

Sarah Valentine

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 15 March 2026 14:39
To: planninginfo
Cc: richardcherry; Janice Henwood (Cllr); David Eggleton (Cllr)
Subject: OBJECTION BURGESS HILL OBJECTION - Franklands DM/26/0328

[REDACTED]

SITING AND APPEARANCE

I strongly object to the above proposal. I visit Burgess Hill regularly and I am deeply concerned about this, not least on the grounds of siting and appearance. The location is densely residential; the nearest houses are only 30 metres away across the road in Lurgashall. The installation would be an ugly monstrosity, be visible in all directions, and impact the visual amenity of the area. It is also shocking that Birchwood Grove School is 330 metres away and Woodlands Mead School is 340 meters away, and would impact the development of children (see below). Moreover, it is very significant that Burgess Hill Town Council have already stated: "Effect of 5G In addition, the health impacts of 5G remain unclear from the reports submitted with the application. This remains a technology in infancy and appropriate considerations should be taken when installing in residential areas".

https://padocs.midsussex.gov.uk/PublicAccess_LIVE/Document/ViewDocument?id=26BAE92071F947E9A377787C785AA6CD

NEW HAMPSHIRE COMMISSION-EXCLUSION ZONE

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 only sets guidelines not legal standards; the ICNIRP certificate is not a safety certificate. The guidelines were set by Germany, and are therefore are NOT international. Each country sets its own standards. Moreover, ICNIRP was never commissioned. The guidelines only protect against thermal effects, not non-thermal effect, and do not address cumulative effects over a lifetime. However, there is evidence of harm below ICNIRP safety levels (International Commission of the Biological Effects of EMF's [icbeemf.org] or ehtrust.org or rfinfo.co.uk). Basically, the ICNIRP certificate is industry based whereby telecom companies self-certify; this raises serious questions regarding conflict of interests. specifically excludes those with medical implants.

The Swisscom patent application WO2004075583A1 has revealed that non-thermal radiation is carcinogenic. However, ICNIRP only covers thermal effects.

HEALTH

As well as the cumulative effects of electro-magnetic frequencies, ICNIRP does not consider fetuses, babies and children. Children are 'sensitive receptors' to microwave radiation (MWR), because their brain tissues are more absorbent, their skulls are thinner, and their relative size is smaller. The elderly are also sensitive. 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 Judicial Review, *Thomas v Cheltenham Borough*, 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 must satisfy 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.

Principle 2 states that consultations needs to ensure: "there is sufficient information to give 'intelligent consideration'. The information provided must relate to the consultation and must be available, accessible, and easily interpretable for consultees to provide an informed response." Breaches of the Gunning principles mean council consultations are not legitimate.

Thank you for considering my objection.

[REDACTED]
35 Hillier Road
Wandsworth
London
SW11 6AXA