
Sent: 27/08/2020 7:03:06 PM
Subject: DA2020/0661 - 7356 / 1167221 - Submission
Attachments: Sophie Stack Submission 2.pdf;

Dear Sir or Madam

Please find attached my second submission re: DA2020/0661 - 7356 / 1167221.

Many thanks

Sophie Stack

Sophie Stack
Adams St, Curl Curl
sjstack@bigpond.net.au

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

To the Assessing Officer

I strongly object to this development application.

The proposed site is approximately 300m from North Curl Curl School. As many including the Department of Education have stated, the proposed location breaches the precautionary principle for schools.

However irrespective of distance from North Curl Curl School, it is NOT APPROPRIATE TO BUILD A CELL TOWER ANYWHERE IN JOHN FISHER PARK OR ANYWHERE ON CURL CURL LAGOON for the following 5 reasons.

Health effects

There are numerous studies indicating that the current standards are unsafe for human health.

The following video contains a presentation by a team of three professionals; Barrister Raymond Broomhall, Doctor Russel Cooper (Integrative Medical Practitioner specialising in and having treated hundreds of patient with Electro Magnetic Radiation Sensitivity) and Special Counsel Greg Melick, who assist communities around Australia with their concerns in relation to proposed cell facilities.

Link: https://www.youtube.com/watch?time_continue=3&v=AEjnMPpVj40&feature=emb_logo.

Dr Cooper is the team's expert witness. In this presentation Dr Cooper notes that the ARPANSA (Australian Radiation and Nuclear Safety Agency) standard (the radiation standard which governs out country) includes a disclaimer as follows:

At 12 min 15 sec: "...In the *Forward* they state "There is currently a level of concern about RF exposure which is not fully alleviated by existing scientific data. It is true that data regarding biological effects, at levels below the limits specified in the Standard, are incomplete and inconsistent. The health implications for these data are not known and such data could not be used for setting the levels of the basic restrictions in the Standard.'....".

Dr Cooper speaks about what he believes are incomplete aspects of the ARPANSA standard as follows:

At 11 min 35 sec "The ARPANSA standard... is mandated by ACMA (Communications and Media Authority). This standard is based on the international standards from ICNIRP which is the International Commission on Non-Ionising Radiation. It's almost like an oxymoron because we're not protected from non-ionising radiation; we're protected from *ionising* radiation. No one's protecting us from non-ionising radiation. That's why we are here today."

and

At 15 min 30 sec "The ARPANSA standard was not designed to protect us from non-ionising radiation. It protects us like the burns of radiotherapy, like if someone is having cancer treatment. The standard does not expose 24 hour exposure levels. It does not disclose overnight exposure levels. We are lying in one spot for 8-10 hours and we have no data on this level of exposure. "

Do Optus agree that the proposed tower, which will be within a couple of hundred metres of residences, adheres to a Standard which does not protect from non-ionising radiation, disclose 24 hour exposure levels or disclose overnight exposure levels?

I draw Council's attention to the *BioInitiative Report*. The BioInitiative Report is a vast collection of independent studies on the effects of electromagnetic radiation and electromagnetic frequencies on human health. The radiation levels that the studies contained in BioInitiative Report have found to be safe are generally well below those allowed by the current Standard. The BioInitiative Report does not aim to write off the concept of cell towers and wireless devices. Its aim is to provide sound scientific explanation about the electromagnetic radiation levels and electromagnetic frequency levels at which cell towers and mobile devices can operate safely.

In the above video Dr Cooper presents a copy of the BioInitiative Report and he spends the majority of his 75 minute presentation summarising key findings in the Report. He states:

12 min 55 sec "...On the desk here I have the BioInitiative Reporta 1557 page document of over 2000 independent scientific research publications, with 24 sections and each section is edited by a world leading authority in medicine and science, and these are experts in the dangers of electromagnetic radiation. What I am getting at is that I believe there is more than enough scientific data to elucidate the potential dangers of interacting with this technology...."

Council should be aware of the BioInitiative Report and take seriously, the published professional opinions and concerns of specialists such as Dr Russel Cooper.

The BioInitiative Report is a 1557 page document and is 20MB in size. I hereby provide Council with a link to the Report. <https://bioinitiative.org/> The Report may be accessed from the home page at this link.

Visual impact

John Fisher Park has netball courts and posts, a basketball court, baseball nets and fences, soccer posts, AFL posts, rugby posts, cricket nets, flood lights, Weldon Sports Club, a creative space centre, a netball administration building, a community sports centre, kids' playgrounds, toilet blocks, public seating, a bitumen path and carparks.

There is a delicate balance that exists today between nature and man-made structures in John Fisher Park. Whilst you can enjoy a delightful 10-15 minute stroll around sections of the Park, immersed in nothing but natural beauty, open green spaces and wildlife, with a full stroll right around the park you cannot help but see that the park is AT ITS LIMIT with infrastructure.

What all of the abovementioned structures have in common is that they are there to give people greater amenity to the park itself. To keep this vital balance in check, it is CRUCIAL that any further additions to the park be approved for the SOLE PURPOSE of giving people greater direct amenity to the park. Optus have not stated anywhere in their DA that there is any problem with phone reception in John Fisher Park.

The Curl Curl community have fought hard to maintain the balance that exists today between nature and infrastructure in the Park. A visually overbearing profit-reaping edifice, visible from both ends of the park and beyond, along with up to 6 potentially graffiti-strewn base stations and their unsightly compound fencing, will outright destroy this balance. See below current pictures of the cell tower and associated equipment at Plateau Park, Collaroy. The Plateau Park cell tower is the example that Council's own Property and Commercial Development team have used, to warn us about the visual impact that users of John Fisher Park could in fact be in for, if Optus's proposal is approved.





Curl Curl Lagoon is a rehabilitation zone

Dedicated groups in the Curl Curl community have been working directly with Council for decades to rehabilitate Curl Curl lagoon and its flora and fauna and they continue to work with Council today. It would be wrong for Council approve a visually overbearing microwave beaming tower being built right in the middle of the Lagoon's rehabilitation zone.

Effects on wildlife

There are numerous studies on the effects of electromagnetic radiation on wildlife. Please refer to my submission lodged on 25 August regarding adverse effects on wildlife.

Emotional Upset

By applying for a third time to erect a cell tower in John Fisher Park, Optus have shown a disregard for the community's strong attachment to the park and their desire for no further development. I am disgusted by the fact that Optus's third attempt to build a cell tower in John Fisher Park breaches the precautionary principle for schools. Optus's 'decided disinterest' in our community's emotional and physical wellbeing causes me to feel offended and upset.

As children are our most precious asset, Optus's failure to meet the precautionary principle for schools must be a primary reason for rejecting this DA. Should the current DA be rejected for this reason, I would wonder about the prospect of rectification of that issue being used as leverage in later DA – i.e. to enhance the merits of a later DA proposing a site location that does comply with the precautionary principle. However irrespective of distance from North Curl Curl School, it is NOT APPROPRIATE TO BUILD A CELL TOWER ANYWHERE IN JOHN FISHER PARK OR ANYWHERE ON CURL CURL LAGOON for the reasons given above.

Sophie Stack