

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Local1 Team

Customer Details

Name: Ms Rajni Punj

Address: 10/2 Summerside Place Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The proposed 20m, 5G street pole and ancillary works will be ugly and incongruous with the surrounding character, appearance and visual amenity of the neighbourhood which is a Conservation Area. This proposed 5G infrastructure will dominate the walkway and spoil the enjoyment of nearby green spaces (Victoria Park), contributing to visual clutter in the neighbourhood and reduced visual amenity of the surrounding area. It will have a negative impact to the outlook and house prices of residential properties nearby. I fear injury to the health of the children attending the school and nursery nearby.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Local1 Team

Customer Details

Name: Mr Ian Ritchie

Address: 4 Dudley Gardens E

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The proposed 20m, 5G street pole and ancillary works will be ugly and incongruous with the surrounding character, appearance and visual amenity of the neighbourhood which is a Conservation Area. This proposed 5G infrastructure will dominate the walkway and spoil the enjoyment of nearby green spaces (Victoria Park), contributing to visual clutter in the neighbourhood and reduced visual amenity of the surrounding area. It will have a negative impact to the outlook and house prices of residential properties nearby. I fear injury to the health of the children attending the school and nursery nearby.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Local1 Team

Customer Details

Name: Mr A Young

Address: 12 Dudley Gardens E

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The proposed 20m, 5G street pole and ancillary works will be ugly and incongruous with the surrounding character, appearance and visual amenity of the neighbourhood which is a Conservation Area. This proposed 5G infrastructure will dominate the walkway and spoil the enjoyment of nearby green spaces (Victoria Park), contributing to visual clutter in the neighbourhood and reduced visual amenity of the surrounding area. It will have a negative impact to the outlook and house prices of residential properties nearby. I fear injury to the health of the children attending the school and nursery nearby.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Local1 Team

Customer Details

Name: Mr Sardar Mohammad

Address: 17 Dudley Gardens E

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The proposed 20m, 5G street pole and ancillary works will be ugly and incongruous with the surrounding character, appearance and visual amenity of the neighbourhood which is a Conservation Area. This proposed 5G infrastructure will dominate the walkway and spoil the enjoyment of nearby green spaces (Victoria Park), contributing to visual clutter in the neighbourhood and reduced visual amenity of the surrounding area. It will have a negative impact to the outlook and house prices of residential properties nearby. I fear injury to the health of the children attending the school and nursery nearby.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Local1 Team

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Shanin Mohammad

Address: 17 Dudley Gardens E

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The proposed 20m, 5G street pole and ancillary works will be ugly and incongruous with the surrounding character, appearance and visual amenity of the neighbourhood which is a Conservation Area. This proposed 5G infrastructure will dominate the walkway and spoil the enjoyment of nearby green spaces (Victoria Park), contributing to visual clutter in the neighbourhood and reduced visual amenity of the surrounding area. It will have a negative impact to the outlook and house prices of residential properties nearby. I fear injury to the health of the children attending the school and nursery nearby.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Local1 Team

Customer Details

Name: Mr Irfar Mohammad

Address: 17 Dudley Gardens E

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The proposed 20m, 5G street pole and ancillary works will be ugly and incongruous with the surrounding character, appearance and visual amenity of the neighbourhood which is a Conservation Area. This proposed 5G infrastructure will dominate the walkway and spoil the enjoyment of nearby green spaces (Victoria Park), contributing to visual clutter in the neighbourhood and reduced visual amenity of the surrounding area. It will have a negative impact to the outlook and house prices of residential properties nearby. I fear injury to the health of the children attending the school and nursery nearby.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Local1 Team

Customer Details

Name: Ms Rebecca Westwood

Address: 174/2 Newhaven Road E

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The proposed 20m, 5G street pole and ancillary works will be ugly and incongruous with the surrounding character, appearance and visual amenity of the neighbourhood which is a Conservation Area. This proposed 5G infrastructure will dominate the walkway and spoil the enjoyment of nearby green spaces (Victoria Park), contributing to visual clutter in the neighbourhood and reduced visual amenity of the surrounding area. It will have a negative impact to the outlook and house prices of residential properties nearby. I fear injury to the health of the children attending the school and nursery nearby.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Local1 Team

Customer Details

Name: Mr Alex Lamb

Address: 174/2 Newhaven Road E

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The proposed 20m, 5G street pole and ancillary works will be ugly and incongruous with the surrounding character, appearance and visual amenity of the neighbourhood which is a Conservation Area. This proposed 5G infrastructure will dominate the walkway and spoil the enjoyment of nearby green spaces (Victoria Park), contributing to visual clutter in the neighbourhood and reduced visual amenity of the surrounding area. It will have a negative impact to the outlook and house prices of residential properties nearby. I fear injury to the health of the children attending the school and nursery nearby.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Local1 Team

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Susie Reid

Address: 172/2 Newhaven Road E

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The proposed 20m, 5G street pole and ancillary works will be ugly and incongruous with the surrounding character, appearance and visual amenity of the neighbourhood which is a Conservation Area. This proposed 5G infrastructure will dominate the walkway and spoil the enjoyment of nearby green spaces (Victoria Park), contributing to visual clutter in the neighbourhood and reduced visual amenity of the surrounding area. It will have a negative impact to the outlook and house prices of residential properties nearby. I fear injury to the health of the children attending the school and nursery nearby.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Local1 Team

Customer Details

Name: Mr David Reid

Address: 172/2 Newhaven Road E

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The proposed 20m, 5G street pole and ancillary works will be ugly and incongruous with the surrounding character, appearance and visual amenity of the neighbourhood which is a Conservation Area. This proposed 5G infrastructure will dominate the walkway and spoil the enjoyment of nearby green spaces (Victoria Park), contributing to visual clutter in the neighbourhood and reduced visual amenity of the surrounding area. It will have a negative impact to the outlook and house prices of residential properties nearby. I fear injury to the health of the children attending the school and nursery nearby.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Local1 Team

Customer Details

Name: Mr John Reid

Address: 172/2 Newhaven Road E

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The proposed 20m, 5G street pole and ancillary works will be ugly and incongruous with the surrounding character, appearance and visual amenity of the neighbourhood which is a Conservation Area. This proposed 5G infrastructure will dominate the walkway and spoil the enjoyment of nearby green spaces (Victoria Park), contributing to visual clutter in the neighbourhood and reduced visual amenity of the surrounding area. It will have a negative impact to the outlook and house prices of residential properties nearby. I fear injury to the health of the children attending the school and nursery nearby.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Local1 Team

Customer Details

Name: Mr Erik Oldale

Address: 172/2 Newhaven Road E

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The proposed 20m, 5G street pole and ancillary works will be ugly and incongruous with the surrounding character, appearance and visual amenity of the neighbourhood which is a Conservation Area. This proposed 5G infrastructure will dominate the walkway and spoil the enjoyment of nearby green spaces (Victoria Park), contributing to visual clutter in the neighbourhood and reduced visual amenity of the surrounding area. It will have a negative impact to the outlook and house prices of residential properties nearby. I fear injury to the health of the children attending the school and nursery nearby.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Local1 Team

Customer Details

Name: Mr Luke Oldale

Address: 172/2 Newhaven Road E

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The proposed 20m, 5G street pole and ancillary works will be ugly and incongruous with the surrounding character, appearance and visual amenity of the neighbourhood which is a Conservation Area. This proposed 5G infrastructure will dominate the walkway and spoil the enjoyment of nearby green spaces (Victoria Park), contributing to visual clutter in the neighbourhood and reduced visual amenity of the surrounding area. It will have a negative impact to the outlook and house prices of residential properties nearby. I fear injury to the health of the children attending the school and nursery nearby.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Local1 Team

Customer Details

Name: Mr Sinclair Holland

Address: 172/1 Newhaven Road E

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The proposed 20m, 5G street pole and ancillary works will be ugly and incongruous with the surrounding character, appearance and visual amenity of the neighbourhood which is a Conservation Area. This proposed 5G infrastructure will dominate the walkway and spoil the enjoyment of nearby green spaces (Victoria Park), contributing to visual clutter in the neighbourhood and reduced visual amenity of the surrounding area. It will have a negative impact to the outlook and house prices of residential properties nearby. I fear injury to the health of the children attending the school and nursery nearby.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Local1 Team

Customer Details

Name: Ms Juli Dagleish

Address: 172/1 Newhaven Road E

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The proposed 20m, 5G street pole and ancillary works will be ugly and incongruous with the surrounding character, appearance and visual amenity of the neighbourhood which is a Conservation Area. This proposed 5G infrastructure will dominate the walkway and spoil the enjoyment of nearby green spaces (Victoria Park), contributing to visual clutter in the neighbourhood and reduced visual amenity of the surrounding area. It will have a negative impact to the outlook and house prices of residential properties nearby. I fear injury to the health of the children attending the school and nursery nearby.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Local1 Team

Customer Details

Name: Ms Catherine Holland

Address: 172/1 Newhaven Road E

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The proposed 20m, 5G street pole and ancillary works will be ugly and incongruous with the surrounding character, appearance and visual amenity of the neighbourhood which is a Conservation Area. This proposed 5G infrastructure will dominate the walkway and spoil the enjoyment of nearby green spaces (Victoria Park), contributing to visual clutter in the neighbourhood and reduced visual amenity of the surrounding area. It will have a negative impact to the outlook and house prices of residential properties nearby. I fear injury to the health of the children attending the school and nursery nearby.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Local1 Team

Customer Details

Name: Mr Addison Graham

Address: 176 Newhaven Road E

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The proposed 20m, 5G street pole and ancillary works will be ugly and incongruous with the surrounding character, appearance and visual amenity of the neighbourhood which is a Conservation Area. This proposed 5G infrastructure will dominate the walkway and spoil the enjoyment of nearby green spaces (Victoria Park), contributing to visual clutter in the neighbourhood and reduced visual amenity of the surrounding area. It will have a negative impact to the outlook and house prices of residential properties nearby. I fear injury to the health of the children attending the school and nursery nearby.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Local1 Team

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Helen Graham

Address: 176 Newhaven Road E

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The proposed 20m, 5G street pole and ancillary works will be ugly and incongruous with the surrounding character, appearance and visual amenity of the neighbourhood which is a Conservation Area. This proposed 5G infrastructure will dominate the walkway and spoil the enjoyment of nearby green spaces (Victoria Park), contributing to visual clutter in the neighbourhood and reduced visual amenity of the surrounding area. It will have a negative impact to the outlook and house prices of residential properties nearby. I fear injury to the health of the children attending the school and nursery nearby.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Local1 Team

Customer Details

Name: Mr Alan McHoul

Address: 184 Newhaven Road E

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The proposed 20m, 5G street pole and ancillary works will be ugly and incongruous with the surrounding character, appearance and visual amenity of the neighbourhood which is a Conservation Area. This proposed 5G infrastructure will dominate the walkway and spoil the enjoyment of nearby green spaces (Victoria Park), contributing to visual clutter in the neighbourhood and reduced visual amenity of the surrounding area. It will have a negative impact to the outlook and house prices of residential properties nearby. I fear injury to the health of the children attending the school and nursery nearby.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Local1 Team

Customer Details

Name: Ms Jane Herd

Address: 184 Newhaven Road E

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment:

The proposed 20m, 5G street pole and ancillary works will be ugly and incongruous with the surrounding character, appearance and visual amenity of the neighbourhood which is a Conservation Area. This proposed 5G infrastructure will dominate the walkway and spoil the enjoyment of nearby green spaces (Victoria Park), contributing to visual clutter in the neighbourhood and reduced visual amenity of the surrounding area. It will have a negative impact to the outlook and house prices of residential properties nearby. I fear injury to the health of the children attending the school and nursery nearby.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Local1 Team

Customer Details

Name: Ms Louise McDade

Address: 184 Newhaven Road E

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The proposed 20m, 5G street pole and ancillary works will be ugly and incongruous with the surrounding character, appearance and visual amenity of the neighbourhood which is a Conservation Area. This proposed 5G infrastructure will dominate the walkway and spoil the enjoyment of nearby green spaces (Victoria Park), contributing to visual clutter in the neighbourhood and reduced visual amenity of the surrounding area. It will have a negative impact to the outlook and house prices of residential properties nearby. I fear injury to the health of the children attending the school and nursery nearby.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Local1 Team

Customer Details

Name: Mr Adam McHoul

Address: 184 Newhaven Road E

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The proposed 20m, 5G street pole and ancillary works will be ugly and incongruous with the surrounding character, appearance and visual amenity of the neighbourhood which is a Conservation Area. This proposed 5G infrastructure will dominate the walkway and spoil the enjoyment of nearby green spaces (Victoria Park), contributing to visual clutter in the neighbourhood and reduced visual amenity of the surrounding area. It will have a negative impact to the outlook and house prices of residential properties nearby. I fear injury to the health of the children attending the school and nursery nearby.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Local1 Team

Customer Details

Name: Mr David Adamson

Address: 160 Newhaven Road E

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The proposed 20m, 5G street pole and ancillary works will be ugly and incongruous with the surrounding character, appearance and visual amenity of the neighbourhood which is a Conservation Area. This proposed 5G infrastructure will dominate the walkway and spoil the enjoyment of nearby green spaces (Victoria Park), contributing to visual clutter in the neighbourhood and reduced visual amenity of the surrounding area. It will have a negative impact to the outlook and house prices of residential properties nearby. I fear injury to the health of the children attending the school and nursery nearby.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Local1 Team

Customer Details

Name: Mr Victoria Adamson

Address: 160 Newhaven Road E

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The proposed 20m, 5G street pole and ancillary works will be ugly and incongruous with the surrounding character, appearance and visual amenity of the neighbourhood which is a Conservation Area. This proposed 5G infrastructure will dominate the walkway and spoil the enjoyment of nearby green spaces (Victoria Park), contributing to visual clutter in the neighbourhood and reduced visual amenity of the surrounding area. It will have a negative impact to the outlook and house prices of residential properties nearby. I fear injury to the health of the children attending the school and nursery nearby.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Local1 Team

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Margaret Roberton

Address: 158 Newhaven Road E

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The proposed 20m, 5G street pole and ancillary works will be ugly and incongruous with the surrounding character, appearance and visual amenity of the neighbourhood which is a Conservation Area. This proposed 5G infrastructure will dominate the walkway and spoil the enjoyment of nearby green spaces (Victoria Park), contributing to visual clutter in the neighbourhood and reduced visual amenity of the surrounding area. It will have a negative impact to the outlook and house prices of residential properties nearby. I fear injury to the health of the children attending the school and nursery nearby.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Local1 Team

Customer Details

Name: Mr Phil Capon

Address: 156 Newhaven Road E

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The proposed 20m, 5G street pole and ancillary works will be ugly and incongruous with the surrounding character, appearance and visual amenity of the neighbourhood which is a Conservation Area. This proposed 5G infrastructure will dominate the walkway and spoil the enjoyment of nearby green spaces (Victoria Park), contributing to visual clutter in the neighbourhood and reduced visual amenity of the surrounding area. It will have a negative impact to the outlook and house prices of residential properties nearby. I fear injury to the health of the children attending the school and nursery nearby.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Local1 Team

Customer Details

Name: Mr Karen Capon

Address: 156 Newhaven Road E

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The proposed 20m, 5G street pole and ancillary works will be ugly and incongruous with the surrounding character, appearance and visual amenity of the neighbourhood which is a Conservation Area. This proposed 5G infrastructure will dominate the walkway and spoil the enjoyment of nearby green spaces (Victoria Park), contributing to visual clutter in the neighbourhood and reduced visual amenity of the surrounding area. It will have a negative impact to the outlook and house prices of residential properties nearby. I fear injury to the health of the children attending the school and nursery nearby.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Local1 Team

Customer Details

Name: Ms Faye Calder

Address: 130 Newhaven Road Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The proposed 5G mast is completely out of character with the conservation area.

Planning has a duty to preserve the character and appearance of the area and this will contravene this. It will create a very large eyesore in a well used green space. Furthermore it is within very close proximity to a residential area and children's playground and the health implications of this have not been fully explored.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Local1 Team

Customer Details

Name: Mr Aidan Smith

Address: 154 Newhaven Road E

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The proposed 20m, 5G street pole and ancillary works will be ugly and incongruous with the surrounding character, appearance and visual amenity of the neighbourhood which is a Conservation Area. This proposed 5G infrastructure will dominate the walkway and spoil the enjoyment of nearby green spaces (Victoria Park), contributing to visual clutter in the neighbourhood and reduced visual amenity of the surrounding area. It will have a negative impact to the outlook and house prices of residential properties nearby. I fear injury to the health of the children attending the school and nursery nearby.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Local1 Team

Customer Details

Name: Ms Maura Daly

Address: 154 Newhaven Road E

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The proposed 20m, 5G street pole and ancillary works will be ugly and incongruous with the surrounding character, appearance and visual amenity of the neighbourhood which is a Conservation Area. This proposed 5G infrastructure will dominate the walkway and spoil the enjoyment of nearby green spaces (Victoria Park), contributing to visual clutter in the neighbourhood and reduced visual amenity of the surrounding area. It will have a negative impact to the outlook and house prices of residential properties nearby. I fear injury to the health of the children attending the school and nursery nearby.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Local1 Team

Customer Details

Name: Mr Greg Sansom

Address: 19 Dudley Gardens E

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour-Commercial

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The proposed 20m, 5G street pole and ancillary works will be ugly and incongruous with the surrounding character, appearance and visual amenity of the neighbourhood which is a Conservation Area. This proposed 5G infrastructure will dominate the walkway and spoil the enjoyment of nearby green spaces (Victoria Park), contributing to visual clutter in the neighbourhood and reduced visual amenity of the surrounding area. It will have a negative impact to the outlook and house prices of residential properties nearby. I fear injury to the health of the children attending the school and nursery nearby.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Local1 Team

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Katheryne Ferguson

Address: 25 Dudley Gardens E

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The proposed 20m, 5G street pole and ancillary works will be ugly and incongruous with the surrounding character, appearance and visual amenity of the neighbourhood which is a Conservation Area. This proposed 5G infrastructure will dominate the walkway and spoil the enjoyment of nearby green spaces (Victoria Park), contributing to visual clutter in the neighbourhood and reduced visual amenity of the surrounding area. It will have a negative impact to the outlook and house prices of residential properties nearby. I fear injury to the health of the children attending the school and nursery nearby.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Local1 Team

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Bea Frances

Address: 7 Dudley Gardens, Newhaven, Edinburgh EH6 4PX

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour-Residential

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Unsightly in the middle of a Conservation Area

Cluttering the pavement for pedestrians

Will affect the health of children and local wildlife in the area

No informed consent to irradiation with RF has been given by the public

Safety limits not outlined in the application

Please redact my personal details from this objection

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Ms Mairi Grant

Address: 34/4 Annfield Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour-Residential

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Due to possible adverse effects of 5G masts I object whole heartedly. This is right by a school, by a park that many families use and dog walker walk. A worse location could not really be chosen for this.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Mr David Reid (VICTORIA PARK CONSERVATION GROUP)

Address: 172 NEWHAVEN ROAD EDINBURGH

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Amenity Body

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: THE PROPOSED SITE PLAN SUBMITTED LACKS PRACTICAL DETAIL AND SERIOUSLY COMPROMISES THE PAVEMENT WIDTH AND ACCESS FOR PUBLIC GOING TO VICTORIA PARK AND PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL CHILDREN ALIKE JOURNEYING TO TRINITY SCHOOL

ALREADY A CONGESTED AREA OF PAVEMENT WITH A LARGE GROUP OF COMMUNAL BINS, BUS STOP SHELTER, A PUBLIC BIN CREATING AN UNNECESSARY DANGEROUS PEDESTRIAN BOTTLE NECK.

THE EXISTING PAVEMENT WIDTH IS (AT THIS POINT) IS 2.0M

THE PLANT KIT EXCLUDING SWING DOOR ACCESS INDICATED TAKES UP AT LEAST 1.0M PAVEMENT SPACE.. BUT THIS IS NOT CLEAR.

OBJECTION IS SERIOUS COMPROMISE TO PEDESTRIANS USING THE PAVEMENT.

BUT IT IS NOT CLEAR AND NOT DEMENSIONED THE CLEAR SPACE LEFT FOR THE PEDESTRIAN

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Sarah Wilson

Address: 243 Newhaven Majn Street Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The sheer scale of the mast is not in keeping with the surrounding neighbourhood.

Not enough neighbours were notified of the proposal only 5 buildings, no notice put up in the public park notifying users of the proposal.

Not enough medical or environmental research has been carried out concerning the impact of these huge masts

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Sarah Yeoman

Address: 2 Craighall Bank Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour-Residential

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The proposed 5G mast will be unsightly and will not be an appropriate scale to
surrounding amenities. It will be an eye sore for local houses and the public parkland.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Mr Vito Milazzo

Address: 7 Dudley Grove Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Having this last near a school and local park will cause inconvenience in terms of construction and other consequences. The public feel there has been no thorough consultation and what is available is vague as to the negatives of this proposal.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Mr Paul McAuley

Address: 91/1 Dudley Avenue Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour-Residential

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: This should be in a more discreet location and not be so obtrusive near the park in this
conservation area

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Mr Allan Johnston

Address: 23/1 Dudley Terrace Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour-Residential

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object on the grounds that I live nearby and the proposed 5G mast will have a harmful impact on the nearby residential properties and local area. Also it will not be fitting with the character, appearance and amenity of the area. I am very unhappy with the lack of consultation with those who live here and the fact that I only found out about the proposal through word of mouth from neighbours. I am totally opposed to it.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Samantha Clark

Address: 24 Dudley Avenue Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment:<https://www.bmj.com/company/newsroom/stop-global-roll-out-of-5g-networks-until-safety-is-confirmed-urges-expert/>

In line with the above article, I object to the proposal for a 5G Telecoms mast in Newhaven Road. The benefits of 5G have to be looked at from all angles, not just through an economic or convenience prism, and there does not appear to have been enough research, through epidemiological studies and other medical research, to conclude with any degree of certainty that there are no health risks associated with 5G masts. There should be more research in this field before the rolling out of masts, particularly given that there require to be more masts for 5G than 4G, increasing the exposure of a much greater number of people living and working in proximity to such masts. At present, the very limited benefits of 5G are far outweighed by the potential health risks to humans. I would also cite this article in support of my objection and strongly urge Edinburgh City Council to reconsider this planning application and the rolling out of 5G in general until more is known about its risks to human life.

[https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2021/690012/EPRS_STU\(2021\)690012_EN.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2021/690012/EPRS_STU(2021)690012_EN.pdf)

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Mr Lee MCCROHAN

Address: 60 Dudley Avenue Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: significant adverse detrimental impact on the appearance of the area.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Mr Douglas Murray

Address: 20 Dudley Gardens Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour-Residential

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to the proposed 5G mast which will be ugly, visible over a large area, not in keeping with the surrounding character, appearance and amenity of the area and will have a detrimental impact on the nearby residential properties and the local area.

Furthermore there is an absence of high quality scientific research into the epidemiological health effects of 5G masts and there is a childrens play area in Victoria Park very close to this proposed mast.

This mast is not appropriate in a residential area and I strongly object to this application which should be refused.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Morven Davidson

Address: 40 Dudley gardens Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour-Residential

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to the erection of the 5G mast on the following grounds -

The proposed structure is within a conservation area, it will spoil the appearance and enjoyment of the area and the nearby green spaces.

Based on current and ongoing research, there are proven health issues caused by microwave radiation. There is a nursery and school nearby, which many children attend including my own. Together with our homes proximity to the pole, I am very concerned for my children's health and safety.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Mr Ewan McIntosh

Address: Newhaven Place Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour-Residential

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: This is an area of beauty and historic buildings, and also a place for the community to relax and for young children to play. As well as being a visual eyesore there is also some discomfort about the proliferation of masts in residential areas.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Judith Witts

Address: Whitehouse 2 Craighall Avenue Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour-Residential

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I think more consultation should have been done on this. The proposed 5G mast will be ugly, will not fit with the character, appearance and amenity of the surrounding area, and will have a harmful impact on the nearby residential properties and local area, particularly Victoria Park

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Imogen Gibson

Address: 189 Newhaven Road Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: A 25 m mast will be an eyesore in the surroundings. It will dominate the landscape and will not fit in with the appearance of the area.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Mr Graham McDonald

Address: 95 Dudley Avenue Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour-Residential

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: This mast is not in keeping with the area. The proposed site is within a well established
conservation area.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Kaye McDonald

Address: 95 Dudley Avenue Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour-Residential

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: This is not in keeping within a conservation area.

It is extremely high and would become a negative focal point in this well established residential
conservation area.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Mr Stephen Metcalfe

Address: 5 Craighall Bank Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour-Residential

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The proposed mast will be ugly, not in keeping with the surrounding area (which is a
Conservation Area) or its character. Contrary to what is claimed in the application, this does not
appear to be a replacement of an existing mast as there is no telecoms mast in the vicinity of
Victoria Park.

My house adjoins the park and I go into the park several times a week.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7 Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Ingrid Forteath

Address: 138/1 Newhaven Road Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour-Residential

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The application site is located within Victoria Park Conservation Area with Victoria Park at its heart.

Section 64 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997 places a duty on planning authorities to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas.

The character appraisal for the conservation area states that " Victoria Park remains the focus of the conservation area and as an attractive public park, it plays an important role in the daily lives of the community. The original Georgian and Victorian villas still have a presence around the park and the Dudleys remain a fine example of Victorian housing. In essence, the area retains the charms of a Victorian suburb, secluded from the rest of the City." It also states that " Facing onto the park are a mixture of Georgian and Victorian villas, many of architectural interest and often set in large and well landscaped grounds." "The generous, colourful and mature plants in private gardens, the number of trees around the park and the cottage set along the line of the old burn rather than the street all create an atmosphere of rural retreat." Newhaven Road is identified as a principal route within the conservation area and the character appraisal goes on to state that new development needs to be sympathetic and sensitive to the townscape and also restricted in height.

The proposed mast will be in a conspicuous location and as noted in reports on other similar masts the stark and utilitarian appearance of the mast and associated apparatus would create a visually discordant addition to the vicinity.

The proposed mast and associated apparatus are totally out of keeping with the traditional and pleasant residential character of the area. It will appear incongruous in this location, out of scale with the domestic scale of surrounding buildings, and including the clutter of the associated apparatus will have a serious detrimental impact on the setting of the park around which the conservation area is based and the street scene of Newhaven Road.

The proposed mast will cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area contrary to policy 7 of NPF4 and as per similar proposals the application should be refused on the grounds of being contrary to NPF 4 Policy 7 in relation to heritage assets, as it would adversely affect the character and appearance of the conservation area, by virtue of its incongruous design, when assessed within the context of the surrounding area.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Miss Leticia Rodriguez

Address: 135/2 Newhaven Road Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to the 5G pole near 141 Newhaven Road because it might have a negative impact in the health of the children in the nearby school and nursery, not only the children but the whole population. Also, it would be an eyesore to the area nearby the park.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Mr Colin Brown

Address: 35 Dudley Gardens Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: This is no place for such a tall piece of equipment. It's a residential area with well used
park amenity adjacent.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Mr Ronnie Grantham

Address: 4c church street Haddington Haddington

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Other

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Not good for public health!

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Mr Jay Jayaram

Address: 100, Lindsay road Edinburgh Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I strongly reject this horrendous idea, I regret to say I have to take legal opinion
regarding this.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Mr Yamuna Venky

Address: 5/3 110/3 Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment:Near the School No Way. I object

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Mr Piotr Albrycht

Address: 22 Gilsay Place Perth

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The proposed 20m street pole, cabinets and ancillary works will be obtrusive, ugly and incongruous with the surrounding character, appearance and visual amenity of the neighbourhood. The proposed 5G infrastructure, and others like them, increasingly dominate the walkways, green spaces, skylines and roofscapes contributing to visual clutter, resulting in a detriment to the visual amenities of the surrounding area, as well as a harmful impact to the outlook of residential properties nearby.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Ruth Margaret Kerr

Address: 7 landseer crescent Leeds

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The proposed 20m street pole, cabinets and ancillary works will be obtrusive, ugly and incongruous with the surrounding character, appearance and visual amenity of the neighbourhood. The proposed 5G infrastructure, and others like them, increasingly dominate the walkways, green spaces, skylines and roofscapes contributing to visual clutter, resulting in a detriment to the visual amenities of the surrounding area, as well as a harmful impact to the outlook of residential properties nearby.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Mr James Campbell

Address: 8 Tyneholm Cottages Pencaitland

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The proposed 20m street pole, cabinets and ancillary works will be obtrusive, ugly and incongruous with the surrounding character, appearance and visual amenity of the neighbourhood. The proposed 5G infrastructure, and others like them, increasingly dominate the walkways, green spaces, skylines and roofscapes contributing to visual clutter, resulting in a detriment to the visual amenities of the surrounding area, as well as a harmful impact to the outlook of residential properties nearby.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Ms Kirsty Hamilton

Address: 31/2 Pitt Street Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The proposed 20m street pole, cabinets and ancillary works will be obtrusive, ugly and incongruous with the surrounding character, appearance and visual amenity of the neighbourhood. The proposed 5G infrastructure, and others like them, increasingly dominate the walkways, green spaces, skylines and roofscapes contributing to visual clutter, resulting in a detriment to the visual amenities of the surrounding area, as well as a harmful impact to the outlook of residential properties nearby.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Mr Isty Ahmad

Address: 134 Newhaven Road Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The proposed 20m street pole, cabinets and ancillary works will be obtrusive, ugly and incongruous with the surrounding character, appearance and visual amenity of the neighbourhood. The proposed 5G infrastructure, and others like them, increasingly dominate the walkways, green spaces, skylines and roofscapes contributing to visual clutter, resulting in a detriment to the visual amenities of the surrounding area, as well as a harmful impact to the outlook of residential properties nearby.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Sheila Ahmad

Address: 134 Newhaven Road Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The proposed 20m street pole, cabinets and ancillary works will be obtrusive, ugly and incongruous with the surrounding character, appearance and visual amenity of the neighbourhood. The proposed 5G infrastructure, and others like them, increasingly dominate the walkways, green spaces, skylines and roofscapes contributing to visual clutter, resulting in a detriment to the visual amenities of the surrounding area, as well as a harmful impact to the outlook of residential properties nearby.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Pauline Maria Gayner

Address: 18 Maple Road Langport

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The proposed 20m street pole, cabinets and ancillary works will be obtrusive, ugly and incongruous with the surrounding character, appearance and visual amenity of the neighbourhood. The proposed 5G infrastructure, and others like them, increasingly dominate the walkways, green spaces, skylines and roofscapes contributing to visual clutter, resulting in a detriment to the visual amenities of the surrounding area, as well as a harmful impact to the outlook of residential properties nearby.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7 Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Ann Hansen

Address: 3A/8 Warriston Road Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers, and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps), and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.:UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse that gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Tara Louth

Address: 20 Southdown Brant Rd Lincoln

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers, and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps), and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.:UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse that gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Alison Mclean

Address: 8 The Drey Darras Hall Ponteland

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers, and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps), and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse that gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Ian Mclean

Address: 8 The Drey Darras Hall Ponteland

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers, and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps), and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse that gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7 Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Valerie Malcolm

Address: 40 Craiglockhart Drive South Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers, and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps), and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse that gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Glenn Telfer

Address: Flat 3, 6 Pinkhill Park Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers, and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps), and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse that gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Michel Henry

Address: c/o Hackspace Unit F6, Roden Street Nottingham

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers, and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps), and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse that gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Moira Nicol

Address: 21/2 Waverley Park Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers, and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps), and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.:UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse that gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: William Ip

Address: 63 Granville Court Jesmond Newcastle upon Tyne

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers, and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps), and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse that gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Alistair MacIntyre

Address: 17 Mardale East Kilbride Glasgow

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers, and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps), and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse that gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Peter Ryder

Address: 76/5 Duddingston Road Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers, and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps), and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse that gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7 Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Ann Skinner

Address: 23 Polwarth Gardens Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers, and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps), and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse that gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Wendy Hartmann

Address: 4 Silverknowes Place Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers, and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps), and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse that gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Nicola Jane Reid

Address: 159 Thanet House Thanet Street London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers, and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps), and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse that gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Lauren Rodden

Address: 8 St Cuthberts Square Berwick

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers, and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps), and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse that gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: John Gould

Address: 4 Broughton Market Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers, and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps), and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse that gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Chris Gould

Address: 4 Broughton Market Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers, and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps), and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse that gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7 Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Nick Gould

Address: 4 Broughton Market Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers, and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps), and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse that gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7 Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Jane Gould

Address: 4 Broughton Market Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers, and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps), and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.:UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse that gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Matthew Wilson

Address: 40/8 Waterfront Park Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers, and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps), and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.:UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse that gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Sarah Lewis

Address: Alpine Cottage 11 Silverdale Rd Yealand Redmayne

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers, and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps), and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.:UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse that gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Teresa Kerans

Address: The Nook The Green Lincoln

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers, and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps), and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse that gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Pauline Frankman

Address: 1 Clarence House Lincoln

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers, and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps), and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse that gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Amy Butters

Address: 15 Midville Close Lincoln

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers, and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps), and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse that gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Kayleigh Brown

Address: 27 Hebdenmoor Way Lincoln

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers, and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps), and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse that gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Catherine Strang

Address: 71 Avontoun Park Linlithgow

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers, and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps), and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse that gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: P Searle

Address: 21 Lichfield Close Kingston Park

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers, and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps), and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.:UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse that gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Amy Louise Scott

Address: 41 West Pilton Street Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers, and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps), and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse that gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Alan Laidler

Address: 13 Christon Close Gosford Newcastle upon Tyne

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers, and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps), and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.:UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse that gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: David Mawdsley

Address: 23/21 Jameson Place Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers, and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps), and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse that gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Belinda Cunnison

Address: 7/1 South Sloan Street Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers, and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps), and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse that gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7 Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Marie Hole

Address: 38 Seton Court Port Seton

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers, and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps), and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.:UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse that gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Vince Barnes

Address: 11 Walker Court Whickham

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers, and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps), and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse that gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Ebony Pollard

Address: 1 Fairford Gardens Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers, and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps), and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse that gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Alison Menzies

Address: 25/4 Kingsburgh Crescent Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers, and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps), and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse that gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Lorna Blair

Address: 2 Flemington Avenue Strathaven

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers, and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps), and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse that gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7 Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Ann Hansen

Address: 3A/8 Warriston Road Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers, and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps), and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse that gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7 Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Rachelle Tansley

Address: Flat 12, 19 Ashcroft lane Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps) and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse which gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Piotr Albrycht

Address: 22 Gilsay Place Perth

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps) and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse which gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Ruth Margaret Kerr

Address: 7 landseer crescent Leeds

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps) and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse which gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: James Campbell

Address: 8 Tyneholm Cottages Pencaitland

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps) and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse which gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7 Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Isty Ahmad

Address: 134 Newhaven Road Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps) and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse which gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7 Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Sheila Ahmad

Address: 134 Newhaven Road Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps) and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse which gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Pauline Maria Gayner

Address: 18 Maple Road Langport

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps) and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse which gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Joanne Criss

Address: 53 Squires Court Eaton Socon

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps) and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse which gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Dr Anne Renfrew

Address: Caravan at St Mary's Arisaig Invernessshire

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps) and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse which gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Paul Kerr

Address: 7 landseer crescent Leeds

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps) and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse which gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Nick Hornig

Address: 54 Corstorphine High Street Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps) and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse which gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7 Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Amanda Armstrong

Address: 53/3 The Shore Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps) and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse which gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Kenny Cockerell

Address: 102/75 Commercial Street Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps) and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse which gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Laura Gilmartin

Address: 67 Rotherwood Avenue Knightswood Glasgow

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps) and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.:UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse which gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Miss Claire Thompson

Address: 63 Sighthill View Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps) and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse which gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Michael Floyd

Address: 35 Aquila Drive Heddon on the Wall Newcastle upon Tyne

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps) and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse which gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Stuart Insh

Address: Flat 39, 41 Pilrig Heights Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps) and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse which gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7 Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Anne Henry

Address: 22 West Boreland Road Denny

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps) and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse which gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Eric Henry

Address: 22 West Boreland Road Denny

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps) and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse which gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: John Kilbride

Address: 5 Cronulla Place Kilsyth Glasgow

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps) and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse which gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Mary Walker

Address: 19 Arras Close Lincoln

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps) and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse which gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Lynsey Taylor

Address: 40 Foyers Road Kinlochleven

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps) and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse which gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Cathy Dowd

Address: 55 Colesdown Hill Plymstock Plymouth

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Parliament

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps) and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse which gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Lee Brack

Address: 4 Watson Avenue Mansfield Notts

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Parliament

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps) and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse which gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Stephanie Seal

Address: 19 Scot Gardens Lincoln

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps) and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse which gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Claire Logan

Address: 14 Larne Close Lincoln

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps) and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse which gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Martin Brown

Address: 42 Corchester Walk High Heaton Newcastle Upon Tyne

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps) and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse which gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7 Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Jim Taylor

Address: 119 Lanark Road West Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps) and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse which gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Catriona Taylor

Address: 119 Lanark Road West Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps) and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse which gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Caroline Lea

Address: Spindrift, Northfield Road Burray Orkney

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps) and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse which gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Dragan Matijevic

Address: Old Home Cottage Sparkwell Plymouth

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps) and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse which gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Jane Sherrand-Smith

Address: 18 Bolding House Lane West End Woking

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps) and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse which gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7 Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Creag Browning

Address: 126 Ochil View Denny

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps) and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse which gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Stephen Luke

Address: 7 Coalway Lane Whickham Newcastle Upon Tyne

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps) and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse which gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Brenda Johns

Address: 7 Frogmore Court Eggbuckland Plymouth

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps) and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse which gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.

Comments for Planning Application 23/02607/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02607/FUL

Address: Proposed Telecoms Apparatus 35 Meters North Of 141 Newhaven Road Newhaven
Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed telecommunications installation. Proposed 20.0m high EE / H3G Phase 7
Streetworks Pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works.

Case Officer: Conor MacGreevy

Customer Details

Name: Debbie Zappa

Address: 15 Rectory Road Stoke Plymouth

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Parliament

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this Planning Application as the siting is incredibly inappropriate as it is right on the edge of the beautiful Victoria Park where children play in the playpark and others walk their dogs. It is also far too close to the school. This mast would seriously affect the appearance of the park. The mast is also in a conversation area so it cannot go up regardless.

I have had a look at the Self-Certification letter which has been lodged with the Planning Application and it reads as follows:

Three UK Limited is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection[1] as expressed in EU Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)".

1) This is the link to the ICNIRP Safety Guidelines which were published in 1998 and are now very out of date. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

2) This is the link to the EU Council Recommendation which is also now very out of date. https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/environment/EMF/implement_rep_en.pdf

My comments are as follows. Both guidelines are very out of date.

The ICNIRP Guidelines specifically state on page three (including the cover page) that the guidelines DO NOT APPLY TO ANYONE WITH METAL in their body and states that: "These guidelines will be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields" as per this paragraph from page 3 of the ICNIRP Guidelines.

Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers and defibrillators, wearable diabetic devices (e.g.: subcutaneous glucose monitors and insulin pumps) and cochlear implants. Interference with pacemakers and other medical devices may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels. Advice on avoiding these problems is beyond the scope of the present document. Some advice is available elsewhere (e.g.: UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993), although this document is now 20 years out of date and may not be relevant to medical devices currently in use. These guidelines should be periodically revised and updated as advances are made in identifying the adverse health effects of time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

Many who live near the location of the mast will have pacemakers, hip replacements or other medical devices and these ICNIRP Safety Guidelines DO NOT APPLY to them. Where are the promised periodic revisions as advances are made in identifying adverse health effects? Have we not had any in a quarter of a century.

I plead with you to refuse this planning application on the grounds that its appearance and siting are FAR TOO DETRIMENTAL. You have been handed a gift horse which gives you a GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD because I do understand that you are not allowed to officially and specifically question the HIGHLY QUESTIONABLE SAFETY GUIDELINES WHICH THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS ASKED YOU TO BLINDLY TRUST.

Please do the right thing. Thank you in advance.