

---

**Sent:** 18/10/2018 6:10:39 PM  
**Subject:** Online Submission

18/10/2018

MR GB Walkom  
Lantana AVE  
Wheeler Heights NSW 2097  
gregg.walkom@gmail.com

**RE: DA2018/1481 - 1 / 0 Veterans Parade NARRABEEN NSW 2101**

We strongly object to the proposed construction of a mobile phone tower at 1 Lakeshore Drive Narrabeen. Our house is in close proximity, less than 150m from the proposed site. We can see the RSL ANZAC Village's multi storey building partially obscured by trees from our property but the proposed tower would be more than three times the height of this building, monstrously excessive at 40 metres and an obtrusive focal point in a bushland setting, dwarfing even the tallest trees. It is inconceivable that this proposal is even considered.

In addition, there needs to be more scientific information provided by impartial agencies with health assurances given to nearby residents regarding the EMR effects especially as 5G technology is rapidly advancing. Currently there is no information accompanying this proposal on the long term health effects from exposure to these emission levels other than from the telecommunication agencies themselves. We question if the members of the Council, telecommunications agencies, or the Village decision-making team would be content to allow their own families, especially children to live in close proximity to such a tower.

A quick online search reveals a plethora of information and research studies that show the adverse affects of such mobile towers close to residential areas.

- "People living within 300m of such a tower showed an increased rate of unpleasant symptoms: Nausea, loss of appetite, visual disruptions and difficulty in moving - within less than 10m. Irritability, depression, concentration problems, memory loss, dizziness and reduced libido - within 100m. Headaches, sleep problems, feelings of discomfort and skin problems - within 100-200m. High rate of fatigue - within 200-300m. (Study by Dr Roger Santini, France)
- A study in Belo Horizonte Brazil looked at the addresses of 7,141 people that had died from cancers of the prostate, breasts, lungs, kidneys and liver. These were cross checked against cell tower locations within the city. It found that those who lived within 500 metres of a phone tower had a higher mortality rate than the average mortality rate of the entire city.
- In Netanya, Israel, a study by Wolf and Wolf, found an increase of 4.15 times in the cancer incidence of residents living within 350m of a base station.
- In Naila, Germany, the risk of new cancer cases was three times greater among the patients who had lived at a distance less than 400 m from a cellular telephone transmitter antenna during the last ten years."

Source: Mobile Safety, Mobile Towers, accessed 8 October 2018  
<https://www.mobilesafety.com.au/mobile-phone-towers/>

Given the potential health risks and our neighbourhood's close proximity to the base station, the tower must not proceed at this location. The negatives to the nearby community and schools far outweigh any positives.

It is also important to consider the local flora and fauna. This tower is meant to serve the Village's 'Dardanelles' site, in our opinion an already contentious site. An aerial view of this site clearly shows the vast expanse of natural habitat that was cleared to build 130 units and function centre, fragmenting the highly sensitive environmental area by a bridge and roads, isolating native animal habits into pockets, which leads to overcrowding and displacement of territorial species, as well as removal of their food source. Why was mobile phone coverage not considered prior to the development of 'Dardanelles'? Is the tower planned to serve future undisclosed development that will clear more bushland areas?

In May 2018, the Manly Daily revealed the Village's plans to continue its expansion and residential capacity at the 'Darby and Joan' site, adjacent to the recently developed 'Gallipoli' site, covering over 11,000 square metres, with a six storey high rise living complex consisting of 86 two bedroom units and 208 parking spaces, with a roof top pool and recreation centre. This structure is incompatible with the existing site and does not consider the load on infrastructure and impacts on local residents and natural surrounds. If this proceeds, should residents in Lantana Ave expect more high rise developments in the future?

With reference to the 'Statement of environment effects - Application for development consent' document, prepared on behalf of Telstra Corporation Limited by Visionstream Pty Ltd, we note that many points are not substantiated with fact. It also appears that the Village residents were only presented with a biased perspective from a Telecommunications company and without any impartial agency input or opinions from nearby residents before making their collective decision on the Plan C 40m Tower.

Significant points from this document are worth questioning:

- "The proposed installation will provide possible opportunities for future co-location on the monopole by other carriers."

Is the potential to expand this project and increase EMR already anticipated and planned? What are the health implications of adding extra carriers, Optus, Vodafone, etc to the Telstra Tower?

- "Negotiations with the RSL Club and its residents have been ongoing for many months to find a suitable location and solution for the coverage problems currently being experienced. It has taken extensive negotiations to reach the current point. Internal discussions at the RSL have taken place and the residents are aware of the proposed installation and its location."

As is the case for the proposed 'Darby and Joan' site expansion, it appears not all residents are aware. Was an impartial agency sought to assist Village residents in coming to a decisions or was it emotionally based considering the term "negotiations" is used.

- "Telstra and Visionstream has been in negation with the RSL to find a suitable position on the premises to place the proposed new mobile base station. Several locations have been considered, which include two proposals for rooftop installations on existing buildings. Initial discussions were based on the proposal to place antennas and equipment on the roof of the main RSL building. After consultation with members at the RSL, this option was not pursued. A second proposal was submitted for another rooftop installation on one of the residential

buildings. Part of the discussions involved shrouding the equipment so that it is not visible from the street. After extensive negotiations with the RSL and residents, this option was rejected and it was agreed that a new 40m tower would be considered at the current proposed site"

Why did the Village residents reject both rooftop options? The report indicates that the tower will also serve the wider community, yet extensive negotiations or discussions did not include this community or consider their opinion of the best location. Several submissions from Lantana Ave residents clearly state they are satisfied with their current mobile reception, yet the tower is proposed to be located nearer to Lantana Ave than anywhere else.

Why was the option A proposal not pursued? Was the Village concerned with the visual impact of antennas on their main building? Why was the residential rooftop Plan B rejected? Was it because the Village residents were concerned about EMR? Other than being in a separate location from their own dwellings, what were the reasons given by the Village residents that a 40m tower "was considered more appropriate" as their preferred option and "suitable position"? If the most viable location had have been identified by experts as Colooli Rd, would the Village have accepted this option? Or rejected it on aesthetic grounds?

•"Telstra does not propose the installation of a new telecommunications facility without exhaustively investigating possible alternatives, including co-location on existing infrastructure. In this case, Telstra concluded that there is no viable existing infrastructure within the Narrabeen area to achieve a co- location, so a new facility at 1 Lakeshore Drive, Narrabeen would be the most appropriate option."

They stated that Plan A and B were in fact viable options but proposals were either not pursued or rejected by Village residents. The 40m tower is therefore not necessarily the optimal location or only option, seemingly selected based on Village residents' opinion.

•"Visual impact is an important consideration in any area in which Telstra seeks to build a new facility. There are a number of factors which will ensure the visual impact of this facility will be minimized...The proposed structure is setback more than 50m from the nearest residential unit."

Was having the tower located away from the Village residents or an 'out of sight out of mind' reason the residents considered the tower the best option? The decision making appears emotionally driven and opinion based and does not consider the greater good or visual impact on the wider community.

•"Given the nearby trees are not of any particular environmental significance, no additional supporting specialist studies will be required. Council is therefore required to provide us with the necessary consent to remove one tree...."

It is not clear how it was deemed that the tree is of no environmental significance. If this is the case, then every resident in the area would have cause to remove trees on their property.

The 'Environmental EME Report 1 Lakeshore Drive, NARRABEEN NSW 2101' document states:

•"Maximum EME (Electromagnetic Energy) levels are estimated in 360° circular bands out to 500m from the base station".

This raises the concern of cumulative EME exposure when the tower is shared by multiple

carriers. This naturally includes our property and many other residents within the 500m radius.

Our primary reason for moving to the area is to enjoy the wildlife and natural bushland surrounds. The tower would not only be an unsightly structure and dominate the vista but would significantly affect house values. The residents and children attending local schools, especially those within 500m of the site have no real assurance that the tower will not have any long term adverse effects on their health and well being.

We hope common sense will prevail and an alternate solution will be considered and implemented to protect the residents, wildlife and natural beauty of the area.

Regards,  
G. & B. Walkom