

From: DYPXCPWEB@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au
To: [DA Submission Mailbox](#)
Subject: TRIMMED: Online Submission
Date: Friday, 10 July 2020 8:14:06 PM

10/07/2020

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

(Note: I request that you redact my personal information if you make this submission publicly available)

I strongly object to the proposed new telecommunications facility at a John Fisher Park, Abbott Road, Curl Curl. I call on you to halt it now for the reasons I will set out below.

Please also extend the deadline of this consultation, it is too fast.

1. Based upon historical trends, this proposed 5G upgrade will adversely affect the value and saleability of nearby properties.

2. I am concerned by the increased RF exposure health risks of 5G as it has 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.

3. The Carrier(s) has failed to have regard to minimisation of EMR exposure to the public by selecting a community sensitive area:

Netball courts,
Soccer and other sports fields
Curl curl public school
Residential area

School children and teachers, residents, children, wildlife, business owners and workers in the vicinity of this proposed 5G upgrade will be subjected to levels of microwave radiation and Electro Magnetic Radiation ("EMR") scientifically proven to cause biological effects and greater than those which currently exist at this site.

4. Numerous studies indicate that mobile phone towers adversely affect plants and wildlife through emitted radiation. It also directly affects humans and the worst affected are those with developing minds ie; Children and teenagers

5. There has been no adequate assessment of the risks to those within its vicinity from increased emissions.

6. The proposal does not contain any limit to the number of Carriers using the mobile telecommunication equipment in the future adding further potential for emission of EMR to residents, again without adequate assessment of health risks or approval of the Community. I am speaking up on behalf of the community.

I understand that for 5G to work as intended it 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 this Telstra 5G upgrade on this location. Particularly considering the immediate close proximity of this proposed tower upgrade to residential homes, Curl Curl public school, netball courts and others as mentioned above.

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

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 5G as far as I am aware. If you have such research supporting its 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, 4GX 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 tower.

I request that you redact my personal information when you make this submission publicly available.

I look forward to hearing from you.