

5G Comments on Application No. [24/P/2145/TEA](#) see also BleadonBOB at https://www.bleadon.org.uk/beinvolved.html?post_id=37756

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 14 Nov 2024

As echoing the comments prior to myself writing this. At no point were we sufficiently consulted prior to this planning application and, due to our proximity (less than 150m direct) to the proposed location of the antenna, I feel there is an increased adverse risk to health for ourselves and anyone within a 250m radius (according to recent studies). Whilst I am not against the idea of a tower (increased means of telecommunications is good news considering we are highly lacking here with no FTTP at a lot of residences), I am against the proposed location, and would recommend it be located further from residential areas. I object as a result and would encourage a relocation of the tower.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Tue 12 Nov 2024

Bleadon Parish Council objects to the application on the following grounds:

The Parish Council does not consider that it was properly consulted as part of the pre-application process. The Parish Council further notes the view of the relevant District Councillors regarding lack of adequate consultation.

The applicant has failed to provide sufficient detail regarding how the potential individual and cumulative negative health impacts (recognised by bodies such as the World Health Organisation) arising from the proposal might be mitigated.

The process followed by the applicant fails to recognise that there is a private airfield within the locality. As such, the Parish Council is concerned that the views of the Civil Aviation Authority have not been sought and that this action should be undertaken prior to consideration of the application.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Mon 11 Nov 2024

I have sent an objection via email but it has not been uploaded.

As follows

The proposed mast is for 4G/5G for EE only. As the rollout of 4G/5G is a national policy and hence a national issue, this mast concerns locals and non-locals alike.

As this is a new mast, please ensure it is treated as a Prior Approval application which should be fully adjudicated as any other planning application under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. According to 'Changes to permitted development rights for electronic communications infrastructure: technical consultation' of 7 March 2022, paragraph 10, all new masts still require the Prior Approval of the LPA, and community views should be

considered. <https://www.gov.uk/.../changes-to-permitted-development...>"

SITING and APPEARANCE

At 20m high, this lattice tower will dominate its immediate surroundings and be highly visible from afar.

Telecoms installations, antennae, etc are overbearing and unnerving. For many people, including myself, they cause anxiety and stress. The impact of this proposal on the health and well-being of locals (including fear and anxiety of harm) is a material planning consideration, which should be taken into consideration.

Telecoms apparatus is an industrialising feature incongruous with in this rural setting and would have a harmful impact on the area.

Being visible also means that it is a constant reminder to the residents in the immediate area of its presence which can cause stress.

It is contrary to Code of Practice Para 22 and 28, with the siting of the proposed mast representing a discordant, intrusive feature to the surrounding area. Local residents (and visitors to the caravan park) alike could well find their enjoyment of a peaceful life replaced by anxiety and distress over the harmful effects of radiation and the overbearing nature of this towering monstrosity. Many people throughout the country have already found their lives suddenly catapulted into a stress-fest when similar installations have been put up.

The proposed site is within 500m of 'sensitive receptors'

** Various farms exist in the area both arable and grazing livestock.

** caravan park with residential lodges (nearest approx. 200m)

** pub and restaurant (approx. 150m)

** a few other residential properties.

This is far too close to the caravan park where people come to relax on holiday. I certainly wouldn't want to be paying for accommodation so close to a 5G mast.

Children are deemed sensitive receptors at school, and this should apply elsewhere too.

Likewise, pre-school children and pregnant women are equally vulnerable.

Elderly individuals are also considered "sensitive receptors" and more likely to have metal implants (e.g. knee or hip replacements). Individuals with metal implants are not covered by ICNIRP guidelines (see below).

The distance of 500m is of particular interest after the New Hampshire Commission (and now Bill) recommended a setback of this distance for telecoms installations from residences, schools, and businesses. Please see below for details.

There are now thousands of studies showing harm to humans and wildlife from 2G - 4G, but the more recent real-life 5G case studies (6 published in 2023, 2 published in 2024 so far) from Sweden (Hardell and Nilsson) demonstrate, without a shadow of a doubt, that 5G most definitely causes harm to humans, at levels below those given in the ICNIRP guidelines. (See sources.) The cases covered individuals living / working close to 5G antennae as well as a family holidaying close to one, and a young 8yo boy who suffered severe symptoms at school.

Symptoms included severe headaches, tinnitus, nosebleeds, insomnia, anxiety, memory loss, irregular pulse, skin rashes, burning skin etc.

The distances from the antennae ranged from 5m to 125m (2023 cases); just under and over 500m (2 base stations), and 285m (2024 cases). These are similar distances to those in this case.

I appeal to you as a fellow human, to read the short summary of findings which I have included at the foot of my letter.

I have also included studies wrt 4G installations.

LPAs CAN lawfully refuse this mast application on health grounds.

Mendip Planning Board refused a 5G monopole in a semi-industrial location in March 2022 on the grounds that 'there is not enough evidence of safety to proceed' after weighing all the information made available to them by objectors. 2021/1951/FUL

Please also refer to the section below on liability and health.

Also of great importance are the SPECIFIC EXCLUSIONS stated in the ICNIRP guidelines.

** The ICNIRP Guidelines (2020) specifically excludes individuals with any metal in their body or an active medical device. The Guidelines state that people with "implantable medical devices" and "metallic implants" in the body are "outside the scope of these guidelines".

This includes pacemakers, metal shunts, children's dental braces ETC

ICNIRP states that the effect of RFR inside the body is unpredictable when metal implants are present.

(Examples of metal in the body include metal pins, plates, rods, discs, screws (hip/knee replacements) Cardiovascular - implantable heart loop recorders, stents and pacemakers. Implants to treat and monitor health conditions, deliver drugs or to restore bodily functions e.g. diabetes related products. Magnetic cerebral spinal fluid shunts. Cochlear implants for hearing loss. Dental work - braces, implants, metal crowns, pins, denture arches, mercury amalgam fillings, copper contraceptive coils, body piercings.)

For anyone who falls under the above list, and living close to the proposed mast, this can cause fear, anxiety, and distress. As such, these constitute a material planning

consideration on the grounds of siting.

The Judicial Review (Cardiff Admin Court Case CO/2498/2023) against Cheltenham Council concerned a mast situated close to a block of flats and care home, and the LPA's role in granting approval for the mast application without giving adequate consideration for the health impacts on a resident with metal implants.

In May-2024, Judge Jarman ruled, in relation to the care home, that the existence of a Declaration of Conformity (ICNIRP certificate) was not sufficient with regard to those with metal implants.

"The failure on the part of the authority to grapple with potential impacts on medical implants was, in my judgment, an error and this ground succeeds"

Also, worth noting

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

Such a document

unchecked by an independent body, is UNRELIABLE.

** 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.

** 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.

** ICNIRP guidelines (2020) only cover HUMANS, NOT animals, plants or the environment. This is a concerning omission as pollinators are in a drastic decline. Studies have also shown that trees are adversely affected by EMFs.

** ICNIRP guidelines only protect against THERMAL effects, not non-thermal effects.

There are now thousands of studies showing adverse NON-thermal effects to human health, at well below the ICNIRP limits.

(The Design Access and Supporting Statement states "The ICNIRP guidelines seek to protect against the well-known thermal effects of radio emissions and include a significant precautionary factor.")

** 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.

** Please ask the applicant to provide further information to clarify the technical proposal and substantiate the ICNIRP certificate declaration. In particular, calculations showing cumulative effects, taking into account other local sources and hotspots.

If we continue to roll out 5G (and also 4G), ignoring the veritable elephant in the room and the genuine concerns of the public, who are rightly worried about the harm these structures will do to their health, then we are heading for a national health crisis in the near

future.

Despite, reassurances from the government and telecoms alike, the public are now becoming increasingly aware of the scientific studies which show adverse health effects caused by EMFs at levels well below ICNIRP guidelines. The case studies, mentioned above, not only highlight the reason why members of the public ARE indeed anxious (which is a material planning consideration) but also highlight the need for caution.

PLANTS and WILDLIFE

The council should conserve and enhance the natural environment as per The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2023) - section 15.

As mentioned above, ICNIRP makes NO provision for Wildlife and plants in its guidelines. In view of Biodiversity Net Gain, the impact on plants and wildlife needs to be considered. This is of huge importance being in such a rural community with farms and agricultural land.

It is interesting to note that loss of biodiversity and wildlife on both Mt Nardi in Australia and on Samos (see below sources) occurred in areas where 4G masts had been erected. Both record DRAMATIC declines in both volume and species type. Of particular concern is the detrimental effect of EMFs on pollinators.

5G can cover miles as documented in the INDUSTRY article by NOKIA

<https://www.nokia.com/thought-leadership/articles/spectrum-bands-5g-world/>

- For low band: "Wireless carriers could serve thousands of customers within hundreds of square miles with just one tower."

- For mid-band: "it can carry plenty of data while traveling significant distances."

Therefore, the impact of this mast could be far-reaching (from 4G and 5G).

The site is close to trees. During groundwork, root structure could be harmed and therefore threaten the health and longevity of these trees overtime. Once up and running, further harm could be done to the trees from radiation. Studies have shown harm to trees by EMFs, and this should also be taken into consideration. See sources for more information.

Trees provide a very positive contribution to the character and appearance of the local area benefiting mental health and wellbeing. As such, they should be protected at all costs.

Is there an Environmental Impact Assessment? Under Environmental Law and the ruling against Surrey County council Finch v Surrey County Council [2024] EWCA Civ 187 that emphasised the importance of public participation in environmental decision making, which is an objective not only of the EIA Directive but also central to the Aarhus Convention; the

Court identified two issues in relation to public participation, namely: increasing the democratic legitimacy of environmental decision, and serving an educational function. An EIA should include the effects of the radiation emitted from all the antennae on the proposed mast (which can be regarded as effluvia or as a pollutant) on public health.

Considering Liability and Health

All public authorities have an obligation and duty to act in the public interest and protect people from harm.

There is NOT a single study to support the radiation from this technology being safe for any human over their lifetime.

Too much reliance is made on NPPF Paragraph 122 which states that they cannot set health safeguards different from those set by ICNIRP, but please note that both the NPPF and ICNIRP are GUIDELINES ONLY, NOT STATUTE.

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>

The NPPF is just another material planning consideration and should be considered no more or less important than any other. The whole of the NPPF (not just section 10) applies to telecoms applications, and hence the paragraphs on Health are just as valid for telecoms as for any other type of application.

This means the councils ARE free to investigate health issues, and there are cases where health has been taken into consideration, such as in Mendip.

Please note that refusing an application for a specific mast in a designated place is not the same as setting different standards.

Setting different standards would entail creating a new standard for every mast application throughout the borough.

The adjudication of a single application is about the validity and suitability of that application with its specific mast/antennae at the proposed site.

In addition, there is the issue of liability for future litigation.

The solicitor for the campaign group "Stop 5G Bath" received a letter from PHE's own solicitors, DLA Piper, (dated 08-Aug-2019) which exempted 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."

"PHE's lawyers advise public bodies to balance PHE's guidance with evidence from other sources i.e. not only from ICNIRP. This contradicts the government's own planning regulations which require local authorities to adhere strictly to ICNIRP's guidelines...This gives no choice to public bodies about accepting a potentially catastrophic risk."

5G health effects are uninsurable and at the same time recognised by reinsurers as a high impact risk with regard to future litigation.

Lloyds of London has refused to insure against health effects from all wireless technology since 2010 (Exclusion 32) and there are currently no insurers in the world who will cover this.

5G is rated a high impact risk by reinsurers Swiss Re in their Emerging Risks Report (May 2019) which states: "To allow for a functional network coverage and increased capacity overall, more antennas will be needed, including acceptance of higher levels of electromagnetic radiation. In some jurisdictions, the rise of threshold values will require legal adaptation. Existing concerns regarding potential negative health effects from electromagnetic fields (EMF) are only likely to increase. An uptick in liability claims could be a potential long-term consequence..."

"As the biological effects of EMF in general and 5G in particular are still being debated, potential claims for health impairments may come with a long latency."

These are referred to by Wera Hobhouse (MP for Bath) in her letter to DCMS (Feb-2020)
More information and sources available on request.

The insurance industry clearly recognises that potential claims for health impairments may come with a long latency. Cases of Cancer Clusters (and other serious adverse effects) are now being recorded in areas in which a mast was installed, approx. 5 - 7 years ago. If this is to happen in your area - then who will be responsible?

Verizon (US-based telecoms company, with offices in the UK) makes provision in their statutory accounts for potential claims regarding the effects of EMF radiation (aka RFR).
Would they do so if they were sufficiently indemnified by their insurance policy?

In addition, Swisscom (telecoms company) made the patent application WO2004075583A1 and disclosed the carcinogenic nature of the associated EMF/RF radiation. It also states that the carcinogenic effects are non-thermal, whereas ICNIRP covers only thermal effects.

Further evidence of genetic changes / carcinogenic effects was published in July-2024

("Cell Tower Radiation Linked to Genetic Changes in Nearby Residents") (See sources)

The requirement for Local Authorities to reconcile the risks to environmental and public health consequences from radio frequency emitting infrastructure is embedded within the European Electronics Communications Code (EECC). There is a current challenge to the UK government concerning their policies that constrain LPAs to blindly accepting an ICNIRP declaration of conformity. (Case Z2309835, filed 12-Sep-2023)

<https://safetechinternational.org/new-legal-challenge-uk-govt-fail-to-enact-public-health-environmental-obligations-within-european-electronics-communications-code/>

In addition, NPPF Paragraph 122 (which states that they cannot set health safeguards different from those set by ICNIRP) is in conflict with Paragraphs 191 and 135.

Paragraph 191: "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

(a) 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 135: Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments :

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

SUSTAINABILITY, CLIMATE CHANGE and ENERGY CONSUMPTION

Humans are part of nature, despite our best efforts to disconnect from it and even control it. Crazy now, with the advent of AI, facilitated by 5G, we are attempting to replace it, especially in the area of food production and virtual reality.

Sadly, "sustainability" and "climate change" have become buzz-terms to allow the political hijacking of genuine green issues.

Those of us who DO ACTUALLY CARE about the health of our planet, recognise that to bring about some sort of balance and restore Earth to a less vulnerable place, we need to take our foot off the techno-pedal, and listen to and observe the natural world around us and what it is telling us.

Councils are committing to net zero by 2030, but it is well worth looking into the green credentials of 5G. It is FAR from green, contrary to what is being touted. As well as being energy hungry, the infrastructure needed to implement the network uses child labour, poor working conditions and devastation to areas caused by intense mining. The energy consumption from cradle to grave is not sustainable. You cannot have 5G AND net zero or sustainability. They are totally incompatible!

Is the opportunity for constant connection (or to download a video at the blink of an eyelid) so important to people, that we plunder the earth for its precious metals, leave devastation in its trace, exploit children and poorer communities in the mining process, often in dangerous conditions, and generally pollute our planet? Absolutely not. More importantly, we cannot boast sustainability, whilst this is happening on the other side of the world.

With the big drive for "net zero", "sustainability" etc, it is essential to understand just how energy-hungry our technology is, particularly 5G with the huge power requirements of 5G base stations and associated infrastructure. Facilitating the growth of the 5G network by allowing more masts, is in fact counter to the objectives of "net zero".

In the 2020 Study by the Haut Conseil pour le Climat (HCC) - report "Controlling the carbon impact of 5G" December of 2020, the HCC report found that 5G technology will lead to a significant increase in the carbon footprint of digital technology and could add between 2.7 to 6.7 million tonnes of CO2 equivalents per year by 2030.

IEEE Spectrum, 5G's Waveform Is a Battery Vampire reports "A 5G base station is generally expected to consume roughly three times as much power as a 4G base station. And more 5G base stations are needed to cover the same area"

A 2022 review by the University of Sussex Business School entitled "The energy use implications of 5G: Reviewing whole network operational energy, embodied energy, and indirect effects" published in Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews finds that the notion that 5G is green technology is not currently backed up by a strong, publicly available, fully transparent evidence base.

Quoted from a planning application from Clarke Telecom (23/00631/TEL, Wakefield), "5G networks, and future mobile generations, will be vital for a range of Internet of Things uses (IoT) and Smart City applications..... The way 5G works, it is closely connected with the Smart City agenda"

In a Cornerstone application (113879/TEL/24, Trafford), advantages of 5G are listed as: the few seconds needed to download a movie; the ultra-fast speed of autonomous vehicles and providing the "backbone for the evolution of the Internet of Things."

These highlight the true reason for 5G: a smart-IoT-vision for the future. There will be no escape.

It beggars belief that we prioritise these over our PRECIOUS HEALTH.

Who voted for SMART cities, IoT, autonomous cars? I do NOT want these, and I don't know anyone else who does. Do your residents?

It may be difficult to imagine considering the green leafy lanes and fields in this area, but sadly if we continue to allow such installations, our green spaces will shrink, and even those left will be subject to constant techno-connection with the promise of smart-farming, autonomous cars etc.

There is too much emphasis nowadays wrt to the perceived benefits of online, which has been extrapolated from our behaviours during COVID/lockdown, when we had no choice but to move a lot of our lives online. It is assumed that people want to continue in this fashion, but in fact, many of us prefer REAL connections with people, community, and nature. Many of us do not want to live in a digital world, surrounded by masts.

Using the internet as a means of education, entertainment, and contact has, instead of boosting health and well-being, created social isolation and an addiction to technology, especially in a generation of youngsters who now have serious mental health issues. Moving to a more digital life offers very little "well-being". We should not be encouraging this behaviour, but instead moving away from it.

What about prioritising FULL FIBRE, as stated in NPPF 118?

According to NPPF 118. "Policies should set out how high-quality digital infrastructure, providing access to services from a range of providers, is expected to be delivered and upgraded over time; and should prioritise full fibre connections to existing and new developments (as these connections will, in almost all cases, provide the optimum solution).

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 drive for constant connection with 4G/5G etc al is far worse because it will be ubiquitous. There is no escape or relief for anyone.

What is paramount and must override every other consideration must be public safety and avoidance of risk and harm to an unsuspecting public that has given no informed consent. The public is being kept in the dark, just as they were with tobacco and asbestos (covered in the book "Late Lessons from Early Warnings").

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. Even if all the thousands of health studies showing adverse health effects and harm to wildlife/environment are conveniently ignored, the 8 recent REAL-LIFE case studies showing harm from 5G exposure PLUS the recent evidence showing genetic changes and carcinogenic effects 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.

It is interesting to note that Swansea University has announced that Swansea Bay is to be a "live lab" for 5G, and likewise WM5G (West Midlands 5G) has been a nominated testbed for at least 3 years, and similarly Liverpool, all of which confirms suspicions that the UK population is indeed being used as guinea pigs to test out 5G.

Would it not be prudent to exercise the precautionary principle? This is an ethical question, not a scientific one, and the time to invoke the precautionary principle is before harm is done and before we know with full certainty the scientific outcome.

By virtue of the nuisance and credible harm or injury to the local residents and to the local area, being sufficient to outweigh the benefits of the development, the application should be refused.

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.

Best Wishes

Judith Reid

SOURCES

New Hampshire Commission

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.

Based on the Commission, the U.S. state of New Hampshire introduced a bipartisan bill (HB1487) in Dec-2023, requiring measures to be put in place to inform the public about the health risks of radio-frequency radiation (RFR) (including information online, public service announcements, notifications on poles carrying 5G antennae), wireless antennae to be placed at least 500 metres away from residences, businesses and schools, replacing Wi-Fi with wired technology in schools.

FINAL COMMISSION 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>
Bipartisan Bill

<https://legiscan.com/NH/bill/HB1487/2024>

https://gencourt.state.nh.us/bill_status/legacy/bs2016/billText.aspx?sy=2024&id=1797&txtFormat=html

8 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.

The cases covered individuals living / working close to 5G antennae as well as a family holidaying close to one, and a young 8yo boy who suffered severe symptoms at school. Symptoms included severe headaches, tinnitus, nosebleeds, insomnia, anxiety, memory loss, irregular pulse, skin rashes etc.

The distances from the antennae ranged from 5m to 125m (2023 cases); just under and over 500m (2 base stations), and 285m (2024 cases).

A summary of the first 6 cases can be found here

https://www.journalserapublications.com/issues/v01/i01/JEPL_1020240101001.pdf

The more recent cases are here

<http://www.fortunejournals.com/articles/a-woman-aged-82-years-with-electromagnetic-hypersensitivity-since-almost-four-decades-developed-the-microwave-syndrome-after-insta.html>

<https://www.fortunejournals.com/articles/a-woman-aged-82-years-with-electromagnetic.pdf>
and

<https://www.medtextpublications.com/open-access/an-eight-year-old-boy-developed-severe-headache-in-a-1582.pdf>

An excellent summary of the first 7 real-life 5G case studies can be found here
[Summary of seven Swedish case reports on the microwave syndrome associated with 5G radiofrequency radiation, Lennart Hardell and Mona Nilsson, June-2024](#)

https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.1515/reveh-2024-0017/html?fbclid=IwY2xjawEgeVRleHRuA2FibQlxMQABHZeG6ToEqT_w0ThGuEMZ-cMc73eAkUVGU7du8JNT-b8ZdK2CQOCr-Jz6TQ_aem_4esr7Pyje9k62298xdJ9tw
Published online by De Gruyter June 19, 2024

From the journal *Reviews on Environmental Health* (<https://doi.org/10.1515/reveh-2024-0017>)

"Most prevalent and severe were sleeping difficultly (insomnia, waking nighttime, early wake-up), headache, fatigue, irritability, concentration problems, loss of immediate memory, emotional distress, depression tendency, anxiety/panic, dysesthesia (unusual touched based sensations), burning and lancinating skin, cardiovascular symptoms (transitory high or irregular pulse), dyspnea, and pain in muscles and joints. Balance disorder and tinnitus were less prevalent. All these symptoms are included in the microwave syndrome."

"Our seven case studies, comprising 16 persons, on health effects from real 5G RF radiation exposure, showed that the study persons developed the microwave syndrome after installation of 5G base stations in the neighborhood of their dwellings.....Very high RF radiation levels, although much lower than limits recommended by ICNIRP and the FCC were measured"

OTHER STUDIES

[Case Study showing health effects when working in close proximity to 4G antennae Electromagnetic hypersensitivity close to mobile phone base stations - a case study in Stockholm, Sweden](#)

<https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.1515/reveh-2021-0169/html>

Lennart Hardell and Tarmo Koppel From the journal *Reviews on Environmental Health*
A 55-year-old previously healthy female office worker changed her workplace in April 2018, when she returned to a building in which she had previously worked. This time her office was situated on the 6th floor close to base stations on the roof, where 4G had been installed a couple of years before her return. She had full time work in the office. At the previous working place, she had had no health problems.

[In the study: Mobile Phone Base Station Tower Settings Adjacent to School Buildings: Impact on Students' Cognitive Health Meo et al, 2019](#)

This studied phone mast exposure of adolescents, the MPBTS located within 200 metres from the school.

*MPBTS = Mobile Phone Base Station Tower Settings)

It was identified that EMFs from MPBSTs were associated with a decrease in fine and gross motor skills and spatial working memory and attention in school adolescents. It was recommended that MPBSTs be installed away from thickly populated residential zones, particularly in or near school buildings.

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6775553/>

Why children absorb more microwave radiation than adults - the consequences (Morgan et al, 2014)

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2213879X14000583>

From the Abstract

Children absorb more MWR than adults because their brain tissues are more absorbent, their skulls are thinner and their relative size is smaller.

MWR from wireless devices has been declared a possible human carcinogen. Children are at greater risk than adults when exposed to any carcinogen. Because the average latency time between first exposure and diagnosis of a tumor can be decades, tumors induced in children may not be diagnosed until well into adulthood. The fetus is particularly vulnerable to MWR.

Belgium, France, India and other technologically sophisticated governments are passing laws and/or issuing warnings about children's use of wireless devices.

Adverse health effects of 5G mobile networking technology under real-life Conditions

Kostoff, Heroux, Aschner, Tsatsakis

Toxicology Letters Volume 323, 1 May 2020, Pages 35-40,

<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31991167/>

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S037842742030028X>

This article from 2020 looks at studies so far on "wireless radiation", both LABORATORY-based and EPIDEMIOLOGICAL.

"Neither 4G nor 5G have been tested for safety in credible real-life scenarios."

It emphasises that laboratory studies are done in pristine conditions, not reflective of real-life, usually excluding the pulsing-modulating carrier signal, and looking singly at the radiation stimulus (i.e. not including other toxic stimuli such as chemical, biotoxins, other radiation which would be experienced in real-life and would act synergistically).

Even with these simplified parameters, however, the article states that there are reasons for concern.

It states that "the results reported in the biomedical literature should be viewed as 1) extremely conservative and 2) the very low 'floor' of the seriousness of the adverse effects from wireless radiation, not the 'ceiling'."

And concludes that "Superimposing 5G radiation on an already imbedded toxic wireless radiation environment will exacerbate the adverse health effects shown to exist. Far more

research and testing of potential 5G health effects under real-life conditions is required before further rollout can be justified."

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?

See also

- 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/>

- The BioInitiative 2012 Report <http://www.bioinitiative.org>

- Physicians' Health Initiative for Radiation and Environment <https://phiremedical.org/>

EAM v East Sussex County Council (Special educational needs) [2022] UKUT 193 (AAC), where the Upper Tribunal required council to secure EHCP for student who is hypersensitive to Wi-Fi signals (UK).

<https://www.localgovernmentlawyer.co.uk/education-law/394-education-news/51400-upper-tribunal-requires-council-to-secure-ehcp-for-student-who-is-hypersensitive-to-wi-fi-signals>

<https://phiremedical.org/education-health-care-plan-ehcp-awarded-aug-2022-for-uk-child-on-the-basis-of-electromagnetic-hypersensitivity-ehs/> includes statements from the parents, child and excerpts from 3 tribunal hearings.

Upper Tribunal judge Jacobs found that the child should be considered disabled by her condition under the Equality Act 2010 and that she required an Education, Health and Care Plan (EHCP).

"Why electrohypersensitivity (EHS) is a biologically expected reaction to harmful radiation" (2024)

Research paper by Paul Hensinger and Bend I Budzinski

<https://www.diagnose-funk.org/aktuelles/artikel-archiv/detail&newsid=2098>

ICBE-EMF PAPER = https://icbe-emf.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/10/ICBE-EMF-paper-12940_2022_900_OnlinePDF_Patched-1.pdf

SWISSCOM PATENT APPLICATION (WO2004075583A1)

<https://patents.google.com/patent/> /en

Description - the below are all excerpts from the patent.

The influence of electrosmog on the human body is a known problem.

When, for example, human blood cells are irradiated with electromagnetic fields, clear damage to hereditary material has been demonstrated and there have been indications of an increased cancer risk (Mashevich M., Folkman D., Kesar A., Barbul A., Korenstein R.,

Jerby E., Avivi L., Department of Human Genetics and Molecular Medicine, Tel-Aviv University, Tel-Aviv, Israel, "Exposure of human peripheral blood lymphocytes to electromagnetic fields associated with cellular phones leads to chromosomal instability," Bioelectromagnetics, 2003 Feb., 24(2): 82-90).

..... These findings indicate that the genotoxic effect of electromagnetic radiation is elicited via a non-thermal pathway. Moreover aneuploidy is to be considered as a known phenomenon in the increase of cancer risk.

Thus it has been possible to show that mobile radio radiation can cause damage to genetic material, in particular in human white blood cells, whereby both the DNA itself is damaged and the number of chromosomes changed. This mutation can consequently lead to increased cancer risk. In particular, it could also be shown that this destruction is not dependent upon temperature increases, i.e. is non-thermal.

Cell Tower Radiation Linked to Genetic Changes in Nearby Residents (July 1, 2024)
<https://microwavenews.com/news-center/cell-tower-radiation-linked-genetic-changes-nearby-residents>

"More Chromosomal Aberrations

Senior European scientists are reporting that people living near cell phone towers show significant changes in their genetic makeup. This is the first time that chronic exposure to cell tower radiation has been linked to unrepairable genetic damage.

A team led by Wilhelm Mosgöller of the Medical University of Vienna and Igor Belyaev of the Slovak Academy of Sciences in Bratislava contend that years of low-dose RF exposure can increase the incidence of a number of different types of chromosomal aberrations. Such changes could lead to serious, though uncertain, health consequences, including cancer and neurological disease."

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

WILDLIFE / INSECTS

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.

CLIMATE CHANGE, ENERGY CONSUMPTION and SUSTAINABILITY

2020 Study by the Haut Conseil pour le Climat (HCC) "Controlling the carbon impact of 5G" "Dec-2020"

The HCC report found that 5G technology will lead to a significant increase in the carbon

footprint of digital technology and could add between 2.7 to 6.7 million tonnes of CO2 equivalents per year by 2030.

References to the 2020 Study by the Haut Conseil pour le Climat (HCC) can be found here <https://ehtrust.org/science/reports-on-power-consumption-and-increasing-energy-use-of-wireless-systems-and-digital-ecosystem/>

<https://ehtrust.org/5g-is-a-sinking-ship-slow-poor-performance-and-a-power-hog/?fbclid=IwAR029YFUtklYKIZqnwd6Qjg0kMkt1TCx5QuviYhQgfPRCc1PDzS05NB4Lsl>

<https://www.france24.com/en/europe/20201220-deploying-5g-will-lead-to-spike-in-co2-emissions-french-climate-council-warns>

IEEE Spectrum, 5G's Waveform Is a Battery Vampire reports "A 5G base station is generally expected to consume roughly three times as much power as a 4G base station.

And more 5G base stations are needed to cover the same area"

<https://spectrum.ieee.org/5gs-waveform-is-a-battery-vampire>

A 2022 review by the University of Sussex Business School entitled "The energy use implications of 5G: Reviewing whole network operational energy, embodied energy, and indirect effects" published in Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews finds that the notion that 5G is green technology is not currently backed up by a strong, publicly available, fully transparent evidence base.

<https://sro.sussex.ac.uk/id/eprint/103944/2/1-s2.0-S1364032121012958-main.pdf>

On Global Electricity Usage of Communication Technology: Trends to 2030 (Published 2015)

www.mdpi.com/2078-1547/6/1/117/htm

Green 5G or red alert? 23 November 2020 <https://www.meer.com/en/64080-green-5g-or-red-alert>

With 5G's greatly increased mobile traffic, electricity usage from telecommunications could create up to 23% of global greenhouse gas emissions by 2030; power demand would be the equivalent of 36 nuclear reactors or 7800 massive offshore wind farms worldwide.

Quoted from a planning application from Clarke Telecom "5G networks, and future mobile generations, will be vital for a range of Internet of Things uses (IoT) and Smart City applications..... The way 5G works, it is closely connected with the Smart City agenda and will enable centralized control of lots of different street infrastructure owned or managed by councils, such as streetlights, water meters and bus stops."

<https://planning.wakefield.gov.uk/online-applications/>

Useful articles

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

What will 5G mean for the Environment? <https://jsis.washington.edu/news/what-will-5g->

mean-for-the-environment/

Smart tech's carbon footprint (The Ecologist April-2020)

<https://theecologist.org/2020/apr/30/smart-techs-carbon-footprint>

The Staggering Ecological Impacts of Computation and the Cloud

<https://thereader.mitpress.mit.edu/the-staggering-ecological-impacts-of-computation-and-the-cloud/>

fbclid=IwAR0dvYDGwxHaT1oASxO58W44bRuhrWSJAbdH4q6z_I3Zq9X9cs0ARUt9ORA

Anthropologist Steven Gonzalez Monserrate draws on five years of research and ethnographic fieldwork in server farms to illustrate some of the diverse environmental impacts of data storage.

With a greater carbon footprint than the airline industry, the cloud as a CARBONIVOIRE, which is also water-thirsty (causing water shortages near datacentres), creates noise pollution with devastating effects on neighbours as well as creating "immortal waste" in e-waste graveyards.

Lithium fields - out of sight, out of mind (ANH article, Oct-2024)

https://www.anhinternational.org/news/lithium-fields-out-of-sight-out-of-mind/?utm_source=The+Alliance+for+Natural+Health&utm_campaign=934e8fabd8-EMAIL_CAMPAIGN_2024_10_17_03_54&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_-934e8fabd8-%5BLIST_EMAIL_ID%5D&mc_cid=934e8fabd8&mc_eid=cbf4ae04a2

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Mon 04 Nov 2024

The proposed development presents significant concerns regarding its impact on the local environment and community aesthetics. The following points outline the primary objections based on the development's characteristics and its potential effects on the surrounding nature reserves and conservation areas.

Key Issues: Visual Impact: The proposed structure is characterized by its towering and unsightly drab colour, which is obtrusive and imposing. Its overbearing presence, coupled with a lack of adequate screening, results in a poorly integrated and overly prominent form of development. This is particularly harmful to the visual appeal of the area.

Environmental Concerns: The development is situated near several important nature reserves, including Bleadon Levels Nature Reserve, Walborough Nature Reserve, Uphill Nature Reserve and nearby conservation area. These areas are critical for local wildlife and biodiversity. The introduction of an alien, industrializing structure in close proximity to these reserves poses a threat to their ecological balance.

Visitor Experience: The presence of such a development would be unsightly for visitors to the area, potentially deterring tourism and negatively impacting the local economy. The natural beauty and tranquility of the nature reserves and conservation areas are key

attractions for visitors, and this development would undermine these qualities.

Environmental implications and climate change targets - Carbon footprint: Each 5G mast requires approximately 3 x more power than a 4G mast (as much as 73 typical homes).

www.spectrum.ieee.org/5gs-waveform-is-a-battery-vampire

With 5G's greatly increased mobile traffic, electricity usage from telecommunications could create up to 23% of global greenhouse gas emissions by 2030; power demand would be the equivalent of 36 nuclear reactors or 7800 massive offshore wind farms worldwide. -

www.mdpi.com/2078-1547/6/1/117/htm -

www.wsimag.com/science-and-technology/64080-green-5g-or-red-alert

The France, Spain and California Green Parties, the France Climate Change Council, and Greenpeace East Asia have all warned of the climate footprint of 5G.

The French Climate Council states that an extra 7 billion tonnes of carbon dioxide could be released into the atmosphere by 5G - www.france24.com/en/europe/20201220-deploying-5g-will-lead-to-spike-in-co2-emissions-french-climate-council-warns

Legal firm Client Earth and telecoms consultants Strand Consult have expressed concerns about greenwashing by providers. - www.clientearth.org/media/wbglw3r3/clientearth-accountability-emergency.pdf

This indicates an incompatible use of the land.

In addition to significant environmental concerns, the proposed development poses substantial health and safety risks for both residents and visitors to the area. The following points outline these concerns, particularly focusing on the proximity of schools and residential assisted living homes.

Key Issues:

1. Health and Safety Concerns: The proposed site for development is within a 10-minute drive of several critical community facilities, including schools and residential assisted living homes. The health and safety of children, elderly residents, and other vulnerable individuals could be at risk. Transmitter density required for 5G means that more people will be exposed to radio frequency electromagnetic fields (RF-EMFs), and at levels that emerging evidence suggests, are potentially harmful to health. ICNIRP standards are mainly based on acute warming effects, with more than one degree of temperature increase. In several thousand studies, biological effects such as DNA damage have been shown to occur at exposure levels FAR BELOW these standards. There are NO safety studies on the cumulative effects on health from exposure to these radiation emissions 24/7 over a lifetime. Studies show harm to people, wildlife and the environment.

<https://icbe-emf.org/> <https://www.orsaa.org/>

2. There are multiple schools within a 5 to 10-minute drive from the proposed site. The presence of a development of this nature so close to educational institutions raises serious

concerns about the well-being of students. In addition, there are several residential assisted living homes are also located within a 10-minute drive of the proposed site. The residents of these facilities, many of whom have underlying health conditions, could be particularly vulnerable to the potential hazards posed by the development. Ensuring their safety should be a top priority. The ICNIRP certificate submitted is NOT sufficient to provide the necessary confirmation that the proposed mast would conform to the ICNIRP guidelines, AS FOLLOWS: The ICNIRP Guidelines state that people with "implantable medical devices" and "metallic implants" in the body are "outside the scope of these guidelines" (as mentioned on page 2 of the 2020 ICNIRP Guidelines report) and, therefore such people are particularly vulnerable and need to be afforded extra protection under the council's obligations within the Health and Social Care Act 2012. There are many scenarios in which metal is used in the human body for medical reasons: Surgical - metal pins, plates, rods, discs, screws e.g. scoliosis surgery and joint replacement of knees and hips. Urinary, gynaecological and intestinal repairs - e.g. mesh repairs and copper contraceptive coils. Cardiovascular - implantable heart loop recorders, stents and pacemakers. Implants to treat and monitor health conditions, deliver drugs or to restore bodily functions e.g. diabetes related products. Magnetic cerebral spinal fluid shunts. Cochlear implants for hearing loss. Dental work - braces, implants, metal crowns, pins, denture arches, mercury amalgam fillings. What about body piercings?

This causes fear, anxiety, alarm and distress for those living close to a mast and as such these health effects are a material planning consideration on the grounds of siting.

The ICNIRP certificate - a vital public health safeguard, provides a declaration by Three UK Ltd - a company that does not appear on the Ofcom register of persons with powers under the Electronic Communications Code, and according to Companies House was dissolved in 2015.

This makes the application in breach of the Code of Practice para 74. High-quality applications are essential and this includes ensuring the information provided in the application is of a good standard. The application information should be complete and straightforward.

The proposed development is wholly inappropriate for the designated location. Its negative visual impact, environmental concerns, and incompatibility with conservation objectives make it a harmful addition to the area. It is recommended that this proposal be objected to preserve the natural beauty and ecological integrity of the local nature reserves and conservation areas.

Furthermore, the proposed development is not only environmentally detrimental but also poses significant health and safety risks to the local community. The proximity to schools and residential assisted living homes makes this site wholly unsuitable for such a project. It

is imperative that these concerns be taken seriously to protect the well-being of residents and visitors alike. Therefore, it is strongly recommended that the proposal be rejected in light of these substantial health and safety issues.

This application should be refused.

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Mon 28 Oct 2024

I note with some concern that the Site Specific Supplementary Information document states that there is no aerodrome or airfield within 3km of the proposed mast site. This is incorrect as there is a private airfield at Batch End Farm Airstrip (GB0886) which is less than 1.5km away. I'm assuming the Civil Aviation Authority/Secretary of State for Defence and/or Aerodrome Operator should therefore have been consulted ?

(Objects)

Comment submitted date: Sat 26 Oct 2024

I am writing to register my concerns regarding the above planning application which I worry could potentially be deemed fraudulent ? North Somerset Council obviously have obligations under the Planning Inspectorate to ensure that planning applications are accurate and conform with all relevant legislation and guidelines ? I am hoping North Somerset Council Planning Department can allay my concerns ?

The UK Government have produced a Code of practice for wireless network development in England https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/621e0f1ae90e0710bfc89ea2/Code_of_practice_for_wireless_network_development_in_England.pdf. This code of practice states " Operators will provide a range of supporting information with their planning applications, including a Supplementary Information Template and ICNIRP Declaration (Annexes B and C). The information will not be identical for all applications but should be provided in a standardised format where possible". Annex C shows what data is required to be present.

Application 24/P/2145/TEA contains a ICNIRP Declaration containing reference to BT Group PLC but completed by Dan Rowland, a designer for Telnet ? It states that this declaration is completed for and on behalf of EE and Three UK ? No signature exists on the ICNIRP Declaration not even a redacted version. North Somerset Council would presumably require a named contact from the operator declaring safe operation in order to mitigate liability in the event of injury or adverse reaction etc. Or will North Somerset

Council accept liability ? The Site Specific Supplementary Information lists contact as Niall Kelleher ?

A register exists which lists all companies / operators who have been granted powers under the Electronic Communications Code - <https://www.ofcom.org.uk/phones-and-broadband/telecoms-infrastructure/register/>. Neither Telnet nor Three UK exist on the register. Indeed, on further investigation Three UK appears to be a dissolved company ?

Looking at the Site Specific Supplementary Information, reference is made to "Ten Commitments Consultation" where it states that Councillor's Solomon and Porter along with Bleadon Parish Council were issued pre-application consultation. I can find no details nor reference made in any Bleadon Parish Council Agenda or Minutes ? I would have hoped that said public representatives of Bleadon village residents would have sought residents opinions ? The Pre Application Consultation states that "A covering letter and associated planning drawings were sent to the planning department via email on the 13th February 2024. A response was issued on the 14th Feb enquiring if we had consulted with our councillors, we informed him that the councillors, Parish Council and LPA had been sent correspondence. We were told that someone in his team would pick it up and be in touch but as of submission no response has been received.". Regarding the NSC Councillors and BPC its states "As of submission, no response has been forthcoming". ? Could someone from NSC Planning please provide clarification as to who has been informed and when ?

I can find no data (Risk Assessments etc.) in the planning application regarding safety and the impact on surrounding area, it's residents and it's ecology. Is this to follow ?

I have serious concerns regarding the installation of 5G apparatus so close to my home in the village of Bleadon. A increasing amount of safety information is appearing on what seems like a daily basis. The following PDF lists pages and pages of Peer reviewed studies relating to 5G and Electromagnetic Radiation safety.

<https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fo/vipv5flw3wc0trfv8wvfz/ANzuGBZQ3vRgtrnDWWCNIOM?e=2&preview=5G+Tonnes+of+Evidence+.pdf&rlkey=46o06ky5n3juyx4r3x2cqxlsk&dl=0>