
Sent: 15/12/2020 11:09:14 AM
Subject: Re: Planning Panel 16 December 2020
Attachments: NBCCPP sbmission letter final.docx; NBCPP SUBmission.docx;

Thanks Carly

Please find attached my 2 pages of submission information

Regards

Steve

On Tue, Dec 15, 2020 at 10:59 AM Carly Sawyer
<Carly.Sawyer@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au> wrote:

Hi Steve,

Apologies, the agenda is quite large for this meeting. You may need to reload the document a few times until the blue bar at the top completes. Our web team are looking into this issue and unfortunately it is too large to send via email.

Due to the large numbers of speakers, this meeting will be held via [Microsoft Teams](#). Please see below links and instructions to join the meeting.

Join on your computer or mobile app

[Click here to join the meeting](#)

Or call in (audio only)

+61 2 9161 1235 Australia, Sydney

Phone Conference ID: **529 496 709#**

[Find a local number](#) | [Reset PIN](#)

[Learn More](#)

Meeting instructions:

- If you do not have internet access, you can phone into the meeting on the number above
- Please test the above link prior to the meeting to familiarise yourself with Teams
- Please log into the meeting while we are on the previous item (we recommend watching the livestream as outlined below)
- You do not need to have your camera on if you do not wish to
- You will wait in the 'lobby' and will be given access to the meeting when we get to this item
- All speakers will be in the meeting at once, however will be muted
- The Chair will call your name to address the Panel, please unmute yourself when you start talking
- Please listen to previous speakers, as the Chair may ask speakers not to repeat points that have already been raised

We recommend watching the livestream on Council's website so you are aware when we are nearing this item -

<https://www.northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au/council/meetings/committees/northern-beaches-local-planning-panel>

Any other questions regarding the meeting process please let me know.

Kind regards,

Carly Sawyer

Acting Administration Coordinator

Business Systems & Administration

t 02 8495 6474

carly.sawyer@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au

northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au



From: Steve Latham <steve.lathaminternational@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, 15 December 2020 8:01 AM
To: Carly Sawyer <Carly.Sawyer@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au>
Subject: Planning Panel 16 December 2020

Hi Carly

In relation to the planning panel mtg for 23-33 Bassett St Mona Vale 2103 I advise that I would like to address the meeting.

Please also note there is an error with the Agenda on Council website & it will not download - it stops mid way through every time I try- perhaps you could attach pdf to an email?

Thankyou

Steve Latham

1/37 Bassett St Mona Vale

0413008622

Northern Beaches Council

PLEASE CONSIDER THE ENVIRONMENT BEFORE PRINTING THIS EMAIL. This email and any materials contained or attached to it ("Contents") may contain confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient contact the sender immediately, delete the communication from your system and destroy any copies. The contents may also be subject to copyright. Any unauthorised copying,

disclosure or distribution of the contents is strictly prohibited. Northern Beaches Council makes no implied or express warranty that the integrity of this communication has been maintained. The contents may contain errors, computer viruses or have been subject to interference in transmission. Northern Beaches Council. [Northern Beaches Council](#)

SUBMISSION TO NBCPP RE 23-33 Bassett St Mona vale

Dear Panel members

1. I am appreciative that Council has directed that the substation be placed at a minimum of 1.5m east of the proposed pedestrian pathway. However, I have enquired with both Thompson Healthcare & Arpana as to the EMF intensity/specifications for the sub station without response. As such, in keeping with:
 - a/ the precautionary principle
 - b/ the burden of proof on the developer
 - c/ the scientific studies showing damage at much lower levels than current [outdated] standards
 - d/ Council diagram showing the substation will be 8.4m from my boundary which is my only outdoor space
 - e/ my medical situation¹ and
 - f/ the availability of additional open/green space beyond 1.5m minimum [specified by Council as a condition] to the east of the proposed pathwayIn the absence of radiation exposure specifications I would kindly request that the substation to be situated further to the east as a precautionary measure that ought not disadvantage the developer in any material way whilst providing extra protection for me.
2. Notwithstanding the application of the code/precautions regarding minimisation of impact to surrounding properties during construction it is clear that there will be inevitable dust/airborne particulate that is likely to saturate my property. As the front yard is my only outdoor space this will be more than a minor inconvenience. It seems unreasonable that I should have to sweep & clean almost daily at times to enjoy my property rights & be able to utilise my outdoor space over the period of construction.
I would kindly request a mechanism for on going remediation & regular/timely supervision by the Council to ensure the issue is managed fairly with efficiency & due care.

Thankyou

Steve Latham
1/37 Bassett St Mona Vale 2103
0413008622

¹ Medical letter available on request

The International Agency for Research on Cancer has classified ELF magnetic fields as possibly carcinogenic to humans. [ARPANSA]

Bioeffects are clearly established and occur at very low levels of exposure to electromagnetic fields. The large majority of [over 1800 new] studies report biological effects as opposed to 'no effect'. The trend continues to show that exposure to low-intensity ELF-EMF/Static Fields and RFR at levels allowable UNDER current public safety limits pose health risks. Sixty nine (69) new ELF-EMF papers (including two static field papers) that report on genotoxic effects of ELF-EMF published between 2007 and mid-2012. Of these, 64 (93%) show effects¹.

In Australia, a 1991 government report (Gibbs, 1991) recommended a policy of prudent avoidance which was adopted in 1997.

A sensible guide to the precautionary/prudent avoidance" approach was described by Swedish local officials (National Board of Occupational Safety and Health, 1996): If measures generally reducing exposure can be taken at reasonable expense and with reasonable consequences in all other respects, an effort should be made to reduce fields radically deviating from what could be deemed normal in the environment concerned. Where new electrical installations and buildings are concerned, efforts should be made to design and position them in such a way that exposure is limited.² Also, The United Nations Educational and Scientific Organization (UNESCO), 2005) definition of the Precautionary Principle : "When human activities may lead to morally unacceptable harm that is scientifically plausible but uncertain, actions shall be taken to avoid or diminish that harm."

If the environmental risks being run by regulatory inaction are in some way "*uncertain but non-negligible*", then a regulatory action is justified. In such a situation, the burden of proof is to be placed on those attempting to alter the *status quo*. They are to discharge this burden by showing the absence of a 'reasonable ecological or medical concern'. That is the required standard of proof. The result would be that if insufficient evidence is presented by them to alleviate concern about the level of uncertainty, then the presumption should operate in favour of environmental protection. Such a presumption has been applied in ***Ashburton Acclimatisation Society v. Federated Farmers of New Zealand, 1988(1) NZLR 78***. The required standard now is that the risk of harm to the environment or to human health is to be decided in public interest, according to a 'reasonable persons' test. (See Precautionary Principle in Australia by Charmian Barton) (Vol. 22) (1998) Harv. Env. L.Rev. 509 at 549).

According to ARPANSA, residential street distribution lines can produce AC Magnetic Fields of **2-30mG** (underneath) and **0.5 to 10mG** (10 metres away) (ARPANSA, 2020). Substations can produce AC magnetic fields of 1-8mG (ARPANSA, 2020). However, substations may emit AC magnetic field levels of **200mG to 800mG** (Gajšek *et al.*, 2016). Therefore, to reduce exposure from substation/transformer AC Magnetic Fields, keep a distance of **more than 10metres³** from substations and transformers.

¹ <https://bioinitiative.org/>

² The precautionary principle and EMF: implementation and evaluation LEEKA I. KHEIFETS*, GORDON L. HESTER and GAIL L. BANERJEE Electric Power Research Institute, 3412 Hillview Avenue, Palo Alto, CA 94304-1395, USA

³ Absolute minimum as advised by Mr Senri Oiso, Building Biologist – radiation emissions are frequently higher than stated by Arpana based on numerous site testing installations

