

WHAT BRICK WALL?

I write to object strongly to erection of monopole 5G mast in application 23/00750/TEL56

A 5G mast on this exact site in Kirtlington's Conservation Area has already been turned down by Cherwell District Council and *then refused at appeal by the Planning Inspectorate*. This application refers incorrectly to a brick wall, which I use to exemplify, with other errors of fact, not just ignorance of the site but serious disregard for our Conservation Area and for the significance of the whole Conservation Area process and ideals. There is no brick wall behind this site, nor can I think of one within this whole Conservation Area. Kirtlington's Conservation Area, based on the standard format of English Heritage's document, *Conservation Area Appraisals*, was reappraised as recently as 2010. So, the proposed site, being within the Conservation Area, falls under The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Area) Act 1990.



Fig. 2: Red Rose Cottage

Turnpike Cottages (Fig.1), ▶ across the road from the proposed site to its North West, are even cited within that 2010 Conservation Appraisal document. Red Rose Cottage ◀ (Fig.2) is also right opposite (due North) the proposed site. [Photos taken from the proposed site!]



Fig. 1: Turnpike Cottages

Figure 3 (also taken from the proposed site) looks East, up Bletchington Road. Beyond the nearest house can be seen a row of traditional limestone cottages up to and beyond the red car; the nearest house maintains the style. This differs from the applicant's claim/photo with only trees and hedge, as though suggesting no residences close by to the East.



Fig. 3: View East from site: row of limestone cottages as far as and beyond red car.

Furthermore, the proposed site is at a very obvious position for those entering the old part of this village from the West on the A4095, on a descending hill from which the mast and cabinets will be in full view. It would be a totally incongruous sight for a Conservation Area village! In fact, this site would be prominently in view from every direction.

To the due South of the site the land drops away to fields and then up again to Bletchington. From this direction the mast will be seen from a distance. There are several errors in what the application suggests is there already. Figure 4 shows a portion of the traditional limestone (not brick!!) wall.



Fig.4: Looking due South, a short section of the limestone wall, referred to as a brick wall in the application. It is also not a very high wall.

Furthermore, there is no street lighting here.

As well as the old stone residences mentioned, there is also Troy House, hidden by tall hedging, and all of these add to my next point that there are nearby residences all around this proposed site, except for due South [See Google map]. In the previous planning application 21/03350/TEL56 other sites in the village were shown as having been considered and rejected (correctly) because near residences. As regards the scientific literature on radio-frequency radiation and health risk, laboratory studies have shown evidence of risk to health and it is argued that the 5G system uses a wider range of radio-frequency waves than earlier networks. In an overview of research articles about 5G masts and health risk, one finds an ongoing scientific debate, the full details requiring very specialist knowledge, but we can all see there is debate and disagreement. In this literature, it is regularly explained that the effects on health accumulate with long-term

results. So, it is worth noting that the SCENIHR of the EU in its very thorough review of ‘*Potential health effects of exposure to electromagnetic fields*’, including effects on brain tissue, nervous and other systems, genetic code and more, is careful to summarise that ‘*further research should be conducted particularly as pertains to long term exposure and potential risks of exposure to multiple sources.*’ The point is that, as cumulative effects are acknowledged, a suggestion of long-term harm should not be neglected as the issue clearly requires later research to observe later results. So, one must conclude that the extent of risk remains unresolved, which is not proof of the negative. So, at present this only means that 5G masts should not be sited where there are residences, such as within a village. If one day such effects are found to have accumulated harmfully, whom will the affected individuals or their families sue? One certainly cannot say that there have been no warnings of risks to health.

In the current application (23/00750/TEL56) there is the claim that this one site is the only option site and is essential because of certain radii. In contrast, the previous application (21/03350/TE56) claimed to have considered many other sites and that some of these were not chosen because of residences nearby (!). With so many options considered in the previous application along the length of our linear village, many options to go out of the village at a right angle to this North-South axis must logically exist, away from residences.

Furthermore, as so many sites were previously considered, I draw attention to the statement in the applicants’ covering letter for this application: ‘*The location has been identified as being necessary for Cignal Infrastructure UK Ltd business development.*’ Such a claim may indeed be viewed as important from within that business, but is a totally inappropriate reason to break the constraints of a Conservation Area duly appraised, set up and then re-appraised as recently as 2010. The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Area) Act 1990 exists to defend against such pressures. It is the inappropriate siting of such a tall monopole plus large cabinets, so obvious from any direction, within a Conservation Area that surely means this application must be refused. The suggestion that green paint would change this situation just emphasises the applicants’ lack of sensitivity to Conservation Area perspectives. It is hard to imagine anything suitable to obscure such a mast and cabinets. Enclosing them in local stone walling would look either like some very tall, illogical stone tower or a stone bunker with a tall monopole rising out of it. Not only ridiculous, such a strange structure would be equally out of keeping with the Conservation Area, and anyway the site would still be close to residences, in some of which (I add, as relevant in the health risk literature) are very young children. It would seem logical to consider siting it on higher ground out of the village.

Finally, I ask the District Council to read all the arguments made by the Planning Inspectorate in upholding the Council’s decision to refuse the previous application 21/03350/TEL56. These arguments can be found in PINS appeal decision against APP/C3105/W/22/3290284 and have not been addressed in this current application, but they still apply.

Helen Macbeth
Kirtlington.