

# Comment for planning application 21/03350/TEL

<b>Application Number</b>	21/03350/TEL
<b>Location</b>	Street Record Station Road Kirtlington
<b>Proposal</b>	Proposed 5G Telecommunications Installation
<b>Case Officer</b>	John Cosgrove
<b>Organisation Name</b>	Helen Macbeth
<b>Address</b>	4 South End Cottages,Bletchingdon Road,Kirtlington,Kidlington,OX5 3HF
<b>Type of Comment</b>	Objection
<b>Type</b>	neighbour
<b>Comments</b>	<p>Objection to Planning Application 21/03350/TEL I argue that a 5G mast should not be sited near residences. This view has supported arguments for refusal of an 5G mast elsewhere and proximity to residential housing is even mentioned in this SSSI as reason against some options. As scientific discussions on distance and longer-term effects remain real and unresolved (see points made below), the proximity issue should preclude a 5G mast from being within a village. The proposed site is not only within Kirtlington's village envelope, with residences all around it, but it is within the CONSERVATION AREA of this old stone Oxfordshire village. The exact position proposed for mast with wrap-around cabinet, plus 3 other large cabinets, plus paved area, would have a totally inappropriate visual effect soon after entering this traditional rural village. Seen at ground level, today that site has green verge around a junction where two minor roads join the main road. Verge on northwest side of road is a wildflower area. For those entering the village, the current view is of old stone buildings in several directions, seen across green verge and, in season, wildflowers. It is a very traditional village scene. The 15 metre height of the mast with structure at top, even without any light, will be overwhelming and visible from several angles further away. The Council should require this mast to be sited outside the village envelope. Connectivity is understood, but costs of additional cabling are not a planning matter, but a cost to the firm which it would recoup with later profits from transmissions via the mast. That level of extra distance of optical-fibre and other cabling has minimal effect on the connectivity. From the limited information given, plus the sites considered in the SSSI and turned down, one gains some idea of the radii of coverage desired for the proposed mast, and so, because our village is linear, coverage can be presumed to be equally good or better from several sites outside of the village. Again, cost issues are not a planning matter. Scientific papers on radiofrequency radiation/health have regularly drawn attention to specific risks to human health and other life near such masts, including criticism of the WHO reassurances on the matter. Please note that the EU's SCENIHR report on potential health effects of exposure ends with the statement 'Further research should be conducted, particularly as pertains to long term exposure and potential risks of exposure to multiple sources.' The point about multiple sources is noted and risk from this mast should not be added within a village. A mast once erected is permanent and today very young children live within short radii of this proposed site. If the benefits from the progress of 5G communication technology cannot wait for that 'further research', then the site for this 5G mast should be outside of the village envelope. As some scientific research papers support the view that there are health risks, the suggestion of harm cannot be neglected and at least one must conclude that the matter is unresolved, which is not proof of the negative. Instead consider, if one day such harm is found to have occurred, whom will the affected individuals or their families sue in the future? One cannot say that there have been no warnings of health issues. CDC should take note of all these points and its potential responsibility for any risk, and not allow a 5G mast on this site or anywhere within a village envelope.</p>
<b>Received Date</b>	28/10/2021 14:43:51
<b>Attachments</b>	