

Telephone Mast : Fog Lane/Cranmer 135908/TEL/2023

Steven Brear <sgbrear@yahoo.com>

Sun 2023-02-05 1:08 PM

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

Cc: Andrew Simcock <cllr.andrew.simcock@manchester.gov.uk>; Linda Foley <cllr.linda.foley@manchester.gov.uk>; cllrjames.wilson@manchester.gov.uk <cllrjames.wilson@manchester.gov.uk>

You don't often get email from sgbrear@yahoo.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear sirs/madam

I wish to strongly object to the erection of a telecoms mast at the junction of Fog Lane/Cranmer Rd on the following grounds:

1. No clear evidence has been presented in the application that this mast is essential nor that it has been requested by the residents in the locale. The vast majority are, or could easily be, well serviced with cable broadband. The case for this 5G mast is not made on local amenity or access to broadband grounds.
2. According to Hutchinson Communications own submission, the proposed site is very suboptimal being several hundred metres from the original proposed location and at the very edge of their acceptability and effectiveness zone. The optimal site was rejected in part, on the grounds of residential density yet the new proposed site is similarly flawed.
3. There are well documented health concerns regarding EMR from reputable industry-independent sources.

[EMFscientist.org - Home](#) ,

EMFscientist.org - Home

EMFscientist.org is dedicated to the International Electromagnetic Field Scientist Appeal. submitted to the Unit...

[We Have No Reason to Believe 5G Is Safe - Scientific American Blog Network](#) ,

This is a densely residential area and includes the Didsbury Village Day Nursery. Whilst there are many industry funded/aligned rebuttals of claims of harm from EMR, I know of no independent research showing categorically that 5G EMR is SAFE.

4. The mast would be an unacceptable eyesore in a prominent **residential** location and, along with the health concerns, would clearly be detrimental to the area. Alternative, less obtrusive sites should be considered. For example commercial properties/areas around

Didsbury, near the Poppy Walk, Catterick Rd (pavement widening to accommodate the mast easily feasible), along the metro or at the periphery of parks (Fog Lane/Didsbury etc). Could you please highlight which of these and others have been considered and ruled out and on what grounds.

Dr SG Brear
1 Fog Lane