

ACTION STEPS

1) Answer survey yourself

2) Send section 1 and 2 to your council clerk with an email requesting to attend a meeting or speak to someone one to one.

3) Use this speech to talk at council or your own of course and take printed documents of research to leave with them.

SECTION 1

CONSULTATION PROCESS OPEN UNTIL NOV 4th 2019 "Proposed reforms to permitted development rights to support the deployment of 5G and extend mobile coverage "

INTRODUCTORY NOTES from Page 7 of Government Document.

1. The Government recognises that widespread coverage of mobile connectivity is essential for people and businesses. People expect to be connected where they live, work, visit and travel. That is why the Government is committed to extending mobile geographical coverage further across the UK, with continuous mobile connectivity provided to all major roads and to being a world leader in 5G.

2. This will allow everyone in the country to benefit from the economic advantages of widespread mobile coverage, something rural communities in particular have been calling for. A recent report found that better mobile infrastructure has the potential to transform the rural economy by enabling small businesses to grow, recruit and retain staff and making it easier for people to work from home.

As well as improved mobile signal, 5G networks are also crucial to drive productivity and growth across the sectors that local areas are focusing on through their emerging Local Industrial Strategies. Enabling and planning for 5G implementation is central to achieving the Government's objective to deliver prosperity at the local level and enable all places to share in the proceeds of growth.

Link to the Government Document

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/827162/Proposed_reforms_to_permitted_development_rights_to_support_the_deployment_of_5G_consultation.pdf

Link to answer Consultation online:

<https://www.surveymonkey.co.uk/r/3LBZ5ZH>

RECOMMENDED RESPONSES:

1. Not all people and business expect or want constant connectivity. People who are electro-sensitive, estimated at 800,000 in this country are very ill in an environment of constant connectivity. For them it is **NOT ESSENTIAL** Already we desperately need White zones for these people who are isolated and totally disempowered through lack of safe environments for them to live and work. Not considering their needs is totally unacceptable.

2. It is **not an economic advantage** to those who cannot work, it is **not economic advantage** to weaken the workforce with chronic health conditions by adding more exposure to pulsed microwave radiation proven to cause biological harm. PHE relies on guidelines set by the International Commission on Non-Ionising Radiation Protection (ICNIRP), a private NGO with up to 14 members, about which serious concerns have been raised regarding conflicts of interest. The ICNIRP guidelines are widely contested within the scientific community—see, for instance, the International EMF Scientist Appeal, signed by more than 240 scientists from more than 40 countries. The guidelines do not take into account a vast and coherent body of peer-reviewed research, that demonstrates that microwave radiation causes harm at levels way below ICNIRP's "safe limits" ; a

good summary is in Lancet Planetary Health 2018; 2: e532-e534 (the Lancet being Europe's, and arguably the world's, leading medical journal). Many countries (China, Russia, Israel, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, etc) use exposure limits far lower than those mandated by ICNIRP.

In 2011, the International Association for Research on Cancer, of the World Health Organisation, declared electromagnetic fields a type 2B carcinogen ("possibly carcinogenic to humans"). Findings from subsequent animal and human studies are widely expected to lead to electromagnetic fields being reclassified as type 2A ("probably carcinogenic") or type 1 ("carcinogenic").

Council of Europe, Parliamentary Assembly, special report, The potential dangers of electromagnetic fields and their effect on the environment, 2011: "One must respect the Precautionary Principle and revise the current threshold values; waiting for high levels of scientific and clinical proof can lead to very high health and economic costs, as was the case in the past with asbestos, leaded petrol and tobacco." High levels of evidence now exist, but the ICNIRP guidelines remain unchanged.

* See Dr Martin Pall reports latest reports on www.bioinitiative.org

The Health research is not being understood and included into the ICNIRP-PHE guidelines. Think Smoking, Think Asbestos.

Rural communities need to be provided with SAFE connectivity, not experimented on with untested, beam formed microwave radiation 5G. See www.safeg.net for discussion of options. Roaming is used in Europe, mobile companies could be persuaded/forced to provide roaming contracts therefore reducing masts and infrastructure. Assuming 5g is the only answer to provide equal business opportunities to rural areas and solve is a **WRONG ASSUMPTION.**

3. The Government is determined to ensure the UK receives the coverage and connectivity it needs, and, in recent years, a number of initiatives have been completed to help achieve this. In 2014, the Government reached a landmark deal with mobile network

3. Is there an equal determination and commitment to make sure this connectivity is safe? NO

What safety tests have been done? NONE

NO SAFETY RESEARCH and NO CONSULTATION with the public. The languaging in this paragraph

operators, securing their commitment to significant investment in mobile infrastructure and to the achievement of specific coverage targets. In return, following an extensive period of research and consultation, the Government introduced reforms to the Electronic Communications Code (the Code) in 2017 that will incentivise and support network investment, by making it cheaper and easier for communications apparatus to be installed, maintained and upgraded.

4. The Government has also made significant reforms to the planning system to support increased mobile connectivity. In 2016 we amended planning regulations in England to extend the existing permitted development rights to enable ground and building-based mobile telecommunications masts to be built without the need for a full planning application. Whilst in 2018 we strengthened national planning policy to support the expansion of electronic communications networks. Collectively the reforms to the Code and the planning system have played an important role in supporting the Government's ambitions for improving mobile connectivity.

5. The Future Telecoms Infrastructure Review, published in July 2018, sets out the Government's long-term strategy for meeting its digital connectivity targets. It restated our commitment to tackling barriers to deployment and concluded that there were steps the Government could take in order to create the right conditions for the investment required to deliver additional network coverage and capacity. These measures included keeping the planning regime under review and listening to suggestions from industry for how new technology is best supported in the planning regime.

6. We are now considering further reforms to the planning system in England in order to support the network upgrades that will be required to deploy 5G and to extend network coverage, particularly in rural areas. The purpose of this consultation is to seek views

is misleading.

Let's not assume this determination, research and commitment is in favour of the people. We should be **SLOWING DOWN THE DRIVE** and researching the health impacts.

We must not be misled into believing solving the problem of Rural coverage justifies rolling out an untested technology.

4. **These moves to take more control of the planning process are UNACCEPTABLE.**

Local councils and the people are being disempowered and unable to make decisions about what they want and need in their environment. Vast numbers of local councillors are completely unaware of what's happening already in their local area with the installation of LED lamp posts ready fitted with 5g sockets and other 5G equipment. **This is UNACCEPTABLE, UNDEMOCRATIC.**

We need local residents to have power to choose and determine what they need and want locally.

5. HERE the whole focus is on listening to TELECOMS and how to introduce measure to get 5g deployed.

This is assuming we want it, we need it, it is safe **These assumptions are UNFOUNDED, UNSAFE and UNDEMOCRATIC.**

Large sections of the public don't know anything about 5G and of those who do a large proportion along with hundreds of Doctors and scientists are very concerned. 5Gspaceappeal.eu.

WE NEED TIGHTER JURISDICTION ON PLACEMENT OF MASTS NOT A RELAXING OF PLANNING LAWS.

6. With the Rural landscape blighted with thousands more masts and small cells known to have carcinogenic effects in their immediate vicinity. The PHE guideline itself makes the point that it is not safe to be in the close vicinity of a mast. **LOCAL JURISDICTION over the placement**

on the principle of amending permitted development rights for operators with rights under the Code to support deployment of 5G and extend mobile coverage, and the circumstances in which it would be appropriate to do so. The consultation also seeks views on whether it is appropriate to impose specific limitations, conditions and restrictions on any amendments to permitted development rights to mitigate the impact of any new development. As planning is a devolved matter, these proposals relate to England only.⁷ Along with Ofcom, the Department for Digital, Culture, Media & Sport is working to ensure that mobile network operators commit to extending their coverage across the UK. Therefore, to complement the proposed planning reforms we are consulting on, we are also asking the Operators for evidence of the impact these changes to the planning regulations would have on meeting the Government's ambitions for 5G and mobile coverage. Views are also sought on what further measures industry could offer to mitigate the impact of any new electronic communications infrastructure, including assurances about the greater use of existing sites and buildings, sharing of infrastructure, and removing redundant infrastructure and restoration of the land, to protect local amenity and minimise proliferation of infrastructure. Deployment of 5G infrastructure and extending mobile connectivity⁸. Improvements have been made to mobile coverage with a 3.9 million hectares reduction in the area of the UK with no mobile signal in the last five years. In the same period, 13.8 million hectares (an area roughly the size of England) has been upgraded to 4G across the UK⁴. Ofcom's recent Connected Nations 2018⁵ report found that good 4G coverage is available across 67% of the UK from all four of the main mobile network operators (EE, O2, Three and Vodafone). However, there is more to be done, as 8% of the UK does not have good outdoor 4G coverage from any mobile network operators - so called "total not-spots", with the remaining 25% of the country covered by one, two or three mobile network operators - so called "partial not-

and upgrades of masts is **ESSENTIAL**.

The radiation from masts is known to be damaging to wildlife, bees and trees, 5G will be worse as the waves are similar in length to the body size of insects. This has been shown in research to amplify the harmful effects. Research shows pulsed microwave radiation has a devastating effect on their navigation systems and immunity. Hive collapse is seen in research studies when mobile phones are placed in the hives. Beehive collapse is being observed in central Bristol where 5g is turned on.

https://zero5g.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/s41598-018-22271-3.pdf?fbclid=IwAR0crNXxoFasWh_6Ac0opnnErn229vWhoDxAJLtCG9JPJldHcVpwb69r-QU

Disrupted navigation (Goldsworthy 2009, Sainudeen 2011, Kimmel et al 2007)

This will **NOT BENEFIT Rural communities** as pulsed microwave radiation will be **DAMAGING** to the integrity of our ecological systems vital to our ongoing wellbeing.

We want and need to save the bees.

It pains me to read about the Government's ambitions and commitment to an untested technology. We do not allow untested cars and washing machines onto the market so why are we putting a whole new technology into the environment without safety testing? It's not logical and it's not acceptable, especially as there are thousands of studies showing harmful biological effects of Wi-Fi and cell phones already AND there are increases in chronic health conditions in our millennials.

<https://www.bcbs.com/the-health-of-america/reports/the-health-of-millennials>

YES to RURAL coverage but it must be SAFE

spots". Rural areas tend to be more severely affected by poor mobile coverage, though we recognise that it can affect other areas such as business parks, market towns and new build developments. 4 House of Lords Select Committee on the Rural Economy 'Time for a strategy for the rural economy' HL Paper 330 (published 27 April 2019), paragraph 284 – available at:

<https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/ld201719/ldselect/ldrurecon/330/330.pdf>5 Ofcom, Connected Nations 2018 report – available at: <https://www.ofcom.org.uk/research-and-data/multi-sector-research/infrastructure-research/connected-nations-2018>

9. The Government wants to be a world leader in 5G, the next generation of wireless connectivity, and for communities to benefit from the investments in this new technology. All of the four main mobile network operators have announced intentions to begin deployment of 5G networks in 2019.

10. The case for 5G is compelling as it will bring faster, more responsive and reliable connections than ever before. More than any previous generation of mobile networks, it has the potential to improve the way people live, work and travel, and to deliver significant benefits to the economy and industry through the ability to connect more devices to the Internet at the same time – creating the so-called "Internet of Things". This will enable communities to manage traffic flow and control energy usage, monitor patient health remotely, and increase productivity for business and farmers, all through the real-time management of data.

11. The West Midlands has been selected to host the Urban Connected Communities project, as part of the Government's 5G Testbed and Trials Programme. This will develop a large-scale 5G testbed across the

9. It would be a true World Leader by investing in SAFE technology. Where are the studies proving it is safe? There are not any.

10. Many people are reporting sickness since it has been installed in Bristol. Chronic headaches, fatigue, pressure in the head, heart arrhythmias. I am sure this is the case in other cities too. All the words about it being compelling and improving people's lives and wanting to be first are abhorrent to me, they convey excitement and authority which is unfitting in the face of the evidence of biological harm and lack of testing. It is beyond unwise, it is madness.

The Internet of Things (IOT) with billions more wireless devices does not mean improvements in the way we live, we will be irradiated!

What is the point in monitoring health remotely whilst created a generation of sick people with chronic health conditions?

Remote Health Monitoring can be achieved by existing fibre solutions.

11. This breaks the Nuremburg Code of 1947 as people are being tested upon without their fully informed consent.

The Government and their partners the Telecom

region, with hubs planned in Birmingham, Coventry and Wolverhampton, the UK's first multi-city 5G test bed. The multi-million pound trial of next generation connectivity will pave the way for the future rollout of 5G across the UK, making the region the first in the UK ready to trial new 5G applications and services at scale. This is one example from many in the 5G Testbeds and Trials Programme, that demonstrate the Government's commitment to support investment in digital infrastructure.

12. The demand for mobile data in the UK is increasing rapidly, and as households and businesses become increasingly reliant on mobile connectivity, the infrastructure must be in place to ensure supply does not become a constraint on future demand. As mobile network operators have now started rolling out 5G in the UK, it is timely to consider whether there are further reforms which could be made to the planning system. This consultation seeks views on proposals for further reforms to the planning system in England to support the deployment of the infrastructure needed for 5G and to extend mobile coverage, including in rural areas, to benefit communities and businesses. Proposed planning reforms to support deployment of 5G and extend mobile coverage

13. In order to deploy 5G and improve coverage in partial not-spots, mobile network operators will need to strengthen existing sites to accommodate additional equipment. To extend coverage into total not-spots or to add capacity in areas of high demand, mobile network operators will also need to identify and develop new sites. Under English law, such development generally requires planning permission. There are two forms of permission relevant to the development proposals: a. A planning application is submitted to the relevant planning authority, who can balance the impact of the development including on the environment and community with the economic benefits, and make a decision; and b. Government can grant planning

companies, is committed to its investment in digital infrastructure because of its predicted multi trillion pound return it plans on making at the cost of our, its peoples', health, safety and wellbeing.

12. It is not true that everyone is demanding more data. Many are calling for a re-evaluation of the way we are living and prioritising lifestyles that are eco-friendly. Is 5G eco-friendly? No. It is proven harmful to the birds, bees, means the loss of trees so that line of sight can be achieved for the higher frequencies and more than that the data centres for all this new data will consume vast quantities of energy some estimate more than the aviation industry. The 20,000 satellites used to beam 5G frequencies down upon every square inch of the earth will need to be replaced every 5 years, creating space junk and again taking vast amounts of energy to be launched.

The mission to ease the roll out of 5G by relaxing planning laws is unacceptable.

13. The mission to ease the roll out of 5G by relaxing planning laws is unacceptable.

Environmental and personal wellbeing should not be in any balancing scales against economic benefit.

permission across England for specific types of development (these are known as permitted development rights).

There are two forms of permitted development rights: (i). Permitted Development with prior approval needed – Some permitted development rights are subject to a requirement to seek the prior approval of the local planning authority for the siting and appearance of apparatus before carrying out development and maybe considered by the Planning Committee. This involves a requirement for public engagement through site or written notices to allow representations from local residents, and the views of statutory consultees. This gives the local planning authority the opportunity to refuse the development and, should there be no refusal, the developer may deploy after 56 days. The requirements relating to prior approval are much less prescriptive than those relating to planning applications, as prior approval is a lighter-touch process which applies where the principle of the development has already been established; and (ii). Permitted Development with the requirement to notify - In certain cases, electronic communications infrastructure has permitted development rights that do not require the prior approval of the local planning authority. In these cases, the developer must notify the local planning authority of its intention and can deploy after one calendar months' notice.

14. The choice between these approaches is about balancing the importance of local democratically elected representatives making decisions on infrastructure which affect their local community and giving mobile network operators certainty that decreases the risk, cost and time associated with deployment of infrastructure. As mobile network operators have now started rolling out 5G in the UK, it is appropriate to consider whether the existing balance needs to be adjusted in light of the new technology requirements of 5G and the public interest in increasing mobile coverage, particularly in rural areas. Mobile network operators have

14. Taller and wider masts, it has been suggested just short of the height of Nelsons column!

I do not consent.

Faster deployment!! all this must be slowed down and the harmful effects of the deployment properly considered.

identified that to provide greater mobile coverage and to support the accelerated deployment of 5G, the following would be needed: taller and wider masts; building-based masts located nearer to highways; and faster deployment of radio equipment housing located on both protected and unprotected land.

15. This consultation seeks views on the principle of amending or creating new permitted development rights to grant planning permission for the following four proposals, and in particular, the circumstances in which it would be appropriate to: (a). enable deployment of radio housing equipment on land without requiring prior approval, excluding on sites of special scientific interest, to support 5G deployment; (b). strengthen existing masts to enable sites to be upgraded for 5G and for mast sharing without prior approval; (c). enable the deployment of building-based masts nearer to highways to support deployment of 5G and extend mobile coverage, subject to prior approval; and enable higher masts to deliver better mobile coverage and mast sharing, subject to prior approval.

15. Upgrading existing masts with no prior approval? NO.

Placing masts on buildings without consent?? NO

QUESTIONNAIRE QUESTIONS

Answers may be submitted online at

<https://www.surveymonkey.co.uk/r/3LBZ5ZH>

or via email to Mobileplanningconsultation@communities.gov.uk

Question 1.1: If these in principle proposals (set out in Questions 2 to 5) were taken forward, what impact would they have on meeting the Government's ambitions in relation to mobile coverage including addressing 'total not-spots' and 'partial not-spots'?

THIS IS A LEADING QUESTION WHICH ASSUMES AN ACCEPTANCE OF THE ROLL OUT. I DO NOT CONSENT TO THE ROLL OUT OF AN UNTESTED TECHNOLOGY. ESPECIALLY WHEN PULSED MICROWAVE RADIATION HAS PROVEN TO BE BIOLOGICAL HARMFUL BY 1000's of STUDIES.

Phiremedical.org, bioinitiative.org, Dr Martin Pall

Question 1.2: If these in principle proposals (set out in Questions 2 to 5) were taken forward, what impact would they have on planned deployment of 5G technology ?

I object to a leading question inviting practices which diminishes peoples rights to their own property and allows the enforcement of housing dangerous equipment on their property.

Question 1.3: If these in principle proposals (set out in Questions 2 to 5) were taken forward, what further measures could industry offer to reduce visual impacts of new electronic communications infrastructure and how would these be delivered? Please provide supporting comment

I do not consent to hiding damaging technology

Question 1.4: If these in principle proposals (set out in Questions 2 to 5) were taken forward, what further measures could industry offer to ensure that equipment at redundant sites is removed and the land is restored, and how would these be delivered?

Why is a question about the need to be responsible for disposing of old equipment needed?

Question 1.5: If these in principle proposals (set out in Questions 2 to 5) were taken forward, what further measures could industry offer to ensure that the use of existing sites and infrastructure were maximised before new sites are identified, for example through increased sharing?

How safe is it to add 5g equipment to existing masts? This question needs to be asked.

Question 2.1:

Do you agree with the principle of amending permitted development rights for equipment housing to remove the requirement for prior approval for development within Article 2(3) protected land and on unprotected land which exceeds 2.5 cubic metres, to support deployment of 5G?

Yes / No / Not Sure **NO**

Question 2.2: What impact could this proposal have on the surrounding area and how could this be addressed?

I DO NOT CONSENT TO FACILITATING ROLL OUT OF UNTESTED TECHNOLOGY

I do not consent to facilitating the roll out of untested technology.

Question 3.1: Do you agree with the principle of amending permitted development rights to allow an increase in the width of existing ground-based masts by more than one third, to support 5G deployment and encourage greater utilisation of existing sites?

Yes/ No / Not Sure **NO**

Question 3.2: If yes to question 3.1, what increase in width should be granted through permitted development rights, without prior approval, to ensure that the visual impact on the surrounding area is minimised?

Question 3.3: To further incentivise operators to maximise the use of existing sites, should permitted development rights be amended to increase the height of existing masts to the relevant permitted height without prior approval?

No

Please provide supporting comments Question 3.4: Are there any other amendments to permitted development rights that would further incentivise operators to maximise the use of existing sites? If yes, what are these and what restrictions would be appropriate to ensure that the visual impact on the surrounding area is minimised

I do not consent to relaxing rights to roll out an untested technology

Do you agree in principle with creating a permitted development right to grant permission for masts to be located within 20 metres of a highway on buildings less than 15 metres in height, in all areas?

NO

IT has not been proven to safe to residents of the buildings.

Question 4.3: If yes to question 4.1, do you agree that this permitted development right should be subject to the prior approval process.

Question 5.1: Do you agree in principle with amending permitted development rights to increase the height of new masts, subject to prior approval?

No I do not agree.

Question 5.2: If yes to question 5.1, what permitted height should masts be increased to and why?

High masts loaded with pulsed microwave radiation are unsafe

Question 5.3:

If yes to question 5.1, should a lower height limit be permitted for masts located in Article 2(3) land or on land on a highway and why?

If yes to question 5.1, what restrictions (if any) should be put in place to control development of permitted higher masts?

Question 6

Do you have any views on the potential impact of the matters raised in this consultation on people with protected characteristics as defined in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010?

Higher levels of EMR from 5G base stations will disproportionately affect babies and young children who absorb more radiation than adults and are more likely to suffer biological effects from exposure. Other vulnerable groups include pregnant women and foetuses and electrosensitive individuals. According to the charity ES-UK there are now around 435,000 people in the UK who are so sensitised to EMR that they are unable to work.'

SECTION 2

WHAT LOCAL COUNCILS NEED TO KNOW ABOUT 5G TECHNOLOGY AND THE GOVERNMENT'S PLANS TO RELAX LOCAL INFRASTRUCTURE LAWS FOR 5G

Reforms to planning laws have been proposed whereby telecom companies will be permitted to install masts and electronic communications infrastructure on protected and unprotected land without the need for prior approval, while the public will be denied the right to object to such installations. These reforms are intended to speed up the rollout of 5G across the UK.¹

5G wireless technology will support artificial intelligence, a network of 'smart' appliances in homes and 'smart' cities, driverless cars and virtual reality. But will this technological revolution make our world better or worse?

Significant points

- 5G wireless technology is not a case of turning a dial from 4G to 5G. It is a technology neither we, nor the planet, have ever seen or been exposed to before.
- 5G will entail pulsed, high-frequency electromagnetic radiation (EMR) emitted 24 hours a day. The intention is to roll it out without independent strategic health or environmental impact assessments and without public consultation.
- Millimetre (MM) wave frequencies (above 30 GHz in the electromagnetic spectrum) will piggy-back on existing 4G connections as the 5G network develops. These frequencies have short wavelengths and do not travel far, so mini base-stations with small cell antennas will be required every 100–200m to ensure full 5G coverage.
- Antennas will be mounted on lamp posts, traffic lights, public buildings etc., significantly increasing emissions of microwave radiation and public exposure to such emissions. Under the reformed planning laws the public will not be able to object to these installations.
- The current 4G signal works by providing blanket coverage of an area. 5G is much more targeted, working on a 'phased array' system which transmits millions of high intensity beams, locking on to and tracking 5G-enabled devices.
- According to a report commissioned by the European Parliament Committee on Industry, Research and Energy, increased exposure to EMR will result not only from the additional higher frequencies but also from the aggregation of different signals and complex interaction effects, especially in dense urban areas.²
- It has been widely claimed that radiofrequency (RF) EMR, being non-ionising, does not damage DNA. This has now been proven to be wrong. RF EMR causes DNA damage

through oxidative stress, similar to near-UV radiation – which was also long thought to be harmless.³

- MM waves behave in unpredictable ways and are highly biologically active. De-classified research describes damage to the eyes, skin, internal organs, metabolism, bone marrow, blood and other body systems.⁴
- International safety guidelines for EMR exposure have (effectively) been set by the telecoms industry. They are 20 years old and hundreds of thousands of times higher than levels at which harmful biological and health effects have been observed.⁵
- Scientists with industry ties hold key positions in national and international health agencies that provide public health advice on wireless technology (Public Health England, the World Health Organisation etc.). This advice disregards extensive independent research showing EMR to be harmful to both humans and the environment.⁶
- More than 156,000 scientists and doctors around the world have signed an appeal for a moratorium on the roll-out of 5G until it has been proven safe.⁷
- MM waves cannot pass through trees or their canopies. Larger masts (over 25m high) will therefore be constructed to ensure a clean line of sight between base stations. More than 400,000 'super masts' are planned for rural areas.⁸
- If the reforms are adopted, prior approval for deployment of 5G infrastructure within conservation areas and on listed buildings, in AONBs, areas defined within the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981), national parks and World Heritage sites, will no longer be required. An increasingly unsightly network of 5G infrastructure will at best severely compromise, and at worst destroy the beauty of the British landscape.
- Concerned citizens are justifiably worried about the potential devaluation of their homes. It is currently believed that properties near masts can be devalued by as much as 20 per cent.
- To expose people to mandatory radiation 24/7 constitutes an unprecedented violation of human rights. No public consultation on the 5G experiment has been conducted, and no public consent has been obtained – 'informed' or otherwise. This breaches the Nuremberg Code and Article 7 of the United Nations' International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which explicitly prohibits medical and scientific experimentation without consent.
- Re the Equality Act 2010 (Section 149): Higher levels of EMR from 5G base stations will disproportionately affect babies and young children who absorb more radiation than adults, and are more likely to suffer biological effects from exposure. Other vulnerable groups include pregnant women and fetuses and electrosensitive individuals. According to research carried out by the charity ES-UK there are currently more than 435,000 people in the UK who are so sensitised to EMR that they are unable to work.⁹
- Leading insurers, including Lloyds of London syndicates, will not cover health risks from mobile phones, wifi or other sources of EMR radiation.¹⁰

- The 20,000 satellites needed to support 5G will require more than 300 launches, adding considerably to carbon emissions and ozone depletion. As the life span of 5G satellites is just five years, these launches will need to be repeated at regular intervals.
- Last year 24 international environmental experts, including Professor William Sutherland (Chair of the British Ecological Society), identified 5G as one of the top 15 emerging threats to global conservation and biological diversity.¹¹
- Olle Johansson, former head of The Experimental Dermatology Unit, Department of Neuroscience, Karolinska Institute, and former adjunct professor of The Royal Institute of Technology, Sweden, states:

'The collective evidence we can draw from the current scientific status regarding adverse health and biological effects of artificial electromagnetic field exposures, such as from cell phones, antennas/base stations, TV and radio towers, baby alarms, smart meters, powerlines, and WiFi routers, [indicates] that we may be jeopardising more than our own health and behaviour. Bacteria, plants, birds, frogs, and pollinating insects may all be targeted, and it is obvious we must proceed with the highest caution before immersing the citizens and our wildlife in more and more artificial electromagnetic fields. We may, as a matter of fact, already be gravely endangering our current as well as coming generations. To not act today may prove a disaster tomorrow, and such lack of action may again result in the classical "late lessons from early warnings", or – even worse – "too late lessons from early warnings"¹²

Some Introductory Videos on 5G

A group of independent European journalists have produced this introductory two-minute video on 5G:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JKaoLxw0qJI&feature=youtu.be>
Investigate Europe

A senior tech insider – the former Microsoft President for Canada – has spoken out against 5G in a ten-minute video. This is significant because industry spokespeople normally emphasise the supposed benefits of 5G, but fail to mention the many disadvantages.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=h4TdY344Now>

References

- 1 <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/proposed-reforms-to-permitted-development-rights-to-support-the-deployment-of-5g-and-extend-mobile-coverage>
- 2 [https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/IDAN/2019/631060/IPOL_IDA\(2019\)631060_EN.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/IDAN/2019/631060/IPOL_IDA(2019)631060_EN.pdf)
- 3 [https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanplh/article/PIIS2542-5196\(18\)30221-3/fulltext?fbclid=IwAR2nUkGgwBevZ9QvZBSy7AYlossTsndg03yvkh_oBaEyu9S_P_VG0IRT3AE](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanplh/article/PIIS2542-5196(18)30221-3/fulltext?fbclid=IwAR2nUkGgwBevZ9QvZBSy7AYlossTsndg03yvkh_oBaEyu9S_P_VG0IRT3AE)
- 4 <https://mdsafetech.files.wordpress.com/2019/02/biological-effects-of-millimeter-wavelengths.-zalyubovskaya-declassif-by-cia-1977-biol-eff-mm-waves.pdf>
- 5 See: https://www.ofcom.org.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0019/62515/cavi_society_attachment.pdf

- 6 See <https://www.investigate-europe.eu/publications/how-much-is-safe/>
- 7 <https://www.5gspaceappeal.org/the-appeal>
- 8 <https://usave.co.uk/news/rural-areas-to-get-bigger-masts-to-boost-mobile-signal/>
- 9 <https://www.omegaonline.org/article-details/The-Prevalence-of-People-With-Restricted-Access-to-Work-in-Man-Made-Electromagnetic-Environments/2402>
- 10 <https://www.computerweekly.com/feature/Mobile-phones-and-health-is-5G-being-rolled-out-too-fast#Insurance>
- 11 [https://www.cell.com/trends/ecology-evolution/fulltext/S0169-5347\(17\)30289-6#secsect0005](https://www.cell.com/trends/ecology-evolution/fulltext/S0169-5347(17)30289-6#secsect0005)
- 12 <https://newsvoice.se/2019/05/5g-question-olle-johansson/>

SECTION 3

3 minute talk to be read at council meeting

Good evening Chairman and Councillors,

Regarding the Government planning survey and 5g

Safety is assumed in the survey but Not one research paper exists to prove it is safe

The EU ITRE report from April this year states that the unpredictability and interference patterns of the 5g waves are a problem

Quote "it is currently not possible to accurately measure 5g emissions in the real world

Rolling out 5g out is an illegal experiment,

From om the INTRODUCTORY NOTES of the survey

Point 1) Not all people and business expect or want constant connectivity. electro- sensitives, estimated at 800,000 in this country are very ill in an environment of constant connectivity. For them it is **NOT ESSENTIAL** Already we desperately need White zones for these people who are isolated and totally disempowered through lack of safe environments for them to live and work.

Point 2) It's **not an economic advantage** to those who cannot work, it is **not economic advantage** to weaken the workforce with chronic health conditions

Public Health England Guidelines are **20 years out of date**, they only consider the heating effects and way higher than in other countries like Italy, Cyprus and Israel.

There are damaging effects from exposures well below the PHE guidelines causing infertility, cancer diabetes, Alzheimers, all biological systems are affected.

The UK have doubled GBM brain cancers in last ten years and teenage health statistics are showing huge rises in mental health problems associated with neurological effects of mobile phones and wifi.

These are very inconvenient and challenging facts to the tech industry and to all of us.

PHE rely on ICNIRP a review panel of members supposedly independent but known to have ties to industry. In 2006 the chairman resigned after it was found he was receiving money via an account at Adelaide hospital.

It took years for the health warnings on smoking to catch up whilst doubt was cast on the science.

We have to listen to the warning signs now. We have the peer reviewed science contradicting PHE and ICNIRP.

LOOKING AT The SURVEY QUESTIONS

1 These are all leading questions, 5g is not proven safe, hiding these masts is not the issue.

2 and 3

Taller and thicker masts mean more radiation, PHEs assurance it is unlikely to exceed limits. Unlikely is not good enough, it is irrational and unacceptable.

There aren't even instruments to measure the mm waves of 5g available on the market,

4 5g antennas should not be placed on any buildings until proven to be safe. This is gearing up for driverless cars, do we really want them?

5 We have to urgently redefine safety limits for masts not give blanket permissions to densify the infrastructure. Already there are many cases of cancer clusters around masts without adding the potentially more dangerous 5g pulsed modulated beam formed waves.

(I hold up Sally Beares research document with the details of studies on this at this point)

Question 6 on the survey is about how the changes will affect vulnerable groups. As defined in equality act 2010. I quote

“The Equality Duty ensures that all public bodies play their part in making society fairer by tackling discrimination and providing equality of opportunity for all.

Electrosensitives would definitely be discriminated against by increasing numbers and heights of masts.

Babies children, pregnant women the elderly are particularly vulnerable too as they absorb more radiation

Thank you for hearing me and I urge you to research the health effects before responding to the survey.

The council has a duty of care to their residents and I ask that you follow the lead of Totnes Glastonbury, Frome, Kingsbridge and apply the precautionary principle. Suggested wording as follows.

This council has a moral responsibility to protect public health and the local environment. Until there is more independent scientific consensus that 5G wireless radiation is harmless to humans and the environment, the council adopts the precautionary principle and will not endorse the roll out of 5G.

