

James Argles

From: Planning Support
Subject: FW: OBJECTION to HGY/2023/1711

Sent: 11 August 2023 18:05

Subject: OBJECTION to HGY/2023/1711

I am writing to object to Application HGY/2023/1711

Proposed 15.0m phase 8 street works monopole, 2no. equipment cabinets with associated meter cabinet, and ancillary development. Shepherds Hill, Crouch End, London Borough of Haringey, England, N6 5RR

My full address is included below.

I frequently visit a friend who lives in the area, but also the rollout of 5G is a national policy and therefore a national issue, which concerns locals and non-locals alike.

APPEARANCE and SITING

-

** Monopoles and their accompanying cabinets are overbearing, hideous and unnerving, and for many people, cause anxiety and stress.

** The impact of this proposal on the health and well-being of residents is a material planning consideration, which includes the fear and anxiety of harm.

** This will be incongruous with the surrounding character and will impact on the quality of the local area.

** Local people (not telecoms or the council) should have the right to say how it affects the character of their local area.

Shepherds Hill Gardens is listed as a Metropolitan Open Land (MOL) as well as being in a conservation area. It hosts many mature trees as well as bats, owls, woodpeckers, and many insects.

All these need to be considered,

ICNIRP does not cover flora and fauna. Studies show damage to trees and insects. See below.

DOCUMENTS and EVIDENCE INCLUDED IN APPLICATION

-

**** CONCERNS re ICNIRP and the Telecoms self-certification document**

** Self-certification is the telecom company certifying itself, which is **a conflict of interest.**

** Both ICNIRP and OFCOM state that they do not issue certificates or verify / guarantee the safety of any device or installation, and therefore do not verify any such self-certified certificate. This is clearly stated on both websites.

** What checks are made to ensure the accuracy of this declaration?

** How much manpower, expertise and specialised equipment does the council have to verify that the installation will in fact comply with ICNIRP standards?

** How will the installation be monitored in future? This is particularly important when considering any subsequent additional masts in the area, cumulative exposures and spikes, and indeed any future upgrade of the mast in this application.

** The application lacks transparency. The document declares that the proposed equipment and installation will comply with ICNIRP but does not include the calculations used to draw that conclusion.

** The applicant's declaration does NOT conform to what is laid out in the "Code of practice on mobile network development in England " (published ar-2022) (Annex C) / NPPF.

1. states that it is “DESIGNED” rather than “shall be OPERATED” to be in FULL COMPLIANCE
2. it is not signed (although it says it is).

Code of practice = <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/code-of-practice-for-wireless-network-development-in-england/code-of-practice-for-wireless-network-development-in-england>

** If the specific antennae design is not given, it is impossible for the council to say that the structure is performing within ICNIRP. _

**** Documents re Health and 5G**

Included in the Documents section of the application are those regarding health which are designed to allay VALID health concerns and influence the planning decision. Why are the Telecoms free to provide “evidence”, such as it is, when members of the public (especially locals), are not?

This “evidence” is generic and industry biased, but more importantly IGNORES the latest published case studies from 2022-2023, which reveal real-life harm from 5G exposure.

These are the only real-life 5G case studies so far. There are no studies anywhere that show there is no risk of harm from 5G exposure. Nor does it state anywhere in ICNIRP that it is safe.

(Please see **LACK of “REAL-LIFE” 5G HEALTH STUDIES** below, for details of these studies.

SUMMARY of MAJOR ISSUES

The following lists a number of VERY IMPORTANT issues which I ask you to take into consideration. For more details, please see below.

**** ICNIRP**

The alleged safety of this application is based solely on ICNIRP standards which are unreliable, out of date, and drawn up by a self-appointed group with conflicts of interests, who have ignored a critical mass of scientific papers showing adverse health effects well below the recommended limits.

In Italy 2017, a brain cancer was linked to mobile phone use, a ruling which was upheld in 2019, in The Turin Court of Appeal. The court recognised clear conflicts of interest within ICNIRP, and the guidelines were rejected by medical professionals as entirely unreliable. Effectively, the Court of Turin ruled that ICNIRP’s review of the science is unreliable.

In the **case of EHT et al vs FCC (13-Aug-2021)**, the US Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, ruled in favour of wireless safety advocates, thus putting into question the decision to retain 1996 safety limits for human exposure to wireless radiation. ICNIRP guidelines similarly date from the late 1990s and were only slightly altered in their 2020 review, despite a huge change in the technology used since that time.

In 2 recent reviews (2023), ICNIRP is once again criticised for its out-of-date assumptions and debatable recommended limits. Its 2020 revisions ignore important animal studies (which have implications for human cancers) and no longer include provisions on pulse modulations, which is hugely significant.

The very foundation on which “safety” is based, is questionable.

Even if we assume that ICNIRP is the gold standard, nowhere does it claim that the levels its set are “safe” and it also lists areas “beyond the scope of these guidelines” which need to be considered by the council. There is no provision for animals (including pollinators) and plants. Individuals with metallic implants are specifically excluded. Very few of in the general population are without some form of metal in their bodies. This means that the “safety” certificate does NOT cover them!!!

ICNIRP do not take responsibility for any harm caused by use of the info on their website, AND they do not guarantee any ICNIRP self-certificate. Who then is left to cover claims when harm IS done?

-
**** INSURANCE**

Insurance companies, including Lloyds of London, will not insure against harm caused by EMFs. In the Lloyd's document "Electro-Magnetic Fields from Mobile Phones, Emerging risks team report 2010", a chapter is dedicated to looking at the lessons drawn from the experience with asbestos, whose long-term health effects and consequent claims, cost the insurance industry heavily. Their approach to EMFs is now one of extreme caution, as parallels are drawn.

What does this say about the safety of EMFs and how might this affect your liability?

-
**** HEALTH and STUDIES**

There are THOUSANDS of scientific papers citing connections between EMFs and multiple adverse health effects, as well as harm to wildlife and the environment.

How can it be claimed that 5G is safe when there has been inadequate testing? **New studies** are demonstrating serious health effects caused by living close to 5G cell towers. **Unequivocally this is a public safety issue.**

-
The evidence demonstrating adverse effects to human health is now overwhelming. We are already living in a soup of electro smog. At what critical point do we stand up and say enough is enough? How much more harm needs to be done?

Worth noting is the refusal of a mast application by Mendip Council **ON HEALTH-GROUNDS** in March-2022.

Also, in 2021 a Judicial Review quashed the decision of **Brighton & Hove City Council** who had granted prior approval for the installation of a mast adjacent to a school, despite strong local opposition. It was ruled that health, safety and siting had been ignored. The council was ordered to pay costs of £13K.

This has significant implications for all councils dealing with applications as ALL masts have potential health implications and studies have shown that detrimental health effects are experienced within 500m.

Most importantly, it is now recognised that Local Planning Authorities must address the health impacts of 5G mast proposals beyond blind acceptance of an ICNIRP certificate.

The **New Hampshire HB522 Commission on 5G** (formed by legislation to explore the environmental and health effects of 5G technology) published their findings after a year-long study in Nov-2020. The commission found that wireless radiation is harmful and **recommended 1,640 feet (500 metres) as a realistic protective setback distance against radiation from masts.** Their recommendation was evidence based, and as such, is **globally applicable.**

NOTE: this 500m setback distance is 10 times the estimated exclusion zone recommended by ICNIRP.

**** PLANTS and WILDLIFE**

Although fewer studies have been done in this area, there are nonetheless sufficient to warrant attention. Of particular concern is the decline in insect populations and most importantly pollinators.

-
MORE DETAILED INFORMATION

(#1) ICNIRP

<https://www.icnirp.org/>

**** ICNIRP specifically excludes certain individuals (with metallic implants). This means that the ICNIRP safety guidelines do not cover a large percentage of the population due to metallic content in their bodies.**

**** ICNIRP does not take responsibility for any harm caused by use of the info on their website (which includes the certificate) being used.**

**** ICNIRP does not guarantee any self-certificate**

**** Question – considering the above 2 points, who then is left to cover claims when harm IS done?**

**** Several papers now reveal conflicts of interest and ICNIRP's blatant disregard for a critical mass of scientific papers showing adverse health effects well below their recommended safety limits.**

**** Standards developed in the 1990s by ICNIRP (and the FCC) used technology of its time. Since then, there has been a digital revolution. Mobile phone use alone has grown from approx. 15% of the population to a state where most individuals use a mobile phone on a daily basis. The old standards do not take into account the current technology, the volume / type of use, non-thermal effects, pulsing signals, and the ubiquitous nature of it. They fail to consider the cumulative exposures from multiple sources.**

**** Standards need to be updated to reflect the most recent technology which uses different frequencies, different transmissions, and infinitely more sources.**

**** There is NO provision for animals (including our vital pollinators) or plants**

There is total reliance on guidelines set out by **ICNIRP**, BUT a peer-reviewed paper **"Self-referencing authorships behind the ICNIRP 2020 radiation protection guidelines"** (Nordhagen and Flydal) published in the journal, **Reviews of Environmental Health, in June-2022**, revealed that ICNIRP's recommendation exposure limits are not as rigorous as they portray and in fact are based on research produced by its own members and affiliates. This narrow focus ignores a wealth of peer-reviewed scientific literature showing harm from non-thermal effects at levels well below those recommended by ICNIRP. The conclusion was that **the ICNIRP 2020 guidelines fail to meet fundamental scientific quality requirements.**

FULL TEXT= <https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.1515/reveh-2022-0037/html>

ABSTRACT = <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/35751553/>

Further article = [ICNIRP's wireless radiation exposure limits are based on smoke and mirrors](https://www.saferemr.com/2018/07/icnirps-exposure-guidelines-for-radio.html)
<https://www.saferemr.com/2018/07/icnirps-exposure-guidelines-for-radio.html>

In Oct-2022, The International Commission on the Biological Effects of Electromagnetic Fields (ICBE-EMF) challenged the safety of current wireless exposure limits to radiofrequency radiation (RFR) and called for an independent evaluation. The paper **"Scientific evidence invalidates health assumptions underlying FCC n ICNIRP guidelines - implications for 5G"** (Oct-2022). It states that the U.S. FCC and ICNIRP have inappropriately dismissed hundreds of scientific studies which document adverse health effects (including DNA damage, cardiomyopathy and carcinogenicity) at exposures below the threshold dose claimed by these agencies and that guidelines do not adequately protect the general population from short-term or long-term RFR exposures. Given the increasing exposures of people and the environment to RFR, including novel forms of radiation from 5G, these guidelines need reviewing, especially as there are no adequate health effects studies.

FULL PAPER = https://icbe-emf.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/10/ICBE-EMF-paper-12940_2022_900_OnlinePDF_Patched-1.pdf And <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/36253855/>

FACT SHEET = <https://icbe-emf.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/10/fact-sheet-221009-v2.pdf>

James Lin, professor emeritus, department of electrical and computer engineering, University of Illinois, Chicago, and a former long-term member of ICNIRP (2004-2016) **criticises ICNIRP in two recent papers (2023).**

In **RF Health Safety Limits and Recommendations (James Lin, IEEE Microwave Mag, June-2023)**, James Lin **criticises** the FCC, IEEE and ICNIRP exposure limits for RF and 5G radiation. The revised ICNIRP guidelines (2020) **ignore the outcome of important animal studies** (which have implications for human cancers) and no longer include provisions for pulse modulations. He states that **"they are not applicable to**

long-term exposure at low levels. Instead of advances in science, they are **predicated on assumptions using outdated exposure metrics.**" <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/stamp/stamp.jsp?tp=&arnumber=10121536>

In **"Incongruities in recently revised radiofrequency exposure guidelines and standards"** (April-2023), Lin states: "There are substantial abnormalities in these putative health safety protection guidelines and standards. **Some of the safety limits are irrelevant, debatable, and absent of scientific justification from the standpoint of safety and public health protection.**" And **"The current scientific database is inadequate at mm wavelengths to render a trustworthy appraisal or to reach a judgment with confidence."** <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/36706903/> it is worth noting the Turin, Italy legal case (2017, 2019) in which the Court judged that an employee's acoustic neuroma was caused by use of mobile phone as part of his work. In December 2019, in The Turin Court of Appeal, the initial judgement was upheld. The court recognised clear conflicts of interest within ICNIRP, and the guidelines were rejected by medical professionals as entirely unreliable concerning the harmful effects, including cancerous effects, resulting from the biological impacts of RFR other than tissue heating. **The Court of Turin ruled that ICNIRP's review of the science is unreliable.**

<https://384ad423-7b2c-4af8-bf67->

ac6163f6e17b.filesusr.com/ugd/c1889a_a7578f7cd35d4c23ad1fd21b35a02d53.pdf

Italian Supreme Court Affirms Tumor Risk from Long-Term Use of a Cell Phone (Turin 2012)

<https://microwavenews.com/news-center/italian-supreme-court-affirms-tumor-risk>

In view of the **ruling in the case of EHT et al vs FCC (13-Aug-2021)** by the US Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, which ruled in favour of wireless safety advocates, it is worth looking more carefully at the safety guidelines (ICNIRP) which are used in the UK for human exposure to wireless radiation.

The US court ruled that the FCC's decision to retain its 1996 safety limits for human exposure to wireless radiation as "arbitrary and capricious".

It ruled that "The case be remanded to the commission to provide a reasoned explanation for its determination that its guidelines adequately protect against harmful effects of exposure to radio frequency radiation". It ruled that the FCC neglected non-cancer evidence in determining their standards, thus putting public health and safety at risk; and also completely failed to acknowledge or respond to concerns over environmental harms.

<https://ehtrust.org/in-historic-decision-federal-court-finds-fcc-failed-to-explain-why-it-ignored-scientific-evidence-showing-harm-from-wireless-radiation/>

Judgement = <https://docs.fcc.gov/public/attachments/DOC-374936A1.pdf>

The UK rely heavily on ICNIRP GUIDELINES which similarly date from the late 1990s. Despite a review in 2020, these standards remain woefully inadequate.

In addition, **in the ICNIRP guidelines document** (last re-published 2020), ICNIRP state that the objective is **"to establish guidelines for limiting exposure to EMFs that will provide a high level of protection for all people against *substantiated adverse health effects* from exposures to both short- and long-term, continuous and discontinuous radiofrequency EMFs."**

The word "substantiated" means that it is established as truth by proof or evidence. **ICNIRP therefore acknowledges adverse health effects on the very first page. In fact, nowhere does it state that the levels it sets are safe.**

It then goes on to list areas **"beyond the scope of these guidelines"**, including metallic implants.

Very few people nowadays are without any form of metal in their bodies (for starters, just think of dental work). Considering the number of individuals in the community with for instance medical implants, pacemakers, metal shunts, dental work (crowns, pins, implants, mercury fillings, and, in the case of children, dental braces) etc, this should be a major consideration and concern, especially as these people

are NOT COVERED by the ICNIRP certificate. What if someone with an implant becomes ill due to a mast being located near their home, and brings a case against the council? What insurance does the council have for such a claim?

On the ICNIRP website page on RF EMFs (within which 5G is listed)

It states: "The overall evaluation of all the research on RF EMFs leads to the conclusion that RF EMF exposure below the thermal threshold is unlikely to be associated with adverse health effects."

The word unlikely does not mean it will not happen.

<https://www.icnirp.org/en/frequencies/radiofrequency/index.html>

It is also worth highlighting their disclaimer

<https://www.icnirp.org/en/legal-notice.html>

*"ICNIRP e.V. undertakes all reasonable measures to ensure the reliability of information presented on the website, **but does not guarantee** the correctness, reliability, or completeness of the information and views published. The content of our website is **provided to you for information only**. We **do not assume any responsibility for any damage**, including direct or indirect loss suffered by users or third parties in connection with the use of our website and/or the information it contains, including for the use or the interpretation of any technical data, recommendations, or specifications available on our website."*

Basically, this disclaimer states that. **ICNIRP will not take responsibility for any damage due to the use of info on their website!**

(#2) Recommended 500m SETBACK

- In 2019, the New Hampshire state legislature created a commission to study the environmental and health effects of 5G technology. The study was conducted over a period of a year, and the **New Hampshire HB522 Commission on 5G** published their findings in November 2020. The commission found that wireless radiation is harmful and recommended 1,640 feet (500 meters) as a realistic protective distance against radiation from masts. *(Note: it was formed through legislation.)*

The commission comprised a 13-strong team of experts in epidemiology, occupational health, toxicology, physics, electromagnetics, biostatistics, medicine, public health policy business and law, plus one wireless industry expert. All except the industry rep agreed RF radiation coming from wireless devices affects humans, animals, insects and plants, and poses a significant threat to human health and the environment.

Following these recommendations, House Bill 1644 is now currently under review at the State House. HB1644 requires telecommunication antennas to be placed at least 1,640 feet from residentially zoned areas, parks, playgrounds, hospitals, nursing homes, day care centres and schools. It also creates a self-reporting registry for anyone who believes they're experiencing symptoms of radiation exposure.

- Their recommendation was evidence based, and as such, is **globally applicable**.

It also demonstrates the growing acknowledgement for adverse effects from RF radiation to humans, as well as animals and plants.

FINAL report =

<http://www.gencourt.state.nh.us/statstudcomm/committees/1474/reports/5G%20final%20report.pdf>

Video of commission member Kent Chamberlin discussing NH Commission Setback Justification 28-Dec-2021 (20 mins) <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DWK74ie7krc>

Articles =

<https://ehtrust.org/new-hampshire-legislature-votes-to-study-cell-tower-setback-bill/>

<https://rfinfo.co.uk/new-hants-commission/>

<https://ehtrust.org/science-health-facts-cell-towers-should-be-setback-from-homes-and-schools-dr-kent-chamberlin/>

(#3) INSURANCE and LIABILITY

- How might this affect **your liability** at allowing this to go ahead?

Insurance companies will not insure against harm caused by EMFs.

Lloyds of London is known for accepting the highest level of risks in liability insurance but Exclusion 32 excludes liability coverage for claims “directly or indirectly arising out of, resulting from or contributed to by electromagnetic fields, electromagnetic radiation, electromagnetism, radio waves or noise.”

<https://stopsmartmeters.org.uk/lloyds-of-london-excludes-liability-coverage-for-harm-from-wireless-radiationrf-emf/>

<https://www.jrseco.com/lloyds-insurance-company-does-not-cover-health-damage-caused-by-electromagnetic-radiation/>

Other insurance companies, such as Swiss Re, are doing similar

In the **Swiss Re Emerging Risks Report (May 2019)**,

“Existing concerns regarding potential negative health effects from electromagnetic fields (EMFs) are only likely to increase. An uptick in liability claims could be a potential long-term consequence”

<https://www.jrseco.com/insurer-swiss-re-electromagnetic-radiation-highest-risk-category/>

Other concerns included in the report are cyber-attacks and security issues.

See also **Major Austrian insurer AUVA finds effects of cell phones on DNA, EEG and human proteins**

<https://www.jrseco.com/major-austrian-insurer-auva-finds-effects-of-cell-phones-on-dna-eeeg-and-human-proteins/>

These show that 4G/5G health effects are uninsurable and recognised by reinsurers as a high impact risk with respect to future litigation.

In the Lloyd’s document “**Electro-Magnetic Fields from Mobile Phones, Emerging risks team report 2010**”, a chapter is dedicated to looking at the lessons drawn from the experience with asbestos, whose long-term health effects, and consequent claims, cost the insurance industry heavily. Their approach to EMFs is now one of extreme caution, as parallels are drawn.

http://coolercoms.co.uk/common-sense/insurance-companies/lloyds_of_london_emf_final_.pdf

It is also worth reading “**Late Lessons from Early Warnings**” (Volumes I and II) which document the incredibly slow recognition of harm of several substances (including asbestos and X-rays) which are now deemed unsafe, and it considers how we should perhaps adopt a more precautionary approach to EMFs in order not to repeat history with its high toll on human health. (The second volume includes a chapter on mobile phones and brain cancers.)

https://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/environmental_issue_report_2001_22

<https://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/late-lessons-2>

Members of the campaign group “Stop 5G Bath” received a letter from PHE's own solicitors, DLA Piper, (dated 08-Aug-2019) which exempts PHE from all liability in the event of future legal action relating to health effects from 5G if their guidance should turn out to be incorrect or misleading. In this letter they state:

“A public body must determine how much weight to put on the PHE guidance. Equally that body must determine what other evidence from your client or other members of the public or interested parties to consider in making

any decision. *If it be alleged that a public body now or in the future acted unlawfully in placing reliance on the guidance, that cannot retrospectively taint the guidance with illegality."*

Where does this leave councils? What Public Liability Insurance does the council have in place against health and environmental harm caused by a technology for which there has been no long-term INDEPENDENT health or environmental studies?

(#4) NPPF (July-2021)

Councils rely on the NPPF Paragraph 118 which states that they cannot set health safeguards different from those set by ICNIRP.

This, however, **is in conflict with Paragraphs 185 and 130.**

Paragraph 185: *"Planning policies and decisions should also ensure that new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects **(including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development"***

RFR non-thermal effects are potentially polluting.

Indeed, **The Pollution Prevention and Control Act 1999**, in Section 1(3), defines 'environmental pollution' as, 'pollution of the air, water or land which may give rise to any harm ... (to include) ... (a) pollution caused by noise, heat or vibrations or any **other kind of release of energy**, and by 'air' includes air within buildings and air within other natural or man-made structures above or below ground'.

Clauses (a) and (d) of Section 79(1) of the **Environmental Protection Act 1990**, require local authorities to address "statutory nuisances", defined as

1. *any premises in such a state as to be prejudicial to health or a nuisance,*

*and (d) any dust, steam, smell or other **effluvia** arising on industrial, trade or business premises and being prejudicial to health and a nuisance.*

Further, Local councils have an obligation to safeguard the health of its constituents by virtue of **the National Health Service Act 2006, section 2B.**

2B Functions of local authorities and Secretary of State as to improvement of public health

*(1) Each local authority must take such steps as it considers appropriate **for improving the health of the people in its area.***

Paragraph 130: *Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments :*

f) create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being,

As asserted by Lord Gill in the Supreme Court judgment in *Suffolk Coastal District Council v Hopkins Homes Ltd et.al*, **'the guidance given by the Framework (the NPPF) is not to be interpreted as if it were a statute. Its purpose is to express general principles on which decision-makers are to proceed'**

<https://www.supremecourt.uk/cases/docs/uksc-2016-0076-judgment.pdf>

Please also take into account **NPPF paragraphs 174, 179, 180, which are protective of our natural environment.**

A primary responsibility of the council is to care for the health of its constituents and the environment. How can it do so for all other applications but not in the case of telecoms? The EECC makes health an imperative and a material consideration within planning for telecoms and that overrides any UK legislation.

EECC Recital 110 The need to ensure that citizens are not exposed to electromagnetic fields at a level harmful to public health is imperative.

EECC Recital 106 states “Competent authorities should seek to reconcile the environmental and public health considerations in question, taking due account of the precautionary approach set out in Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC”

The latter = 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) (OJ L 199, 30.7.1999, p. 59, of which paragraph 19 gives the LPAs legal argument for referencing guidelines other than ICNIRP.

(#5) HEALTH

(#5A) LACK of “REAL-LIFE” 5G HEALTH STUDIES

There are THOUSANDS of scientific papers citing connections between EMFs and multiple adverse health effects.

BUT worthy of note is the number of studies done on “real-life” 5G.

Joel M. Moskowitz, Ph.D. Director University of California, Berkeley, highlights an extremely important fact in his March 28th report regarding the **Biological and Health Effects of 5G**. There are **only 3 out of 38000 studies which research biological and health effects of “real-life” 5G using millimeter waves** (including beamforming, massive MIMO, and phased arrays). “Real-life” millimetre wave 5G utilises modulated frequencies which are likely to be more biologically potent than unmodulated frequencies.
<https://www.saferemr.com/2017/09/5g-wireless-technology-is-5g-harmful-to.html>

3 recently published case-studies demonstrate the real-life effect of 5G on human health. These clearly show that 5G deployment is a serious public safety issue.

Feb-2022, the first ever study on the health effects of 5G radiation on humans (*Lennart Hardell and Mona Nilsson*) showed that 5G causes typical symptoms of microwave syndrome as well as a massive increase in microwave radiation. The case study also confirmed once again that radiation well below levels allowed by the authorities causes ill health.

The study was published in the journal Medicinsk Access no. 1/2022 and was carried out by the oncologist and researcher Lennart Hardell from the Research Foundation for Environment & Cancer and Mona Nilsson from the Radiation Protection Foundation.

<https://mieuxprevenir.blogspot.com/2022/02/first-study-so-far-5g-causes-microwave.html#more>
and https://www.gavinpublishers.com/assets/articles_pdf/Case-Report-The-Microwave-Syndrome-after--Installation-of-5G-Emphasizes-the-Need-for--Protection-from-Radiofrequency-Radiation.pdf

The study shows that 5G causes typical symptoms of microwave syndrome as well as a massive increase in microwave radiation. The case study also confirms once again that radiation well below levels allowed by the authorities causes ill health.

Development of Microwave Syndrome in 2 Men after Installation of 5G on Roof above office (Nilsson and Hardell, Feb-2023)

This case study showed that installing a 5G base station on the roof above an office caused symptoms of microwave syndrome in two previously healthy men. The study is in line with a previous case study that also showed that 5G rapidly caused microwave syndrome in previously healthy people.

<https://www.anncaserep.com/abstract.php?aid=9589>

And <https://www.stralskyddsstiftelsen.se/two-studies-show-that-5g-caused-the-microwave-syndrome-in-healthy-persons/?fbclid=IwAR2Gfg7A15P19tdjNdZ9CI22oND-wn7OJFNdQ6eMHoLD5W175cH6Hx77m5c>

The clinical picture in both men was clearly related to the exposure, although the exposures were well below the guidelines recommended by ICNIRP that are claimed to protect against all health effects. We

conclude that the guidelines for RFR exposure based only on tissue heating by ICNIRP are inadequate to protect human health and that 5G appears to provoke symptoms of microwave syndrome in previously healthy people.

Case Report - 52-Year Healthy Woman Developed Severe Microwave Syndrome (Hardell, Nilsson Apr-2023)

In this case report we present a woman aged 52 years who developed health problems consistent with the microwave syndrome after installation of a 5G base station facing her apartment at 60 meters' distance. These symptoms consisted of e.g., headache, dizziness, concentration difficulties, fatigue, arrhythmia, skin burning and nose bleeding corresponding to the microwave syndrome

<https://www.acmcasereport.com/pdf/ACMCR-v10-1926.pdf>

Also worth reading

In July-2022, Spanish wildlife biologist, Alfonso Balmori's published his research project 'Evidence for a health risk of RF on people living around mobile phone base stations: from radiofrequency disease to cancer'.

"The aim of the project was to conduct a complete review of the existing scientific literature to update knowledge on the effects of mobile masts on humans. Studies conducted in real urban environments, with mobile masts located close to apartments, were selected. The overall results of the review show three types of effects from mobile masts on human health: radiofrequency illness (RS), cancer (C) and changes in biochemical parameters (CBP). Of all studies, 73.6% showed effects"

<https://www.radiationresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/08/Living-close-to-a-mobile-phone-mast-has-consequences.pdf>

The evidence demonstrating adverse effects to human health is now overwhelming. We are already living in a soup of electro smog. At what critical point do we stand up and say enough is enough? How much more harm needs to be done? Interestingly, as stated above, sickness from EMFs is totally uninsurable.

The following provide lists of studies on EMFs and Health

- **Peer-Reviewed Scientific Research on Wireless Radiation Health Effects**

<https://ehtrust.org/science/wireless-radiation-health-effects/>

- **The BioInitiative 2012 Report** <http://www.bioinitiative.org>
- Peer-reviewed scientific studies on EMF related subjects <https://www.powerwatch.org.uk/science/studies.asp>
- EMF-Portal of the RWTH Aachen University - summarizes systematically scientific research data on the effects of electromagnetic fields (EMF) www.EMF-portal.org
- Compilation of the vast number of known biological effects <https://www.5gfrequencyfreefairbanks.org>
- Americans for Responsible Technology – Independent Science on Wireless Radiation on Human Health and Environment <https://www.americansforresponsibletech.org/scientific-studies>
- Compilation of Research Studies on Cell Tower Radiation and Health <https://ehtrust.org/cell-towers-and-cell-antennae/compilation-of-research-studies-on-cell-tower-radiation-and-health/>
- Physicians for Safe Technology <https://mdsafetech.org/>

(#5B) HEALTH and COUNCILS

Back on 30-July-2021, **Brighton & Hove City Council** ('BHC') granted prior approval for the installation of a 15m monopole mast just 28m (90ft) from a school, despite strong local opposition. This decision was quashed in November-2021. (**BH2021/01639 – Fishergate Terrace, Portslade**)
<https://rfinfo.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/Consent-Order-02.11.21.pdf>

A Judicial Review proceeding was brought to quash this decision.

Brighton Council conceded on all 3 grounds in the Judicial Review Challenge including:

- "The Council unlawfully determined that the highway safety implications of the mast's cabinets and the concerns expressed by the highways team were not a relevant consideration."
- "The Council failed to address the health impacts of this particular proposal and to obtain adequate evidence of the assessment of the proximity to the school and the amended proposal;"
- "The Council failed to consider whether the facility could be sited on an existing building or structure"

So basically, health, safety and siting were ignored. The council was ordered to pay costs of £13K.

This has significant implications for all councils dealing with 5G applications.

Whilst the grounds for refusal state "for this particular proposal"; ALL masts have potential health implications and studies have shown that detrimental health effects are experienced within 500m.

Most importantly, it is now recognised that Local Planning Authorities must address the health impacts of 5G mast proposals beyond blind acceptance of an ICNIRP certificate.

Worth noting is the **refusal of a mast application by Mendip Council** [ON HEALTH-GROUNDS](#) in March-2022.

Mendip Planning Board did indeed refuse the 5G mast planning application on health grounds despite the Case Officers recommendation to approve it. Much of the evidence that was provided not being presented in the meeting.

<https://rfinfo.co.uk/mendip-council-health-impact-based-mast-refusal/>

You can view [video of the proceedings here](#). (this has been removed by Mendip since it evidences the committee refusal)

The evidence is here:

** [info-about-Mendip-refusal-of-5G-mast-on-health-groundsDownload](#)

** [ApprovedPlanningBoardMinutes16.03.22Download](#)

All of the above cannot be ignored, and in doing so, a local authority is neglecting its duty of care to its local community.

(#7) PLANTS and WILDLIFE

As mentioned above, ICNIRP makes NO provision for Wildlife and plants in its guidelines.

- Of particular concern is the detrimental effect of EMFs on pollinators.

GENERAL ARTICLES

How Green is 5G? <https://envirotecmagazine.com/2021/11/08/how-green-is-5g/>

Miguel Coma articles <https://www.meer.com/en/authors/943-miguel-coma>

Including 5G's threats to wildlife – Miguel Coma March-2021 = <https://www.meer.com/en/65062-5gs-threats-to-wildlife>

TREES

**** Radiofrequency radiation injures trees around mobile phone base stations (2016)**

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/306435017_Radiofrequency_radiation_injures_trees_around_mobile_phone_base_stations

And <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27552133>

- A detailed long-term (2006-2015) field monitoring study of 120 trees was performed in the cities of Bamberg and Hallstadt (Germany) and demonstrated electromagnetic radiation from phone masts is harmful to trees. _

We selected 60 damaged trees, in addition to 30 randomly selected trees and 30 trees in low radiation areas The measurements of all trees revealed significant differences between the damaged side facing a phone mast and the opposite side, as well as differences between the exposed side of damaged trees and all other groups of trees in both sides.....The 30 selected trees in low radiation areas (no visual contact to any phone mast and power flux density under $50\mu\text{W}/\text{m}^2$) showed no damage. Statistical analysis demonstrated that electromagnetic radiation from mobile phone masts is harmful for trees. These results are consistent with the fact that damage afflicted on trees by mobile phone towers usually start on one side, extending to the whole tree over time.

Additional photos here (published Mar-2022)

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/359481325_Tree_damage_caused_by_mobile_phone_base_stations_An_observation_guide_Photos_and_RF_measurements_by_Cornelia_Waldmann-Selsam_Additional_photos

See also ** Electromagnetic Fields Impact Tree and Plant Growth (2018)

<https://ehtrust.org/electromagnetic-fields-impact-tree-plant-growth/>

##WILDLIFE

It is interesting to note that loss of bi-diversity and wildlife on both Mt Nardi in Australia and on Samos (see below) occurred in areas where 4G masts had been erected.

Effects of non-ionizing electromagnetic fields on flora and fauna (2021, Levitt, Lai, Manville)

PART 1 = Rising ambient EMF levels in the environment <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34047144/>

PART 2 = Impacts: how species interact with natural and man-made EMF

<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34243228/>

PART 3 = Exposure standards, public policy, laws, and future directions

<https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.1515/reveh-2021-0083/html>

A major three-part **2021 research review “Effects of non-ionizing electromagnetic fields on flora and fauna”** on effects to wildlife published by U.S experts journalist Blake Levitt, Dr. Henry Lai and former U.S. Fish and Wildlife senior biologist Albert Manville cites more than 1,200 scientific references which found adverse biological effects to wildlife from even very low intensities of non-ionising radiation, showing impacts to orientation, migration, reproduction, mating, nest, den building and survivorship.

“It is time to recognize ambient EMF as a novel form of pollution and develop rules at regulatory agencies that designate air as 'habitat' so EMF can be regulated like other pollutants. Wildlife loss is often unseen and undocumented until tipping points are reached. Long-term chronic low-level EMF exposure standards, which do not now exist, should be set accordingly for wildlife, and environmental laws should be strictly enforced.”

Effects of non-ionizing electromagnetic fields on flora and fauna,

Low-level EMF effects on wildlife and plants: What research tells us about an ecosystem approach (Levitt, Lai, Manville) 2022

<https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpubh.2022.1000840/full>

"It is clear that non-human species experience EMF as environmental stressors and biological effects can occur at anthropogenic levels in our present environment. This largely unrecognized variable can conceivably alter delicate ecosystems, arguably including the biosphere where all living organisms are located—and may, in fact, be doing so....."

Given our increasing ambient EMF levels, far more precise understanding of the molecular and cellular processes of electro and magneto-reception in non-human species is suddenly critical. We may already be overwhelming some species' natural biological sensors that evolved over eons. Electroreception mechanisms, including magneto/electroreceptors, magnetite, and cryptochrome/radical-pairs, enable vast living organisms in all environments to detect the presence of, and immediate changes, in non-ionizing electromagnetic fields at very low intensities across a range of frequencies. Such heightened sensitivities function far beyond human perception and create unique vulnerabilities that can easily be disturbed by novel manmade fields. Since technology changes so fast, no evolutionary adaptation is possible."

EHT - Published Research on Bees and Butterflies and EMFs

<https://ehtrust.org/science/bees-butterflies-wildlife-research-electromagnetic-fields-environment/>

Alain Thill - Biological effects of EMFs on insects (2020) (ENGLISH version)

https://ehtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/Thill_Review_Insects_2020_Engl.pdf

accessible from <https://ehtrust.org/german-environmental-organization-study-finds-wireless-could-influence-insect-orientation-reproduction-and-foraging/>

72 out of 83 peer-reviewed published studies found effects from EMF radiation on insects.
(An initial 190 studies were reviewed; 83 were identified to be of suitable scientific quality).

Excerpt from the study

"The results show that EMF could have a serious impact on the vitality of insect populations. In some experiments it was found that despite low levels of exposure to transmitters, harmful effects occurred after several months. Field strengths 100 times below the ICNIRP limits could already have effects. Against the background of the rapid decline of insects and the further expansion of high-frequency electromagnetic field sources, there is not only an urgent need for further research, but also in particular on the interactions with other harmful noxious agents, such as pesticides. When planning the expansion of mobile networks, insect habitats should be protected from high-intensity EMF exposure already now."

Electromagnetic radiation as an emerging driver factor for the decline of insects (Balmori, May-2021)

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0048969720384461?dgcid=author>

& <https://ehtrust.org/new-study-electromagnetic-radiation-as-an-emerging-driver-factor-for-the-decline-of-insects/>

Abstract

"The biodiversity of insects is threatened worldwide. Numerous studies have reported the serious decline in insects that has occurred in recent decades. The same is happening with the important group of pollinators, with an essential utility for pollination of crops. Loss of insect diversity and abundance is expected to provoke cascading effects on food webs and ecosystem services. Many authors point out that reductions in insect abundance must be attributed mainly to agricultural practices and pesticide use. On the other hand, evidence for the effects of non-thermal microwave radiation on insects has been known for at least 50 years. The review carried out in this study shows that electromagnetic radiation should be considered seriously as a complementary driver for the dramatic decline in insects, acting in synergy with agricultural intensification, pesticides, invasive species and climate change. The extent that anthropogenic electromagnetic radiation represents a significant threat to insect pollinators is unresolved and plausible. For these reasons, and taking into account the benefits they provide to nature and humankind, the precautionary principle should be applied before any new deployment (such 5G) is considered."

Wildlife & Biodiversity - A Disappearing Act by Cell Towers on Land & in Space (Cindy Russell, 2021, 2023)

<https://mdsafetech.org/2021/07/19/wildlife-and-biodiversity-a-disappearing-act-by-cell-towers-on-land-and-in-space/>

5G Cell Towers Cause Massive Insect Decline on the Greek island of Samos (Kordas 2022)

<https://safetechinternational.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/5G-causes-massive-insectdeclines-on-Samos.pdf>

Diana Kordas lives in a rural area on the Greek Island of Samos. Her paper is “an effort to document what has happened in an area which has cell tower radiation but does not have pesticides or monoculture, which has a rich variety of plant life and is surrounded by wild land. It is based purely on observation”. The paper opens with the alarming statistics “In 2017, a major German study found that flying insects had decreased over 75% in protected areas over the previous 27 years while ruling out climate change and pesticides. In 2021, the bumblebee was declared **extinct in nine** U.S. states.” Her paper includes tables of species observed.

It is Kordas’s opinion that “Cell tower radiation is causing insects to die. An ongoing decline in insect numbers occurred after the introduction of 4G/LTE, and the new 5G network on Samos has caused insect declines to reach a tipping point.”

Mount Nardi Wildlife Report to UNESCO FINAL (2000-2015)

<https://www.emrsa.co.za/report-for-the-united-nations-educational-scientific-and-cultural-organization/> and <https://ehtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/Mt-Nardi-Wildlife-Report-to-UNESCO-FINAL.pdf>

This report was prepared by a naturalist/ethno-botanist, local to the area and detailed the dramatic decline in volume and species variety in the Mt. Nardi area of the Nightcap National Park World Heritage Area (home to ancient forest and endangered plants and wildlife) during a 15-year period (2000-2015) as a result of the introduction of digital technologies, 3G, 4G etc.

In summary

What we are seeing is a repeat of what happened with the Tobacco industry, when risks were ignored / denied, until a critical mass of data showing damage was no longer possible to brush under the carpet. The 5G scenario is far worse because it will be ubiquitous. There is no escape or relief for anyone.

Public health and safety should be paramount, and valid concerns of members of the public should be given a thorough and well considered hearing. I urge you to listen to those concerns.

The ICNIRP guidelines on which councils rely so heavily are deeply flawed, and even if all the thousands of health studies showing adverse health effects and harm to wildlife/environment are conveniently ignored, the 3 recent REAL-LIFE case studies showing harm from 5G exposure should surely make everyone sit up and pay attention to what could happen locally, if we allow all these telecom developments to go ahead unchecked.

I urge you to REFUSE THIS telecoms application (and all future ones) before irreversible damage is done to your residents and the environment.

I am happy for you to publish my comments.

Please can you acknowledge receipt of this email.

Thank you

Best Wishes

Judith Reid

(The Briars, Deepdene Vale, Dorking, Surrey, RH4 1NL)

Sent with [Proton Mail](#) secure email.