Councillor Date 2020
Council

Address

 Your Name

 Your Address

 Your Address

 Your Address

Dear Councillor

**Misleading government advice about 5G**

It has come to my attention that the government via Matt Warman of the Department of Culture, Media and Sport has written to our local council with a leaflet setting out a misrepresentative fact, namely that 5G is entirely safe.  It is not and the information being spread by the government is misleading.  **As a local councillor, you are personally liable for damage to your constituents, a liability for which you are not indemnified by the council or the government.**

You can find reports on the health impacts of 5G prepared by solicitor Jessica Learmond-Criqui, on the page below:

5G-health-impact-briefing, and schedules:

<https://rfinfo.co.uk/index.php/legal-submissions/>

The first is a report on the health impacts and the second are schedules to support the statements made in the first report.  The first is close to 100 pages and the second is over 100 pages.

If you wish to educate yourself thoroughly about this subject to understand why the government is going to such lengths to propagate this false information, then please read the reports.  They are concise and interesting and won’t take you long to understand the issue.  You owe it to your constituents to learn about the devastating consequences of the government’s policies, its impact on your constituents and on your personal liability.

The government is not indemnifying you against action taken against you for failure to safeguard the health and safety of your constituents, a duty which all councils have under s. 2B of the National Health Service Act 2006 (see further below).

In relation to planning applications for masts, the NPPF states the following:

116. Local planning authorities must determine applications on planning grounds only. They should not seek to prevent competition between different operators, question the need for an electronic communications system, or set health safeguards different from the International Commission guidelines for public exposure.

This states that local planning authorities should not “set health safeguards different from the International Commission guidelines for public exposure”.

We appreciate that local councils cannot do that.  But, our local council has an obligation to safeguard the health of its constituents by virtue of s. 2B of the National Health Service Act 2006:

*2B         Functions of local authorities and Secretary of State as to improvement of public health*

(1)         Each local authority must take such steps as it considers appropriate **for improving the health of the people in its area**.

(2)         The Secretary of State may take such steps as the Secretary of State considers appropriate for improving the health of the people of England.

(3)         The steps that may be taken under subsection (1) or (2) include—

(a)         providing information and advice;

(b)         providing services or facilities designed to promote healthy living (whether by helping individuals to address behaviour that is detrimental to health or in any other way);

(c)         providing services or facilities for the prevention, diagnosis or treatment of illness;

(d)         providing financial incentives to encourage individuals to adopt healthier lifestyles;

(e)         providing assistance (including financial assistance) to help individuals to minimise any risks to health arising from their accommodation or environment;

(f)          providing or participating in the provision of training for persons working or seeking to work in the field of health improvement;

(g)         making available the services of any person or any facilities.

(4)         The steps that may be taken under subsection (1) also include providing grants or loans (on such terms as the local authority considers appropriate).

(5)         In this section, “local authority” means—

(a)         a county council in England;

(b)         a district council in England, other than a council for a district in a county for which there is a county council;

(c)         a London borough council;

(d)         the Council of the Isles of Scilly;

(e)         the Common Council of the City of London.

This is a positive duty on our local council.  This is in conflict with the NPPF.  Where there is a conflict, the health considerations must take precedence.

There are people in our council area who are **electro-hypersensitive** (EHS) which means that they are suffering from radiation sickness.  So, while our local council may not “set health safeguards different from” the International Commission guidelines, it can take health into account in relation to considering whether these antennae should be permitted to be placed around the area.  Your general planning guidance states that you can take matters of health into account.

There are upwards of 800,000 people who are experiencing serious health problems because of the masts, antennae and general radiofrequency radiation which is being escalated with the government’s blessing.  This is wrong.

Please let me know that you will raise this within your department and at the highest levels within the council so that the topic will be seriously studied and appropriate measures taken to protect public health and to lobby the government to protect your liability and ability to perform your public duties.

Yours sincerely,

YOUR NAME

Local resident/constituent