

Planning application 135908/TEL/2023: Telecommunications mast on the corner of Cranmer Road and Fog Lane.

Professor Simon Turner
15 Fog Lane.
Didsbury

As a resident of a property closest to the proposed mast location I would hope my comments will be given proper consideration.

I object to this planning proposal on the following grounds:

- 1. The failure of the applicant to follow the guidelines provided by the government that are cited in the application.**
- 2. The inappropriate nature of the site proposed**
- 3. The implication for health of prolonged exposure of 5G radiation.**
- 4. The superfluous nature of the technology given the existing infrastructure.**

I will elaborate on these arguments below

1. The failure of the applicant to follow the guidelines for identifying a suitable site.

As the applicants themselves point out the government advocates “the sequential approach for sites is as follows: Masts and sharing site sharing, existing building structures, ground based installation”.

Sharing existing sites: We currently have 5G masts on the junction of Fog Lane and the Kingsway and at the junction of Palatine Road and Lapwing Lane both within a few hundred metres. The applicant provides nothing to support the assertions that these sites are not appropriate. The facts are that existing masts already provide 5G coverage for other networks such as Vodafone (see below) in the location proposed for the mast.

Existing building structures: Those who encouraged the roll out of 5G, have proposed that the need for a large number of ugly and intrusive masts at high density is supposedly offset by the fact that the smaller masts could be sited on existing structures. However, there appears to have been no attempt to consider any industrial buildings and the applicants appear to have only considered ground-based installations within residential areas. We are close to a telecommunication exchange on Wilmslow Road that would surely make an excellent existing structure to attach a 5G mast. I am happy to suggest any number of other existing sites that are far more appropriate but have not been considered. I am sure these would be known to the applicants if they had carried out any, but the most cursory survey. The application clearly documents the failure to consider anything other than ground-based sites in residential areas. I assume that the ground-based location has been selected deliberately solely on the basis of cost and accessibility. Clearly this would be no basis for granting planning permission.

2. The inappropriate nature of the site proposed

In 2010 I was granted planning permission to replace my rotting wooden garage with asbestos roof tiles with a new brick-built structure with an appropriately tiled roof. The existing structure was in a poor state of repair and frankly was an eyesore. Even though this structure resided entirely within my property, sat well back from Cranmer Road and was barely visible from the road, planning permission was only granted on the condition that I use the approved specified antique style bricks and appropriate tiling. Clearly this reflects the view of the council planning department that it was important to retain the architectural and aesthetic appeal of the unique Cranmer Road location.

The applicant's suggestion that "Proposed location of a new mast shown above will assimilate well into the immediate street scene and not be detrimental" is clearly utterly preposterous. This would it is entirely obvious to any who considers the proposal and knows the local area. For the for the council planning department to agree to such a proposal would be astonishing and an act of staggering hypocrisy.

In rejecting several other potential sites, the applicants have cited them as being in a residential area, however, the proposed site is an entirely residential area. By the applicant's own criteria this would also render the proposed Cranmer Road site equally unsuitable.

To make matters worse it offers no benefits to those residents in the immediate vicinity who are already serviced by far superior infrastructure (see below).

3. The implication for health of prolonged exposure of 5G radiation.

While I understand there are many rumour and conspiracy theories regarding 5G. In the absence of definitive data much of the guidance is taken from the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP), a private German non-governmental organization. As a trained scientist and currently a Professor in the School of Biological Science at the University of Manchester I have always considered peer-review scientific publications the gold standard. While obviously there is insufficient space to go into all of the arguments I would urge you to read a peer-reviewed paper author by Professor John Frank a prominent epidemiologist at the University of Edinburgh, who I believe has clearly and fairly summarised the issues. The paper was published in 2021 in *Epidemiology and Community Health* volume 75 p562–566. I would strongly urge you to study the entire manuscript, however in the interests of brevity and accessibility I include the abstract below.

"New fifth generation (5G) telecommunications systems, now being rolled out globally, have become the subject of a fierce controversy. Some health protection agencies and their scientific advisory committees have concluded that there is no conclusive scientific evidence of harm. Several recent reviews by independent scientists, however, suggest that there is significant uncertainty on this question, with rapidly emerging evidence of potentially harmful biological effects from radio frequency electromagnetic field (RF-EMF) exposures, at the levels 5G roll-out will entail. This essay identifies four relevant sources of scientific uncertainty and concern: (1) lack of clarity about precisely what technology is included in 5G; (2) a rapidly accumulating body of laboratory studies documenting disruptive in vitro and in vivo effects of RF-EMFs— but one with many gaps in it; (3) an almost total lack (as yet) of high-quality epidemiological studies of adverse human health effects from 5G EMF exposure specifically, but rapidly emerging epidemiological evidence of such effects from past generations of RF-EMF exposure; (4) persistent allegations that some national telecommunications regulatory authorities do not base their RF-EMF safety policies on the latest science, related to

unmanaged conflicts of interest. The author, an experienced epidemiologist, concludes that one cannot dismiss the growing health concerns about RF-EMFs, especially in an era when higher population levels of exposure are occurring widely, due to the spatially dense transmitters which 5G systems require. Based on the precautionary principle, the author echoes the calls of others for a moratorium on the further roll-out of 5G systems globally, pending more conclusive research on their safety."

Considering this uncertainty, I would at least hope that we should proceed with caution and make at least some efforts to minimise exposure. In contrast, if this applicant be successful, I would be sleeping every night with my head less than 4 metres from a 5G mast. Children playing in the garden would literally be in touching distance of it. It is hard to think of a more inappropriate and injudicious location.

4. The superfluous nature of the technology given the existing infrastructure.

As with all applications of this type it is possible to that anyone objecting can be accused of being a NIMBE. In this instance the proposed site is already blighted with BT telephone and Openreach exchanges and 2 installations that support the cable network. While none are aesthetically pleasing, attract graffiti and posters and are generally unwelcome they do at least provide the resident with absolutely first-rate internet connections. The governs own directive to encourage conductivity considers not only 5G, but the installation of "Gigabyte" broadband connections. As a consequence of the existing cable network, those that wish may already access full fibre broadband with Gigabyte broadband speeds. The proposed site is already far ahead of curve when it comes to satisfying any government's aim to encourage greater connectivity. Further degradation of the local environment to accommodate an ever increasing density of ugly and intrusive 5G masts is clearly entirely superfluous.

I would also question the need for any further 5G connectivity. Neither my own iphone nor that of my wife's is incompatible with 5G, but my daughter has a basic iphone compatible with 5G. We are able to get a perfectly acceptable 5G signal from inside of our house, not that there is any reason to use it with existence of such exceptional broadband connectivity. The 5G signal outside is even better and is likely to increase even further as phone manufacturers improve phone technology to further increasing their ability to detect a signal. If we are able to obtain a 5G signal from masts situated in existing locations, it makes you wonder why those same locations are not appropriate for this new network.

Your sincerely
Professor Simon Turner
15 Fog Lane.