

135908/TEL/2023 Cranmer Road Fog Lane 5G mast

Doctors <gordon.parker@doctors.org.uk>

Mon 2023-02-06 9:49 AM

To: Adam Mitchell <Adam.Mitchell@manchester.gov.uk>

Cc: bcoombe@mcrlibdems.uk <bcoombe@mcrlibdems.uk>; John Leech <cllr.john.leech@manchester.gov.uk>

You don't often get email from gordon.parker@doctors.org.uk. [Learn why this is important](#)

For the attention of Adam Mitchell (Planning Officer)

Proposed 15m Mobile Mast, Junction of Cranmer Road and Fog Lane 135908/TEL/2023

We should like to object to this proposal in very strong terms:

- (1) Are you satisfied that the mast and its supporting structures will be below 15m?
- (2) Even if the mast height is compliant, the planning application states that "[The] proposed location of new mast shown above will assimilate well into the immediate street scene and not be detrimental" and that it will be "...a better fit within the local community...offering a reduced visual impact...". Those statements are astonishing and (in my view) absolutely wrong. The area around Cranmer Road and Fog Lane is an attractive residential area of a mixture of early 20th century houses and modern developments on Fog Lane (opposite the proposed site). The proposed site has housing and mature trees and only someone who has never visited the site could claim that a 15m mast and associated cabinets would "not be detrimental" and not have a significant and damaging visual impact.
- (3) Are you satisfied that all alternative options have been properly and thoroughly investigated and discounted on legitimate grounds? The application points to other possible sites (including Catterick Road, School Lane, Atwood Road) and rejects them on a variety of grounds – including (ironically) that one of them is "residential". Have other less residential sites been fully examined – for example the car park areas around Aldi on Wilmslow Road, School Lane Car park or behind the commercial properties adjacent to the Metrolink line between Ogden Street and Wilmslow Road? The application admits that the Council's Mast Register was *not* used to check for suitable sites. Why not - surely it should have been consulted?
- (4) Following from point (3) - if this proposed site is rated as 'amber' i.e. one of the least technically favoured options (in terms of coverage and distance to 'next mast') why – exactly – has it been chosen? Ease of construction access (pavements, width of road etc) is not a good reason for imposing a detrimental mast in this residential area.
- (5) The photograph of the Cranmer Road / Fog Lane junction and the proposed site elevation plan A given in the application show an extremely 'biased' view of the actual site. The photograph is wide-angle and does not give an accurate visual picture of the whole affected area, including the opposite corner and the housing across the road on Fog Lane. The elevation shows only the house on the corner where the mast will be placed (15 Fog Lane) and gives the impression that the site is more spacious than it actually is. We note that
 - a. The proposed cabinet height will be significantly greater than - and additional to – the existing cabinets (a visual detriment on a residential corner).
 - b. The visual impact of the mast will be greatest for the houses on Fog Lane (42 to 50). This is not shown on the photograph or plans.
- (6) Are you fully satisfied that a suitable and sufficient risk assessment has been carried out in relation to the radiofrequency radiation emissions from the proposed mast? We note that the application is said to be ICNIRP compliant. It would say that, but has there been a site-specific risk assessment, particularly for RF levels at the height of first and second floors of the closest houses (13 / 15 and 42-50 Fog Lane). RF levels at ground (from a 15m mast) may

currently be considered ICNIRP compliant but have levels at 5-10m (the height of bedrooms) been risk-assessed, and have you seen and approved the risk assessments?

- (7) In general terms, it is understood that health risk from radiofrequency electromagnetic radiation masts at ground level is presently thought to be low, but the aim of any risk-assessment and risk mitigation is to reduce risk as far as is reasonably practicable. Why site a mast close to houses and on a route used by residents, school children and people using the amenities of Fog Lane Park, when the longer-term and as yet unknown effects of cumulative exposure for this group and other individuals who frequently use Fog Lane and Cranmer Road could be reduced by siting the mast in a 'less residential' area (commercial areas off Wilmslow Road for example)?

We trust that you will take note of these points and reject this application.

Dr Gordon Parker
Dr Susan Turner

22 Sussex Avenue
Manchester M20 6AQ