

Address: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_ - \_\_\_\_\_ - 2007

Ian Hewitt Associates  
Town Planning Consultants  
7 Beech Drive  
Clowne  
Chesterfield  
Derbyshire  
S43 4UJ

Ref: NGW/Southwell ATE

Dear Sir,

The follow are my representations on the above proposed development, please take these considerations into account in your deliberations.

**Observations and Objections:**

1. **Objection** - That no one should have their health placed at risk when clear, unequivocal concerns have been raised by nationally appointed health bodies on the long term health effects of constant bombardment by microwave radiation. **This technology has not yet been proved as being safe.** I (*and the majority of my neighbours*) have deep-seated concerns and worries regarding mobile masts and their perceived detrimental effect on health grounds. Current research on this matter has merely concentrated on the effects of **tissue heating** from microwave emitting antenna. There is, however, a large body of scientific research that now challenges this view with regard to other possible symptoms such as increased cancer risk, sterility, effects on heart pacemakers etc, as well as the biological affects which has only had a limited degree of research, the results of which all point to potential adverse effects.

It is perhaps worth mentioning at this point that Kent County Council and other local authorities around the country no longer allow masts to be sited on council property on the grounds of growing health concerns.

2. **Objection** - That the "**precautionary principle**" recommended in the Government commissioned **Stewart Report**, which calls for a cessation in the erection of masts close to people until more is known about the possible health effects of mobile phone technology, appears to have been ignored.

3. **Objection** - That the proposed mast will be an eyesore and that the proposal would have a detrimental effect on the locality generally, and on amenities that ought, in the public interest, to be protected. No consideration, or insufficient consideration has been given to the adverse effect the proposal will have on the amenity of the area, or indeed this particular site.
4. **Objection** - That the proposed development in no way benefits the local community. Mobile phone coverage is more than adequate in this area the new mast is simply a commercial venture by the operator.
5. **Objection** - That the proposed development is out of character with the local area and will further degrade the value of the title Conservation Area.
6. **Objection** - That with the expected future concerns on mobile phone mast safety being similar to those recently raised regarding overhead power lines and television broadcast antennae, private property values will plummet in areas where masts have been erected in or near to residential properties. It is interesting to note that US and other European countries stipulate a minimum exclusion zone of 500m from mast sites to the vulnerable. The Stewart Report also recommends such exclusion zones **Paras 1.44-1.48 Stewart Report. It is also note worthy that the Ombudsman in relation to an objection over the failure of Swindon Borough Council to follow the correct procedures recommended that to correct the maladministration that the local authority pay the deference in loss of value of the property, which resulted in the local authority making total compensation payments of 119.500.**
7. **Observation** - Under current legislation, including the relevant Health & Safety Guidelines and the European Human Rights Act, there is already the very real potential for individual litigation processes to be instigated against Local Authorities, corporate bodies or individuals involved in any way in the approval, erection and operation of apparatus proposed in this and similar applications. It is therefore advised that you seriously consider investigating the legality and consequences, whether current or future, of your involvement in any approval of this and other similar applications in this Borough. Particularly in respect of your public liability insurance cover against the effects of emissions. Lloyds of London has recommended to its members that they do not cover the risks from mast emissions.

For all the reasons set out above I ask that this application be rejected.

Yours faithfully

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Name (print): \_\_\_\_\_

Tel: (Daytime) \_\_\_\_\_, (Evening) \_\_\_\_\_