



## PHONE MAST REFUSED

EM Radiation Research Trust Director Eileen O'Connor and concerned citizens David Bryant, Janet Roberts and Joanne Allman attended the Sefton Council Planning Committee meeting at Bootle Town Hall on Wednesday 21<sup>st</sup> September 2022

We are delighted to report that Sefton Council **REFUSED the application for the** phone mast monopole, equipment cabinets, electric meter and ancillary development including GPS module for **the** application CK Hutchison Networks (UK) Ltd. The application site was outside the entrance to Great Crosby Catholic Primary School on the corner of The Northern Road and Moorside Road, Crosby, Liverpool. Ref: **DC/2022/01546**

Download copy of letter of objection sent from the EM Radiation Research Trust:  
<https://www.radiationresearch.org/articles/crosby-phone-mast-objection/>

### Details from Sefton Council Document Pack

#### REASONS FOR REFUSAL:

- 1) The proposed 18-metre-high monopole would result in a dominating and intrusive feature which would significantly detract from the appearance and character of the area and does not comply with Policy EQ2 of the Sefton Local Plan.
- 2) No information has been submitted to identify the area of search and it has not been demonstrated that a robust search has been carried out of all practical alternatives.
- 3) The proposal could cause harm to pedestrian safety contrary to the provisions of Policy EQ3 (f) of the Sefton Local Plan.

Highways raised safety issues in relation to the layout of the equipment. Councillors Leslie Byrom and Janet Grace both strongly opposed the location of the mast positioned in front of Great Crosby Catholic Primary School.

**A 1,044- signature online petition (updated on 12/9/2022) opposing the development was received by Planning Services on the following grounds:**

'The proposal would severely impact the safety of pupils, parents and children entering and leaving the school by reducing the pavement area and restricting the view of the road. A previous application to site a monopole outside Forefield Lane School was refused siting health and safety as a heavy factor in the decision. It is not in keeping with a residential area.'

Note: The Forefield Lane application was withdrawn by the applicant and was not refused.

**A 156-signature hard copy petition opposing the development was also received by Planning Services on the following grounds:**

‘We object to the proposed structure on the basis of obstructing pedestrian traffic (prams, buggies, children, parents, bikes scooters, wheelchairs, mobility scooters etc.)

There is a heavy footfall, twice daily, to and from a busier than average primary school and nursery.’

**191 individual neighbour/general representations were received. 190 of these representations oppose the application on the following grounds:**

### **MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

#### **Siting**

- Close to school. Close to residential properties. Better alternative sites. Will reduce width of pavement causing pedestrian obstruction. Will conflict with bus stop. Risk of people being forced into the road. Will cause safety issues especially at drop off and pick up times near school. Pavement is already busy with street furniture. People already congregate on the grass verges, this will increase. Reduces space for safe access into school. Northern Road is already a dangerous road. Will cause issues for disabled access on the footway and pushchairs. Distraction to road users. Equipment will create a funnel effect.

#### **Appearance**

- Would not fit in with street furniture. Eyesore. Negative visual impact upon surroundings. Not in keeping with quiet residential area. Far taller than any other infrastructure in the area/ Spoils distant views.

#### **Lack of notification**

- Consultation period taking place in school summer holidays is unfair and undemocratic. Great Crosby School did not receive the consultation as it was within school holidays.

#### **Other Considerations**

- **Health impacts**
- Long-term impact on health on young children. Impacts on health of local residents. Impact on People’s wellbeing and quality of life. Unknown risks, research is ongoing. Lawsuits have proved that mobile towers cause health consequences. Health and safety risks due to location.

#### **Impact of construction works**

- Structural work will cause traffic issues in the area.

#### **Similar proposals refused elsewhere**

- A similar proposal was refused outside Forefield Primary School

#### **No evidence to support need for equipment**

- Vast majority of internet communications uses landlines. Local area is already well served by other 4G networks. Data in the area is already sufficient

#### **Impact on house prices**

It would put people off buying a house within the vicinity of the area.