



The EM Radiation Research Trust Charity
Chairman Mr. Brian Stein CBE,
Chetwode House,
Leicester Road,
Melton Mowbray,
Leicestershire LE13 1GA

Email for the attention of John Kerr, (Case Officer)

Copied: EM Radiation Research Trust Chairman, Mr Brian Stein CBE

Cllr Les Byrom

Cllr Janet Grace

Cllr Michael Roche

13th September 2022

Dear John Kerr,

Ref: DC/2022/01727

In front of Marine Football Club, College Road, Crosby L23 3AS

I formally give notice of objection against phone mast application by Cornerstone Telecommunications for a 17.5m high street works column, supporting six no antennas, 2 no. 0.3m dishes and 2 no. equipment cabinets and ancillary equipment.

The EM Radiation Research Trust calls on Sefton Council to protect the health and safety of the local community, especially our children along with protecting the local area from the visual impacts associated with the clutter associated with the ancillary works and the overpowering visual impact of a 17.5m high street works column, with supporting cabinets and ancillary equipment.

This mast will create a blight on the landscape. The mast would be a constant reminder to the risks it poses causing fear, stress, and anxiety for the local community, this is a material consideration and should be considered.

Cornerstone Telecommunication supplied information to offer reassurance regarding health and safety concerns. The Radiation Research Trust would therefore like to respond accordingly.

Cornerstone Telecommunication's promotes the private members group known **ICNIRP** when offering reassurance for radiation safety.

Let us look at the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP)

ICNIRP have faced criticism via the courts, from members of the EU parliament and scientific publications. In truth, the ICNIRP guidelines are deeply flawed and obsolete. – see Pall, M. (2018) ⁽¹⁾, Hardell & Nyberg (2020) ⁽²⁾, Naren et al. (2020) ⁽³⁾, and Hertsgaard & Dowie (2018) ⁽⁴⁾.

The ICNIRP guidelines are set by a small, pro-industry/non-governmental organization of invitation-only, unelected private members who set guidelines for thermal heating. That means ICNIRP is only concerned whether this form of radiation causes burns, heatstroke, or shocks.

Many doctors and scientists are raising concerns about the biological effects associated with nonthermal frequencies, pulsations, and other signalling characteristics. There is a large body of science showing non-thermal biological and health effects from RFR exposure. What is profoundly misleading about that ICNIRP guidelines is that when the general public thinks about health concerns from a phone mast, they are not thinking shocks and heatstroke. The general public's concern related to RF radiation have to do with cancer, immune suppression, neurodegenerative diseases including Alzheimer's, Parkinson's and ALS, behavioural problems, learning disabilities, birth defects and infertility.

There are concerns regarding government's use of the ICNIRP guidelines. See - **Self-referencing authorships behind the ICNIRP 2020 radiation protection guidelines**. The Abstract concludes “the ICNIRP 2020 Guidelines fail to meet fundamental scientific quality requirements and are therefore not suited as the basis on which to set RF EMF exposure limits for the protection of human health. With its thermal-only view, ICNIRP contrasts with the majority of research findings, and would therefore need a particularly solid scientific foundation. Our analysis demonstrates the contrary to be the case. **Hence, the ICNIRP 2020 Guidelines cannot offer a basis for good governance.**” Einar Flydal et al. (2022). ⁽⁵⁾

Also, please read the important paper published on the National Library of Medicine from 2016 by neuroscientist Dr Sarah Starkey: **Inaccurate official assessment of radiofrequency safety by the Advisory Group on Non-ionising Radiation** ‘The executive summary and overall conclusions did not accurately reflect the scientific evidence available. Independence is needed from the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP), the group that set the exposure guidelines being assessed. This conflict of interest critically needs to be addressed for the forthcoming World Health Organisation (WHO) Environmental Health Criteria Monograph on Radiofrequency Fields. Decision makers, organisations and individuals require accurate information about the safety of RF electromagnetic signals if they are to be able to fulfil their safeguarding responsibilities and protect those for whom they have legal responsibility.’ ⁽⁶⁾

Politicians at the EU Parliament also raise concerns. Read the report by Klaus Buchner and Michele Rivasi, Members of the European Parliament, on ICNIRP and the long history of infiltration by telecom influence, and EU plans to roll out 5G. The International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection Conflicts of interest, corporate capture, and the push for 5G. ⁽⁷⁾

Legal cases and Action

The UK ICNIRP guidelines along with the US guidelines are outdated and obsolete and are obviously not protecting public health. On Friday 13th August 2021 in the USA Robert F. Kennedy

Jr.'s Children's Health Defense and the Environmental Health Trust successfully sued the FCC in a historic lawsuit against the FCC for ignoring 11,000 pages of scientific and medical evidence showing biological effects, so we can no longer rely on industry assurances of safety. ⁽⁸⁾

The USA Children's Health Defense (CHD) launched a campaign on 9th September 2022 calling on the public to Stop 5G near Schools and to take action by emailing state and local officials saying, **'Our Children Are Not Guinea Pigs!'** The report provides details to the scientific literature that clearly documents adverse health effects of RF exposure, including developmental delays, memory and attention deficits, heightened risk to type 2 diabetes and changes to the blood predictive of cancer. CHD also raise concerns about cell towers and small cells posing **considerable fire safety threats**, compounding the existing risks to our children when placing masts near schools. ⁽⁹⁾

The Radiation Research Trust received direct support from the USA's Children's health Defense (CHD) for a letter sent directly to Boris Johnson 27th April 2020 calling on the Government to halt the 5G deployment. Here is the statement from Robert F. Kennedy, Jr Chairman of CHD, and Dafna Tachover in support for the EM Radiation Research Trust:

"Robert F. Kennedy, Jr Chairman of CHD, and Dafna Tachover, Director of CHD's 5G & Wireless Harms project support the UK EM Radiation Research Trust in their call on the UK Government to defend the rights and health of UK citizens and especially children from Big Telecom's scheme to rollout 5G. The harms of radiofrequencies and microwave-based technologies have been proven scientifically and the harms are existing and widespread. We work daily with children who have been injured from this technology including from 5G small cell installations. The UK's ICNIRP based guidelines, just like the US's FCC, are decades obsolete and false. ICNIRP is an industry shell, and its scientists are tainted as has been confirmed by Courts. Robert F. Kennedy, Jr calls on Prime Minister Boris Johnson and political leaders to protect those who have been harmed already by this radiation and prevent further harm. We must stop the uncontrolled proliferation of wireless technology and the on-going deployment of 5G, which will exponentially increase exposure to this harmful radiation and consequently, the sickness of children, adults, and the ecosystem." ⁽¹⁰⁾

Cornerstone Telecommunication offer ICNIRP as a 'certificate of safety' which does not provide any level of protection for industry or government decision makers. Previous Chairman for ICNIRP Paolo Vecchia presented at the EM Radiation Research Trust conference in September 2008. In his presentation, he made it clear that: **"the ICNIRP guidelines are neither mandatory prescriptions for safety, the "last word" on the issue nor are they defensive walls for Industry or others."** ⁽¹¹⁾

This statement makes it clear that the decision to adopt these guidelines into national legislation as 'sufficient to protect public health' is political.

Considering this information, I call on Sefton Council and planning to dismiss any claims of safety for the phone mast based on ICNIRP.

The Stewart Report

Cornerstone Telecommunication's refers to (The Stewart Report). The Stewart Report was chaired by Sir William Stewart in response to the DTI request. The Stewart Report (2000, 2005) recommended that the beam of greatest intensity from a mobile phone mast antenna should not fall on any part of a school's grounds or buildings without the informed consent of the school and parents.

Sir William Stewart strengthened his call for concern in 2005 saying that the evidence for possible harm has become stronger in the (almost) 5 years since the publication of his original IEGMP Report. Sir William recommended that young people should be encouraged to minimise their use of a mobile phones, and that children under about 10 years old should not have one. Recently the EU REFLEX ⁽¹¹⁾ project confirmed DNA and protein changes in repeated laboratory experiments that point towards the likelihood that mobile phone use and maybe base station microwave emissions may both be a cause of increased numbers of cancers.” ⁽¹²⁾

I was a member of Sir William Stewart’s UK Health Protection Agency EMF Discussion Group. Sir William Stewart also presented at the EM Radiation Research Trust 2008 conference. He said: “There are additional factors that need to be taken into account in assessing any possible health effects. Populations as a whole are not genetically homogeneous, and people can vary in their susceptibility to environmental hazards. There are well established examples in the literature of the genetic predisposition of some groups, which could influence sensitivity to disease. There could also be a dependence on age. We conclude therefore that it is not possible at present to say that exposure to RF radiation, even at levels below national guidelines, is totally without potential adverse health effects, and that gaps in knowledge are sufficient to justify a precautionary approach.” ⁽¹³⁾

Cornerstone quote the Stewart Report, saying the evidence did not suggest that exposures to EMR below international guidelines could cause adverse health effects. They state that they adhere to the Stewart report and ICNIRP rules, but since 2010, there have been **many publications pointing to actual harm of EMRs on children’s health by mobile base stations** – e.g. Meo et al (2019), studied exposure of adolescents at 2-10 mW/cm² EMR exposure from a mobile base station 200 metres from a school and this resulted in impairment of spatial working memory and attention, and delayed motor skills. ⁽¹⁴⁾

The World Health Organisation

Cornerstone Telecommunication’s also refers to the World Health Organisation but fails to mention the scientific consensus reached by the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC). IARC is a sub-group of the World Health Organization with its role to monitor and identify global causes of cancer. IARC members classified the entire RF/EMF spectrum as a “**2B Possible Human Carcinogen**” in 2011. The Radiation Research Trust would like to reinforce the fact that members of IARC with collective judgment found scientific consensus in reaching this decision. The vote was nearly unanimous: 29 to 1. ⁽¹⁵⁾

The evidence of increased cancer risks has since been strengthened by further human studies, as well as toxicology studies in animals, which demonstrated clear evidence of tumours. The \$30 million US National Toxicology Program (NTP) RF studies and the Italian Ramazzini Institute ten-year research project both found clear evidence of malignant tumours. Two different institutes with laboratories in different countries, totally independent of each other and both producing parallel consistent findings, reinforces the validity of these ground-breaking animal studies. An external peer-review panel of eleven scientists complimented the methodology of the NTP study and concluded that the results showed clear evidence of carcinogenic activity.

Many doctors and scientists are now calling for an urgent upgrade to the classification of RF - EMF from 2B to Group 1 (Known Carcinogen), the same category as tobacco. Dr Hardell stated unequivocally: “The agent is carcinogenic to humans.”

In addition, many scientists are calling for action to better protect the public, including:

- 1) The International EMF Scientist Appeal to the United Nations (www.emfscientist.org)
- 2) Rejection of the current ICNIRP guidelines for not being protective of health (www.emfcall.org)
- 3) Halting the 5G rollout until adequate safety studies have been done. (www.5Gappeal.eu)

Important recent legal developments

The case, EAM v East Sussex County Council (Special educational needs) features a child who suffers electrosensitivity. Upper Tribunal Judge Jacobs found that the child should be considered disabled under the Equality Act 2010, and she required an Education, Health, and Care Plan (EHCP). **This ground-breaking legal decision is significant as it would be difficult for Sefton Council to shield children from exposure to radiation from a phone mast near a school should a child go on to develop or suffer with electrosensitivity because of exposure to radiation from the mast.**

(16)

In addition, The Secretary of State is to be challenged in the Court of Appeal on failure to give adequate information to the public about the risks of 5G and to explain the absence of a process for investigation of any adverse health effects. Michael Mansfield QC, Philip Rule and Lorna Hackett of Hackett & Dabbs LLP represent the claimants. **The Court of Appeal has granted permission on two grounds concerning:**

1. The failure to provide adequate or effective information to the public about the risks and how, if it be possible, it might be possible for individuals to avoid or minimise the risks;
2. (a) The failure to provide adequate and sufficient reasons for not establishing a process to investigate and establish the adverse health effects and risks of adverse health effects from 5G technology and/or for discounting the risks presented by the evidence available; and/or (b) failure to meet the requirements of transparency and openness required of a public body.

These grounds advance a breach of the Human Rights Act 1998 by omissions and failings in violation of the positive obligations to protect human life, health, and dignity, required to be met by Articles 2, 3 and/or 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights. The case has been sent back to the Administrative Court. (17)

Recently, a German court has clarified in a lawsuit that property owners who rent space for base stations and mobile towers assume responsibility for health consequences of the activity. Although the radiation is lower than the relevant reference values from the authorities, this does not mean that the property owner is not responsible for negative health consequences. The same responsibility principles should also apply in the UK. (18)

In June 2022, a 59-year-old UK social worker won ‘early ill health retirement’ for disabling ‘Electromagnetic Hypersensitivity (EHS): In relation to EHS, the Independent Registered Medical Practitioner (IRMP) report concludes: “Mrs. Burns has a medical condition that renders her permanently incapable of undertaking any gainful work. There currently are no treatments available for her condition; avoidance of emissions is the only way to significantly reduce her symptoms.” Whilst such emissions were historically presumed to be biologically inert and are still purported to be safe by many to this day, there is now highly credible evidence to the contrary.

(19)

Here in the UK, a landmark legal ruling in November 2021 took place at the Planning Court, Queen's Bench Division, High Court of Justice, London with campaigners successfully claiming against Brighton and Hove Council with Hutchison 3G as the interested party. The Honourable Mr Justice Holgate overturned the local authority approval for the 5G mast to be sited close to a primary school. The ruling found that the Council “**failed to address the health impacts**” of the mast. The Council was ordered to pay the claimants costs to the agreed sum of £13,340. This finding has significant implications for all councils dealing with 5G applications, it means there is a legal responsibility to investigate effects on health. The ruling highlighted the fact that the council failed to address health impacts of the proposed mast and to obtain evidence of the assessment of the proximity to the school. The case also states the council unlawfully determined that the highway safety implications of the cabinets and the concerns expressed by the council's highway team. Sitting and appearance, are also still a ‘material planning consideration’ under prior approval and must be given attention. ⁽²⁰⁾

I can assure you from personal experience that the detrimental impacts from this form of radiation are profoundly serious and real. I suffered with breast cancer in 2001 after living 100m from a phone mast in Wishaw, Sutton Coldfield and led the campaign against the mast after discovering an illness/cancer cluster surrounding the mast. I have since campaigned for 20 years. ⁽²¹⁾

I would appreciate receiving a progress report for this application. I trust you will do all you can to protect the safety of the local community.

Yours sincerely,

Eileen O'Connor

Director

EM Radiation Research Trust (An independent Charity Registered No. 1106304 © The EM Radiation Research Trust 2003-2004)

www.radiationresearch.org

References:

1. Pall, M.L. (2018) PhD, Professor Emeritus of Biochemistry and Basic Medical Sciences, Washington State University, martin_pall@wsu.edu. 5G: Great risk for EU, U.S., and International Health! Compelling Evidence for Eight Distinct Types of Great Harm Caused by Electromagnetic Field (EMR) Exposures and the Mechanism that Causes Them, <http://bit.ly/RFGuidelinesPall190523>
2. Hardell L, Nyberg R. (2020) Appeals that matter or not on a moratorium on the deployment of the fifth generation, 5G, for microwave radiation. Mol Clin Oncol. Mar;12(3):247-257 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32064102/>
3. Naren, Anubhav Elhence, Vinay Chamola, & Mohsen Guizani. Electromagnetic Radiation Due to Cellular, Wi-Fi and Bluetooth Technologies: How Safe Are We? (Special Section on Antenna and Propagation for 5G and beyond) IEEE Access, March 12, 2020. d.o.i 10.1109/ACCESS.2020.2976434, <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/stamp/stamp.jsp?tp=&arnumber=9016183>
4. Mark Hertsgaard and Mark Dowie, March 29th, 2018 - How Big Wireless Made Us Think That Cell Phones Are Safe: A Special Investigation - The disinformation campaign—and massive radiation increase—behind the 5G rollout. The Nation. <https://www.thenation.com/article/archive/how-big-wireless-made-us-think-that-cell-phones-are-safe-a-special-investigation/>

5. Else K Nordhagen 1, Einar Flydal - Self referencing authorships behind the ICNIRP 2020 radiation protection guidelines <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/35751553/>
6. Dr Sarah J Starkey - Inaccurate official assessment of radiofrequency safety by the Advisory Group on Non-ionising Radiation <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27902455/>
7. The International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection: Conflicts of interest , corporate capture and the push for 5G <https://ehtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/ICNIRP-report-FINAL-JUNE-2020.pdf>
8. Environmental Health Trust ET AL. V FCC Key Documents <https://ehtrust.org/environmental-health-trust-et-al-v-fcc-key-documents/>
9. CHD – No 5G Near Schools <https://childrenshealthdefense.org/child-health-topics/action/no-5g-near-schools/?eType=EmailBlastContent&eld=dfc235a7-8121-46ac-92ae-a61161aa1f0f>
10. RFK, Jr. Joins EM Radiation Research Trust in Calling Upon UK Prime Minister to Halt 5G Deployment <https://www.globalresearch.ca/rfk-jr-joins-em-radiation-research-trust-calling-uk-prime-minister-halt-5g-deployment/5712096>
11. Paolo Vecchia presentation, go to slide number 16 https://www.radiationresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/021145_vecchia.pdf
12. REFLEX project <https://www.emf-portal.org/en/glossary/3142>
13. Stewart Report (revised) 14/01/2005 https://www.powerwatch.org.uk/news/20050114_stewart.asp
14. Sir William Stewart speech – Radiation Research Trust conference 2008 https://www.radiationresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/010920_stewart.pdf
15. Meo SA, Almahmoud M, Alsultan Q, Alotaibi N, Alnajashi I, Hajjar WM. Am J Mens Health. 2018 Jan-Feb;13(1):1557988318816914. Mobile Phone Base Station Tower Settings Adjacent to School Buildings: Impact on Students' Cognitive Health <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30526242/>
16. 31 May 2011 IARC CLASSIFIES RADIOFREQUENCY ELECTROMAGNETIC FIELDS AS POSSIBLY CARCINOGENIC TO HUMANS https://www.iarc.who.int/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/pr208_E.pdf
17. PHIRE Medical which includes Statements from parents, child and excerpts from 3 Tribunal <https://phiremedical.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/08/Press-Release-EHCP-for-UK-child-with-EHS-2022-PHIRE.pdf>
18. Michael Mansfield QC, Philip Rule and Lorna Hackett of Hackett & Dabbs LLP represent the claimants <https://actionagainst5g.org/legal-case>
19. German Court: <https://www.emfacts.com/2022/07/german-court-finds-property-owners-can-be-liable-for-health-impacts-from-base-station-antennas-on-their-property/>
20. 59-year-old UK social worker won 'early ill health retirement' <https://phiremedical.org/59-year-old-social-worker-wins-early-ill-health-retirement-for-disabling-electromagnetic-hypersensitivity-ehs/>
21. UK Campaigners in Brighton and Hove recently won a landmark legal case against a 5G mast in Brighton on 2nd November 2021 <https://rfinfo.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/Consent-Order-02.11.21.pdf>
22. Eileen O'Connor's Conference presentations <https://www.radiationresearch.org/about-us/conference-presentations/>