid. The study reports dizziness, headaches and sleep disturbances.

<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33434609/> Limiting liability with positioning to minimize the negative health effects of cellular phone towers. This JD PEARCE paper states "There is a large and growing body of evidence that human exposure to RFR from cellular phone base stations causes negative health effects, including both i) neuropsychiatric complaints such as headache, concentration difficulties, memory changes, dizziness, tremors, depressive symptoms, fatigue and sleep disturbance, and ii) increased incidence of cancer in those living in proximity to a cell-phone transmitter station.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/337624982_Limiting_liability_with_positioning_to_minimize_negative_health_effects_of_cellular_phone_towers4) Mobile phone mast health effects: J. Moskovic March 2021 <https://www.saferemr.com/2015/04/cell-tower-health-effects.html>5) First Study so Far: 5G Causes the Microwave Syndrome: Lennart Hardell et al, Swedish Radiation Protection Foundation, 22 Feb. 2022 - automatic translation, as posted on 'Towards Better Health' by Meris Michaels

<https://ehtrust.org/study-5g-causes-microwave-syndrome/><https://mieuxprevenir.blogspot.com/2022/02/first-study-so-far-5g-causes-microwave.html?fbclid=IwAR2jNAFoHPsdCkACfShSDP5EBG4-eD6-QXf4gZOP08ObDLI2V308AFDsJ0s#more6>6)

2020 NIR Consensus Statement: UK initiative, health effects from RFR - signed by over 3500 medical and scientific experts. <https://phiremedical.org/2020-nir-consensus-statement-read/>Finally, in a time when we need to be reducing our energy outputs due to climate crisis and health crisis,

should we really be erecting more masts and encouraging more internet usage.

Yours sincerely
Sian Thomas