
Sent: 6/05/2022 6:03:52 PM

Subject: Ojection to 5G tower upgrade proposed for Abbott Roads Grounds – John Fisher Park Field No 5 – Lot 7356/1167221 Huston Parade North Curl Curl, NSW 2099 – DA2020/0661

I strongly object to the 5G tower upgrade proposed for Abbott Roads Grounds – John Fisher Park Field No 5 – Lot 7356/1167221 Huston Parade North Curl Curl, NSW 2099 – DA2020/0661 and call on you to halt it now for the reasons I will set out below.

1. Based upon historical trends, the tower will adversely affect the value and salability of nearby properties.
2. I am concerned by the increased RF exposure health risks of 5G that have not been subjected to any independent testing. There are plenty of studies showing harm from low level Electro Magnetic Radiation (EMR) and non-ionising radiation.

~~Sensitive facilities located close to the site include those attended regularly by children including:~~
Sensitive facilities located close to the site include those attended regularly by children including:

- North Curl Curl Public School
- North Curl Curl Sports fields
- Curl Curl Lagoon/Cycle Path
- Curl Curl Community Gardens/Skate Park
- Community Hall

It is unacceptable to increase the RF radiation from this existing tower which is so close to so many facilities used by children.

Section 3.1 of the Department of Education policy states that the Department has a preference for antennae to be at a distance of at least 500 metres from the boundary of a school property.

This tower is MUCH closer than 500m to the school boundary as preferred by the department. This is not in line with the department's policy of prudent avoidance. Please explain why you are disregarding this policy.

~~Both the Public Health and Planning and the Department of Education are responsible for ensuring that the tower is not sited in a location that is likely to be used by children.~~

I understand that in the longer term, 5G will require a small cell network of antennae to be put on telegraph poles and lampposts outside homes every 100-300m, because the short millimetre microwave cannot travel as far as 4G.

I do not consent to a small cell network.

I also strongly object to the cutting down of trees that obstruct the 5G signal. Trees are essential to the health and beauty of the environment.

Upgrading this tower to 5G is a first step towards installation of such a small cell network.

5G should not come at the expense of community health, or the environment and should not be implement until it can be proven safe for humans, animals and the preservation of our environment and trees can be guaranteed.

I understand the WHO is currently completing a further review on EMF as a whole, due to be released in the later part of this year. Why would you rush ahead with these upgrades before waiting to hear their findings?

I anticipate that you will send me assurances that the EME levels fall within the Australian safety standards as set by ARPANSA.

ARPANSA subscribes to an outdated model that does not recognise –non-thermal effects and is not committed to a precautionary approach. Further ARPANSA does not accept any liability for any injury, loss or damage incurred by use of or reliance on the information provided on [its] website as per its disclaimer. It states that you seek independent medical advice.

Please refer to a response to a letter from ARPANSA of 18 December 2018 from Prof Martin L Pall PhD, Professor Emeritus of Biochemistry and Basic Medical Sciences, Washington State University, for the reasons I do not accept ARPANSA's safety standards.

<https://stopsmartmetersau.files.wordpress.com/2019/03/prof-pall-response-to-arpansa-letter-4-march-2019.pdf>

Are you aware that Barrister Raymond Broomhall (Michael Kirby Chambers) has raised the possibility that the implementation of 5G, without informed consent, could open up carriers and governments to risk of civil and criminal liability in accordance with the legal definition of assault?

The definition of assault includes the application of force by the use of any substance or thing including light, heat, electricity and electrical energy, and would include electromagnetic radiation from mobile phone infrastructure.

Given ARPANSA's disclaimer, I think the government, industry and anyone else responsible for rolling out this technology can certainly expect legal action to be taken in future for irresponsible and misleading assurances given to the public.

I also anticipate that you will send me an assurance from Dr Karl that non-ionising radiation is not harmful and therefore I have no need to be concerned about increasing radiation of this type in my community.

I do not accept that theory as I know there is a huge body of evidence linking non-ionising radiation to detrimental health and environmental effects.

Please take a look at this article by ORSAA (Oceania Radiofrequency Scientific Advisory Association) and note their PDF Point by Point Evidence disputing the Dr Karl interview at the bottom of the page.

<https://www.orsaa.org/blog-updates/dr-karl-misleading-and-wrong-information-and-a-much-deeper-problem-in-the-selection-of-experts>

There has been NO research showing the safety of 5G as far as I am aware. If you have such research supporting the safety of 5G in your possession, please forward it to me.

In the USA, both Democrats and Republicans have asked similar questions and failed to receive any evidence of research demonstrating safety.

For example, Senator Richard Blumenthal questions industry as follows here:

<https://ehtrust.org/letters-from-the-us-congress-to-the-fcc-asking-for-documentation-of-5g-safety/>

Scientists who are experts in this field have called for a moratorium on the rollout of 5G until the potential hazards for human health and the environment have been investigated by scientists who are independent from industry.

The 5G Appeal states:

“5G will substantially increase exposure to radiofrequency electromagnetic fields (RF-EMF) on top of the 2G, 3G, 4G, Wi-Fi etc for telecommunications already in place. RF-EMF has been proven to be harmful for humans and the environment.”

The research which exists, suggests considerable reason for concern.

Just a couple of examples are that scientists have shown the higher frequency millimeter waves intended for use with 5G could be a risk for human skin, with sweat ducts in the skin acting as antennas as well as the possibility of non-thermal biological impacts on the eye, which could unleash an epidemic of eye disease.

I'm sure you will assert that 5G technology is not new, as it has been utilised in defence industries over many years. In what ways has it been utilized? It has certainly not been used in the community, beaming out its waves onto children, pregnant women, the elderly and the sensitive 24/7, without their knowledge or consent.

Whether or not this technology will benefit the community is of absolutely no consequence if it has not been tested for safety and it adversely affects their health.

The fact is, this technology has NOT been tested for safety. The testing will therefore be happening to the citizens of the Northern Beaches without their consent, which contravenes the Nuremberg Code on human experimentation and flies in the face of the UNESCO Precautionary Principle.

I strongly oppose the upgrade of this tower to 5G.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Best regards,
Sabrina Kost