14 February 2024.

To Planning Inspector J Smith

I am writing to seek clarification with regard to the appeal by **CK Hutchison Networks UK Limited** against the refusal by the **Wirral Council** for a 5G mast at **Arrowe Park Road** in Wirral, allowed by yourself on **12 February 2024**.

I objected to the appeal. My email of 12 December 2023 is copied below.
I am not sure if you read my objections.
I raise a number of important points which have **NOT** been taken into account.

1. CK Hutchison Networks UK Limited, a Chinese entity, did **NOT** exist as a company when the application was made on 10 February 2023, and have not existed since 16 November 2022. How can you give permission to a company that does not exist ?
You were supplied the official document to show this to be the case.
This has massive legal implications.

2. The ICNIRP statement / certificate issued on 25 January 2023 is invalidated because the company which guarantees the certificate did **NOT** exist when the application was made, and has not existed since 27 October 2015.

You were supplied the official document to show this to be the case.

This means that the application is **NOT** supported by a statement that self-certifies that, when operational, International Commission guidelines will be met, in clear contradiction of paragraph 117c of the NPPF, and indeed of paragraph 10 of your decision, where you state

'No sufficiently authoritative evidence has been provided to indicate that the ICNIRP guidelines would not be complied with or that a departure from national policy would be justified.'

This also has massive Public Liability Insurance implications.

3. By **NOT** supplying the outcome of consultations with relevant organisations regarding the close proximity of the mast to 3 schools, the appellant has not complied with NPPF paragraph 117.

4. There is already a proliferation of 13 other masts within a 1 mile radius of the proposed mast, which appears to be in contradiction with NPPF paragraph 115.

Please clarify the reasons these important issues were not taken into consideration, as apart from it being a **potentially fraudulent application** on **two** counts, with an additional **two** breaches of the NPPF, myself and many local people are horrified, and petrified of this mast being erected.

Regards

On Fri, 22 Mar 2024 at 22:01, Planning Inspectorate <enquiries@> wrote:

Dear

Whilst we aim to respond to all correspondence within 40 working days, we are currently dealing with a significant backlog of correspondence as well as resourcing issues. This is something that the Planning Inspectorate is working hard to resolve. We would like to apologise for this and can confirm that someone will respond with a full response in due course.

Yours sincerely,

The Customer Team

On Mon, 22 Apr 2024 at 19:02, Planning Inspectorate <enquiries@> wrote:

Dear

Thank you for your email. We are aware that you have not yet received a response to your correspondence. We have currently been dealing with a backlog due to staff shortages, which we have been working on, so please accept our sincere apologies for the delay.

Due to the length of time that has passed, we are aware that many queries may no longer be relevant. As such, we request you to confirm if the queries you detail are still relevant and if you would like to proceed in us looking at them further. If this is the case, please respond to this email to inform us.

Any correspondence that we do not hear back from within two weeks will be assumed that it is no longer relevant and the ticket closed.

Yours sincerely,

The Customer Team