
Sent: 26/07/2020 6:24:37 PM
Subject: Online Submission

26/07/2020

MRS Geraldine Carporzen
48A Golf Parade ST
Manly NSW 2095
dimitrixkoz@yahoo.fr

RE: DA2020/0661 - 7356 / 1167221 Huston Parade NORTH CURL CURL NSW 2099

Hi There,

Assuming this is a 5G tower (wouldn't make sense otherwise?), I do not consent to this Telecommunications tower.

I am yet to see any worldwide Telco conducting, let alone providing, a 5G health study for 6-12 months exposure... you really have to wonder why, except a race for profit...

Of course, we are being told it is safe, so was tobacco, asbestos and glyphosate?

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ARPANSA subscribes to an outdated model that does not recognise -non-thermal effects and is not committed to a precautionary approach. Furthermore, 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 3G, 4G, 4GX and 5G as far as I am aware. If you have such research supporting it's safety in your possession, please forward it to me.

Scientists who are experts in this field have called for safety testing on biological material:

"The existing exposure standards have no scientific basis because they assume the only way electromagnetic fields can exert biological effects is by heating tissue. This contradicts thousands of peer reviewed studies that have reported biological effects at levels below existing exposure standards." Dr Martin Pall, Professor Emeritus of Biochemistry and Medical Science, Washington University.

The research which exists, suggests considerable reason for concern.

"The Report reviewed over 1800 scientific studies showing to DNA and genes, effects on memory, learning, behaviour, attention, sleep disruption and cancer. New safety standards are urgently needed for protection against EMF and wireless exposures that now appear everywhere in daily life." The Bio Initiative Report

There is no evidence of the safety of the cumulative effects of 3G, 4G, 4G+ and now the additional 5G radiation to this cells tower. 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. A slightly (ie. around 10 seconds) improved download speed is the benefit, and in no way justifies the multiple risks. 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 installation of this Telecommunications tower.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Best regards,

Geraldine