



Contact address:

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

19th November 2023

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

Email address: eileen@radiationresearch.org

For the attention of: Birmingham City Planning officer Daniel Illott
planningandregenerationenquiries@birmingham.gov.uk

Cc. Rt Hon Mr Andrew Mitchell MP andrew.mitchell.mp@parliament.uk

Councillor Rob Pocock rob.pocock@birmingham.gov.uk

Councillor Kath Scott kath.scott@birmingham.gov.uk

Head of St. Nicholas School Mrs. Claire Noble-Barton enquiry@stnicholassutton.org.uk
lighthousechildcare2023@outlook.com

News desk newsdesk@birminghamlive.co.uk

EM Radiation Research Trust Chairman Mr Brian Stein CBE

Ref: Planning Application - 2023/07389/PA

Site Address: Concorde House Union Drive Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B73 5TE

Application for a prior notification for the installation of 22.5m high telecommunications mast with associated 12no. antennas, 2no. dishes, 7 no. equipment cabinets and ancillary development works

I am the Co-founder and Charity Director for the EM Radiation Research Trust from 2003 to date: www.radiationresearch.org , Co-founder and Board member for the International EMF Alliance 2009 to date: 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.

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

There is no ICNIRP certificate with this application?

We realise that the ICNIRP guidelines are irrelevant with regards to protecting public health from biological effects and long-term exposure. However, we fully appreciate the importance with regards to industry signing the ICNIRP certificate and therefore taking responsibility for potential future claims.

The application is within a heavily populated area with businesses and residences, and near Lighthouse Childcare Pre-school and St Nicholas Catholic Primary School. Sutton Coldfield and Birmingham City Council should safeguard health as per section 2B of the National Health Service Act 2006. They are not doing this by allowing phone masts.

Cornerstone quote the Stewart Report, they state that they adhere to the Stewart report and ICNIRP recommendations. They fail to mention concerns raised directly from the head of this very report Sir William Stewart. He presented at the EM Radiation Research Trust 2008 conference in London. From Sir William Stewart's presentation "**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.**" https://www.radiationresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/010920_stewart.pdf

Cornerstone also ignore the many publications demonstrating very real and actual harm of RF/EMF radiation. We call on Birmingham and Sutton Coldfield Council to consider the many publications some are presented within this objection against the mast. We are especially concerned for the children attending the two schools and draw your attention to a paper concerning children, Meo et al (2019) studied phone mast exposure of adolescents with the base station 200 metres from the school resulting in impairment of spatial working memory and attention, and delayed motor skills. They state that mobile base stations should be 'installed away from thickly populated residential zones particularly in or near the school buildings or there must be some system to shield human beings from RF-EMF.' <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30526242/>

Andrew Mitchell MP and Dr Rob Pockcock are fully aware of the 2001 Wishaw phone mast cancer/illness cluster having both been called upon for support. Andrew Mitchell raised concerns regarding key constituency experience during a parliamentary debate, one being the matter of a **mast sited adjacent to St Nicholas school, Boldmere**. The school together with the governors and parents, sought a way to raise concern about the siting of the mast. And, also the Wishaw cancer cluster with five ladies who developed breast cancer. One prostate cancer, one bladder cancer, and one lung cancer, and three cases of pre-cancerous cervical cells. One motor neurone and others with benign lumps, skin rashes, sleep problems, dizziness and low immune systems and cases of Electrosensitivity. Out of the eighteen houses surrounding the mast, at a range of up to 500m, and 77% of the hamlet had health-related illness. The outbreak occurred in 2001, after seven years of exposure to the radiation. Many

of the minor ailments cleared up after the mast came down. I am one of the ladies who developed breast cancer in 2001 after living 100m from the Wishaw phone mast and have since campaigned over 20 years. **The history of this campaign should therefore alert Sutton Coldfield Council to take health into consideration.**

Here is the link to the parliamentary debate recorded in Hansard.

<https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/2004-01-28/debates/2db2621c-9510-4f3f-88ae-fd96a0d7d70c/MobilePhoneMasts>

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>.

In addition, six Italian courts have ruled that mobile phones cause brain tumours.

<https://childrenshealthdefense.org/news/six-italian-courts-have-ruled-that-cell-phones-cause-brain-tumors/>

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/>

Cornerstone 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, workers, and school children will be exposed to this radiation 24/7 not 6 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

We would like to draw your attention to an excellent researched article written by Gillian Jamieson and published on 15th 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/>

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

- 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
- Are fire hazards due to electrical faults. <https://www.aspentimes.com/opinion/guest-commentary-is-5g-a-potential-fire-hazard/>
- Can disrupt and disable medical devices such as pacemakers. (Outside scope of ICNIRP guidelines.) <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPrfgdl2020.pdf>
- 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
- 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

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 siting 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 Andrew Mitchell MP, Councillor Dr Rob Pocock, Councillor Kath Scott and Birmingham City Council 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.

Visit the EM Radiation Research Trust for more information: www.radiationresearch.org

Eileen O’Connor
Charity Director for the EM Radiation Research Trust
Website address: <https://www.radiationresearch.org/>
Email: 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