



**Contact address:**

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

28<sup>th</sup> November 2023

**Sent from: EM Radiation Research Trust Director Eileen O'Connor**

Email address: [eileen@radiationresearch.org](mailto:eileen@radiationresearch.org)

For the attention of: **The Planning Inspectorate** [West3@planninginspectorate.gov.uk](mailto:West3@planninginspectorate.gov.uk)

Cc Sefton Council Planning John Kerr [john.kerr@sefton.gov.uk](mailto:john.kerr@sefton.gov.uk)

[Planning.department@sefton.gov.uk](mailto:Planning.department@sefton.gov.uk)

EM Radiation Research Trust Chairman Mr Brian Stein CBE

Peter Dowd MP [peter.dowd.mp@parliament.uk](mailto:peter.dowd.mp@parliament.uk)

Bill Esterson MP [Bill.esterson.mp@parliament.uk](mailto:Bill.esterson.mp@parliament.uk)

Councillors

Les Byrom [Les.Byrom@sefton.gov.uk](mailto:Les.Byrom@sefton.gov.uk)

Janet Grace [janet.grace@sefton.gov.uk](mailto:janet.grace@sefton.gov.uk)

Michael Roche [michael.roche@sefton.gov.uk](mailto:michael.roche@sefton.gov.uk)

Letter of Objection against 5G phone mast

Reference **PP/M4320/W/23/3320488**

Site address: **DC/2023/01871 Victoria Park, Park View, Waterloo Liverpool L22 2AP**

**Ref: Planning Application – DC/2023/01871**

Application for: 25m high climbable monopole, 1No. circular headframe to support 6 antennas and 4 dishes + 4 cabinets enclosed by 2.5m high mesh panel fence with shark tooth spikes.

I am the Co-founder and Charity Director for the EM Radiation Research Trust from 2003 to date: [www.radiationresearch.org](http://www.radiationresearch.org) , Co-founder and Board member for the International EMF Alliance 2009 to date: [www.iemfa.org](http://www.iemfa.org). I was previously a member of the European Commission Stakeholder Dialogue Group on EMF from 2011 – 2014 and a member of the UK Health Protection Agency, Radiation Protection Division EMF Discussion Group from 2006-2008 Chaired by the previous Health Protection Agency Chairman Sir William Stewart. I was a Co-founder and Chair for (SCRAM) Seriously Concerned Residents against Masts. 2002 – 2005.

The EM Radiation Research Trust is currently supporting concerned citizens in Birmingham to object against a phone mast that was overturned by the Planning Inspectorate and has now gone up despite objections from residents, Preet Gill MP, and Birmingham City Council. The decision may even be unlawful due to the Planning Inspectorate accepting an ICNIRP certificate containing details of a company that no longer exists. We have called for a full investigation. The Planning Inspectorate responded on 20<sup>th</sup> November saying they will investigate the EM Radiation Research Trust (RRT) complaint in accordance with Complaints Procedures. Birmingham City Council are also investigating the RRT complaint which is at stage one. This matter has also been reported to the police.

Please read the collection of letters of complaint sent to the Planning Inspectorate, Preet Gill MP and Ministers responsible for the Department for Levelling Up, Housing & Communities sent on behalf of the EM Radiation Research Trust dated 8<sup>th</sup>, 9<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> November:

<https://www.radiationresearch.org/news/em-radiation-research-trust-calls-for-5g-on-war-lane-harborne-birmingham-to-cess-and-desist/>

Preet Gill MP thankfully sent a letter to the Secretary of State regarding the phone mast on War Lane, Harborne, Birmingham calling for the Local Authorities to have more power in the planning process. Tweet by Preet Kaur Gill MP: **“Many constituents have contacted me about a 20m 5G mast in War Lane, Harborne. They objected, I objected, and the Council rejected the application. But the mast has gone up regardless. I asked the Govt why LAs don’t have powers to decide where these masts are placed ”** <https://twitter.com/PreetKGillMP/status/1727718347771392268>

We are facing a similar situation in Waterloo with residents objecting against the 5G mast application and the local council refusing planning permission. We call on the Planning Inspectorate to take objections from residents and the local authority into high priority when considering the appeal by industry calling for the Inspectorate to overturn Sefton council’s decision to reject the 5G mast application.

There are many serious recent developments against phone masts throughout the UK with a current investigation into the Inspectorate’s decision over the War Lane, Harborne, Birmingham phone mast and a Planning Judicial Review was recently granted on 13<sup>th</sup> November 2023 at Cardiff Administrative Court following an appeal hearing in relation to a decision taken by Cheltenham who decided prior approval was not required and approved a 5G mast denying that the impact to a resident with metal implants living within the public exclusion zone. The Judge agreed that the Appeal presented by Steven Thomas supported by Neil McDougall is arguable on both grounds after a review of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Objection from the EM Radiation Research Trust for the following reasons:

The ICNIRP guidelines are irrelevant with regards to protecting public health from biological effects and long-term exposure.

It is common knowledge, and supported by peer reviewed evidence that phone mast radiation and the ICNIRP guidelines raise health & safety concerns, as follows.

- Can disrupt and disable medical devices such as pacemakers. (Outside scope of ICNIRP guidelines.) <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPrfgdl2020.pdf>
- Not suitable for those suffering with Electrosensitivity. <https://www.es-uk.info/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/ES-UK-information-leaflet.pdf>
- ICNIRP based on thermally heating effects only. <https://www.powerwatch.org.uk/science/intguidance.asp>
- Masts emit pulsed microwave radiation. [https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736\(00\)03243-8/fulltext](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736(00)03243-8/fulltext)
- RF/microwave radiation is recognised as a class 2B carcinogen by the WHO. [https://www.iarc.who.int/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/pr208\\_E.pdf](https://www.iarc.who.int/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/pr208_E.pdf)
- Are fire hazards due to electrical faults. <https://www.aspentimes.com/opinion/guest-commentary-is-5g-a-potential-fire-hazard/>
- ICNIRP conflicts of interest stated by a judgement at the Turin Court of Appeal. [https://www.radiationresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/Turin-Verdict-ICNIRP\\_Judgment-SUMMARY-of-the-Turin-Court-of-Appeal-9042019\\_EN-min.pdf](https://www.radiationresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/Turin-Verdict-ICNIRP_Judgment-SUMMARY-of-the-Turin-Court-of-Appeal-9042019_EN-min.pdf)
- ICNIRP's guidelines are based on studies from the 1980's involving 40–60-minute exposures in 5 monkeys and 8 rats. <https://ehjournal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12940-022-00900-9>
- Paolo Vecchia, ICNIRP Chair from 2004 until 2012 said “the ICNIRP guidelines are neither mandatory prescriptions for safety, the “ last word” on the issue nor are they defensive walls for Industry or others.” Slide no (16) [https://www.radiationresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/021145\\_vecchia.pdf](https://www.radiationresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/021145_vecchia.pdf)

Five recently published case studies are now demonstrating 5G rapidly caused harmful health effects. <https://www.radiationresearch.org/news/fifth-case-study-shows-5g-rapidly-caused-harmful-health-effects-published-18-november-2023-by-radiation-protection/>

Research that has shown significant adverse health effects for people living near masts that emit radiofrequency radiation. Here is a link to a list of peer-reviewed scientific studies of human health around mobile phone masts as of the end of 2020. Out of 33 studies, 32 report health problems. <https://www.radiationresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/01/scientific-studies-of-human-health-around-mobile-phone-base-stations.pdf>

Campaigners have already successfully claimed against Brighton and Hove Council with Hutchison 3G as the interested party in the landmark legal ruling in November 2021 at the Planning Court, Queen's Bench Division, High Court of Justice, London with The Honourable Mr Justice Holgate who 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 and was ordered to pay claimants costs of £13,340. <https://rfinfo.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/Consent-Order-02.11.21.pdf>

There are now two successful recent claims in the UK for Electrosensitivity, the case EAM v East Sussex County Council (Special educational needs) features a child who suffers from Electrosensitivity, and a social worker won ‘early ill health retirement for disabling Electrosensitivity, details available via <https://phiremedical.org/in>.

The \$21 billion reinsurance company Swiss Re Group, which is one of the world's leading providers, rated 5G as a "high impact" liability risk, affecting property and casualty claims, citing concerns about biological effects, and potential claims for health impairments with long-term consequences. <https://ehtrust.org/key-issues/electromagnetic-field-insurance-policy-exclusions/>

Industry claim the ICNIRP guidelines are safe for thermal heating and non-thermal but forget to mention that these guidelines are only for short term, (6 minutes) is the normal time frame to a small area of the body, plus a (30 -minute) window for whole body exposure according to ICNIRP's May 2020 paper. Residents, and school children will be exposed to this radiation 24/7 not 6 minutes or 30 minutes. **The ICNIRP guidelines are woefully inadequate in offering any form of protection in the real world for public long-term exposure and especially children.**

Existing scientific data confirms that current levels of radiation exposure, as in 2G, 3G, 4G and now 5G are damaging to health of all biological life forms. The cumulative effect of densification to enable 5G, will potentially be catastrophic for health. The ICNIRP guidelines are irrelevant according to many doctors and scientists, politicians and decisions taken in the courts. The Science and Technology Options Assessment Committee (STOA) of the European Parliament published a review on **5G describing 5G as an experiment on the population.**

[https://www.europarl.europa.eu/thinktank/en/document.html?reference=EPRS\\_STU%282021%29690012](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/thinktank/en/document.html?reference=EPRS_STU%282021%29690012)

We would like to draw your attention to an excellent researched article written by Gillian Jamieson and published on 15<sup>th</sup> November 2023 with the title **Experts Raise Public Health Fears About Microwave Syndrome From 5G Masts.** This article provides detailed information regarding 5G case studies carried out this year by Professor Lennart Hardell and Mona Nilsson, in which eight people developed debilitating symptoms after the installation of 5G masts next to their accommodation, where precise radiation measurements were taken.

<https://dailysceptic.org/2023/11/15/experts-raise-public-health-fears-about-microwave-syndrome-from-5g-masts>

Thousands of medical, scientific, legal professionals and members of the public support the International Declaration calling for the human rights of children in the digital age. This Declaration launched by Americans for Responsible Technology (ART). It focuses on three legal rights of children regarding the deployment and use of technology: their right to be free from intentionally addictive devices, platforms, and apps; their right to be free from excessive exposure to wireless radiation; and their right to be free from commercial exploitation.

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

The BioInitiative Working Group reviewed thousands of scientific papers that show biological harm from such radiation emissions. This group of experts calls for the precautionary approach and urgent action due to chronic EMF-related diseases that are a potential risk for everyone.

<https://bioinitiative.org/conclusions/>

There is also concern for devaluation of property. An article published in 'This is Money' raises concerns with the headline 'Phone mast wipes £50,000 off house value' this feature highlights concerns raised by property experts, David Adams, sales director at Hamptons International. He said: 'There are two ways mobile phone masts affect property prices - by being close to one and actually looking out over it. In this case it's both, so it's a double whammy.' In addition, A spokesman for the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors said there was no way of calculating the exact effect of a phone mast on property prices. 'You have to treat it as any other kind of blight, like being next to a smelly glue factory, a noisy garage, a cliff, a wind farm or something

really ugly.’ <https://www.thisismoney.co.uk/money/mortgageshome/article-1587027/Phone-mast-wipes-50000-off-house-value.html>

Furthermore, public perception of danger is a valid planning consideration. From previous PPG8 – Paragraph 29. Health considerations and public concern can in principle be material considerations in determining applications for planning permission and prior approval. Whether such matters are material in a particular case is ultimately a matter for the courts. It is for the decision-maker (usually the local planning authority) to determine what weight to attach to such considerations in any particular case. Mr Justice Moseley stated in R v Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council ex parte Smith “it is arguable that actual and perceived health risks are relevant to sitting of these masts.”

The case of Yasmin Skelt vs Secretary of State (John Prescott) and Three Bridges District Council and Orange (2003), made it clear that it is not acceptable for local planners to accept an ICNIRP certificate according to a High Court Judge who highlighted “failure to adequately consider the weight to be given to the health concerns of the claimant in his decision letter.” The First Secretary of State offered to concede the case and to pay reasonable costs.

We call on the Planning Inspectorate to reject this application and launch a full investigation calling for a complete review of the whole planning process for this technology taking health into consideration based on independent research demonstrating biological effects below the ICNIRP guidelines.

Fire hazard safety should also follow strict regulations and regular safety inspections. Public health and safety should take priority over industry profits.

Eileen O’Connor  
Charity Director for the EM Radiation Research Trust  
Website address: <https://www.radiationresearch.org/>  
Email: [eileen@radiationresearch.org](mailto:eileen@radiationresearch.org)

The EM Radiation Research Trust is an educational organisation funded by donations. An independent Charity Registered No. 1106304 © The EM Radiation Research Trust 2003-2004