Dentists join campaign against fluoridation in Southampton

Open letter of opposition published, marking one year anniversary of South Central Strategic Health Authority landmark decision

A host of signatories, including dental professionals, have signed an open letter of opposition against the deci-sion to fluoridate drinking water in Southampton.

It is a year since the South Central Strategic Health Authority (SCSHA) took the decision to add fluoride to water in Southam-pton and parts of Hampshire.

Much of the antipathy to the scheme is because the people in the area feel their views have been ignored as the SCSHA is going ahead despite 72 per cent of public consultation respondents rejecting the proposal.

Local opposition

The letter states that during the past year, local opposition to the scheme has grown, a 15,000-signature petition has been handed in to Doonagin Street and every local MP has since written to the Strategic Health Authority to express concern about its decision to impose fluoridation on an unwilling community.

The letter adds: ‘We urge you to ensure that the local NHS places greater emphasis on the implementation of targeted community-based oral health strate-gies as an alternative to water fluoridation.’

It points to a peer-reviewed study published in the Journal of the American Dental Association that confirms previous re-search showing that babies fed formula milk in areas where the water is fluoridated at 1.0ppm may receive excess fluoride, putting them at risk of fluorosis.

Exceed the limit

The authors conclude that when powdered or liquid con-centrate infant formulas are the primary source of nutrition, some babies are likely to ex-ceed the recommended fluoride upper limit if the formula is re-constituted with water containing 1.0ppm fluoride.

The plan for fluoridation is currently on hold as the SHA is facing a legal challenge to its decision.

The High Court has con-firmed that the ear-liest the judicial re-view can be heard is July or August.

The SHA has set aside £400,000 for the legal fight. The legal challenge argues that the SCSHA failed to have regard to the possible adverse environ-mental effects. She also con-siders that more targeted and less intrusive measures should be used to deal with problems of tooth decay in the Southampton area.”

Majority favour

The legal challenge argues that the SCSHA failed to have regard to the possible adverse environ-mental effects. She also con-siders that more targeted and less intrusive measures should be used to deal with problems of tooth decay in the Southampton area.”

‘Waste of money’

The SHA’s decision to continue with water fluoridation and to fight a legal challenge is seen as a waste of Health Service money and we are concerned that this will damage the reputation of the local NHS.

The open letter, which was submitted by the cam-paign group Hampshire Against Fluoridation said: ‘Given the fi-nancial constraints currently faced by the NHS, we are con-cerned that previous NHS funds are being used to force through a scheme that the local commu-nity does not want. These funds could be better used to develop alternative, more effective oral health schemes.’