

Sarah Valentine

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 10 June 2025 20:14
To: planninginfo
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: OBJECTION LATTICE TOWER M/25/1349

[REDACTED]

BURGESS HILL OBJECTION
M/25/1349

SITING AND APPEARANCE

I object to the installation. Although I do not live in the area I do visit Burgess Hill, because I used to live in Brighton. 5G is an extremely important issue, and the roll out of this technology is of national importance. The bulky high lattice tower would be ugly monstrosity-a horrid eyesore, and will impact the visual amenity. The South West Corner of Batchelors Farm Nature Reserve, and Nightingale Meadows are very popular open spaces. Also, the higher ground looks onto the South Downs and two windmills. Moreover, there are also tree preservation orders on Nightingale Lane, and horses nearby. Industrialization of the site is highly inappropriate.

5G towers emit high levels of electro-magnetic radiation (EMFs); this will impact residences within 370m, and the nearby Woodlands Meads School in Chanctonbury Road.

NEW HAMPSHIRE COMMISSION-EXCLUSION ZONE

ICNIRP have set a safe distance of 50m for a mast. However, the New Hampshire Commission was formed through legislation to access and mitigate the risks caused by wireless antennas used in the telecoms industry. The commission included experts in: physics, toxicology, epidemiology, biostatistics, occupational health medicine, public health policy, business and law. Their overarching conclusion was that wireless antennas be placed no less than 500m from residents, parks, playgrounds, hospitals, nursing homes, day care centres and schools. This recommendation is evidence based, and therefore globally applicable.

The full transcript with 15 recommendations can be downloaded at:

<https://www.gencourt.state.nh.us/statstudcomm/committees/1474/reports/5G%20final%20report.pdf>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DWK74ie7krc>

<https://rfinfo.co.uk/new-hants-commission/>

ICNIRP (International Commission Non Ionising Radiation Protection)

ICNIRP does not issue safety certificates; telecom companies self-certify, and ICNIRP cannot verify their accuracy. Also, the ICNIRP certificate is not a safety certificate; it sets guidelines but does not set legal standards. The guidelines were set by Germany, and therefore are NOT international. Basically, ICNIRP DOES NOT SET INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS- each country sets its own standards. Moreover, ICNIRP was never commissioned.

NEW HAMPSHIRE COMMISSION-EXCLUSION ZONE

ICNIRP have set a safe distance of 50m for a mast. However, the New Hampshire Commission was formed through legislation to access and mitigate the risks caused by wireless antennas used in the telecoms industry. The commission included experts in: physics, toxicology, epidemiology, biostatistics, occupational health medicine, public health policy, business and law. Their overarching conclusion was that wireless antennas be placed no less than 500m from residents, parks, playgrounds, hospitals, nursing homes, day care centres and schools. This recommendation is evidence based, and therefore globally applicable.

The full transcript with 15 recommendations can be downloaded at:

<https://www.gencourt.state.nh.us/statstudcomm/committees/1474/reports/5G%20final%20report.pdf>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DWK74ie7krc>

<https://rfinfo.co.uk/new-hants-commission/>

HEALTH

Moreover, ICNIRP does not address the cumulative effects of electro-magnetic frequencies over a lifetime and does not consider fetuses, babies and children. Children are ‘sensitive receptors’ to microwave radiation (MWR), because their brain tissues are more absorbent (affects cognitive development), their skulls are thinner, and their relative size is smaller.

Countries worldwide have introduced laws to reduce children’s exposure to Wi-Fi citing potential health effects, including France, Russia and India. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2213879X14000583>

<https://www.cbsnews.com/amp/detroit/news/france-bans-smart-phones-in-schools/>

LEGAL MATTERS

ICNIRP also excludes the biological effects of electro-magnetic frequencies/radio frequencies EMFs/RFs on bodily implants such as, pacemakers, hip replacements, dental braces etc. Also, many people are electro sensitive. In a recent Judicial Review, *Thomas v Cheltenham Borough* Judge Jarman ruled, in relation to a local care home that: “The failure on the part of the (local) authority to grapple with potential impacts on medical implants was, in my judgment, was an error and this ground succeeds”. At the High Court, *Thomas V Cheltenham Council*, the court clarified the legal position for Local Planning Authorities regarding EMF on bodily metal implants. The court distinguished general health and specific risks regarding metal implants, and advised discretion.

WILDLIFE

EMFs/RFs radiation have harmful effects on wildlife including: insects, bees, birds, and bats that live close to cell towers. Trees, plants and bacteria have also been found to be impacted.

<https://ehtrust.org/electromagnetic-radiation-wildlife-and-environment/>

BIODIVERSITY

The Council are also obliged to consider Environment, Biodiversity Net Gain, Sustainability, Climate and Carbon targets.

LIABILITY COVER

Swiss Re Group insurance have stated “concerns regarding potential negative health effects from electromagnetic fields...An uptick in liability claims could be a potential long term consequence...”

<https://www.swissre.com/institute/research/sonar/sonar2019/SONAR2019-off-the-leash.html>

RISK ASSESSMENT

The council need some sort of risk assessment. The council should consider the precautionary principle if they do not know what they are being asked to erect is safe, and will not cause harm to the environment and people.

GUNNING PRINCIPAL

The council should also take account of the four points within the Gunning Principal The council are legally bound by the Gunning principal to consult with the public in a fair and informative way, which was highlighted in the High Court case *West Dulwich v London Borough of Lambeth* on May 9th 2025; Judge Tim Smith ruled that Lambeth failed to consider key evidence evidence/public input and was thus unlawful. The council appealed this decision and lost.

Thank you for considering my objection.

████████████████████
35 Hillier Road
London
SW11 6AX

