

## **MAST PLANNING OBJECTIONS – THINGS THAT MIGHT BE CONSIDERED**

1. VISUAL AMENITY. A very good argument against masts
2. CODE OF CONDUCT. See Appendix B
3. ICNIRP & Wildlife. See Appendix C
4. ICNIRP not independent of industry. See EU MEP Report
5. LIABILITY. See Appendix D
6. LOCKDOWN. Has the lockdown effect impeded proper consultation etc.
7. 5G IS a public experiment. As such, where are the governments study results etc  
AND WHEN IS THE TRIAL GOING TO BE OVER?
8. SAFETY. If controls in the mast and associated equipment fail, it is plausible that even ICNIRP radiation limits could be exceeded. As such, does the design of the mast system comply with ISO/IEC/BS 61508 for the appropriate safety criticality (people may remember the fairground accidents in recent history – that equipment would have had to comply with that or equivalent).
9. EXCLUSION ZONES. Exclusion Zones need to be declared and an avoid zone marked clearly.
10. What EVIDENCE has the operator provided in regard capacity needs.
11. CMO (Chief Medical Officer) Advice for children's Exposure to Wireless. The CMO in 2005 (advice not rescinded to my knowledge) indicated that children should MINIMISE their exposure to radiation.
12. EMISSIONS. These masts seem to emit copious amounts of radiation 24/7/365 – WHY IS THIS NECESSARY? The levels emitted need to be explained and justified as the minimum necessary.
13. HEALTH SURVEY. Insist on a council funded health survey.
14. If the mast is not yet up, publicise as much as possible
15. 5G MODE OF OPERATION. Lastly, 4G phone users can be targeted unknowingly with a phased array 5G beam – as part of the ongoing 'test bed trials'.
16. Use Lex Mercatoria to cover the impact to property values (See attached – Contract Law). Identify all property owners business etc impacted / within say 1.5m radius and get them to sign a contract back onto the operator for the estimated costs going forward (principle could be extended) as a liability if it goes ahead.
17. Judicial Review. The PHE guideline levels are being called to account by 2 reviews 2020.
18. EQUALITIES ACT 2010 – see Appendix A.

## A. EQUALITIES ACT 2010

If the mast is in the centre of Council controlled public spaces, the use of which should be within the remit of the Equalities Act 2010. Therefore, ask the council for a copy of their Policy compliant to the Equalities Act 2010 for all Council controlled public spaces (essentially it means that variations and individual concerns must be taken into account in decision making).

## B. CODE OF CONDUCT extracts regarding Consultation and in particular Schools

Sensitive Land Use = Site in relation to **residential property, homes and schools** and other sensitive land uses such as **nurseries, playgroups, playgrounds and hospitals**.

..

Nevertheless operators recognise that some parents can be concerned about the possible health effects of mobile phone masts, and therefore, as a matter of good practice, carry out a specific pre-application consultation exercise with schools and colleges where appropriate. This will give them the opportunity to feed in their comments and concerns and to have them considered by the operators at an early stage.

..

Where school or college playing fields are separate from the institutions themselves the guidelines should be applied to the playing fields separately. There are no hard and fast rules for determining whether a base station is near a school or college for the purposes of pre-application consultation. The institutions concerned need to be considered on a case-by-case basis, in the light of local circumstances.'

..

For consultation purposes the following actions should take place as a minimum:-

- Two copies of the standard letter (see below) should be sent recorded delivery to the school/college, one to the Head Teacher

(or Principal in the case of Further Education Colleges) and one to the chair of school governors or equivalent body for Further

Education colleges.

- The operator should wait a minimum of 14 days from the date of the letter to allow an opportunity for the school to respond prior to submitting an application for planning permission or prior approval.

## C. WILDLIFE

‘Furthermore, as stated above, neither the ICNIRP 1998 nor the ICNIRP 2020 guidelines considers the health impact of any wireless communication systems on wildlife whose physiology clearly varies considerably from humans.

The latter point is supported by the below abstract from the ICNIRP 2020 guidelines document ‘GUIDELINES FOR LIMITING EXPOSURE TO ELECTROMAGNETIC FIELDS (100 kHz to 300 GHz)’:-

*Abstract— Radiofrequency electromagnetic fields (EMFs) are used to enable a number of modern devices, including mobile telecommunications infrastructure and phones, Wi-Fi, and Bluetooth. As radiofrequency EMFs at sufficiently high power levels can adversely affect health, ICNIRP published Guidelines in 1998 for **human** exposure to time-varying EMFs up to 300 GHz, which included the radiofrequency EMF spectrum. Since that time, there has been a considerable body of science further addressing the relation between radiofrequency EMFs and adverse health outcomes, as well as significant developments in the technologies that use radiofrequency EMFs. Accordingly, ICNIRP has updated the radiofrequency EMF part of the 1998 Guidelines. This document presents these revised Guidelines, which provide protection for **humans** from exposure to EMFs from 100 kHz to 300 GHz. Health Phys. 00(00):00–00; 2020’*

## D. ICNIRP

1. ICNIRP is NOT an independent body – see very recent report from European Parliament.
2. ICNIRP Guidelines DO NOT address safety levels for wildlife, pets, animals, birds, hedgehogs, insects etc – see separate section
3. ICNIRP Guidelines DO NOT refer to direct biological effects, only thermal effects above exposure level of 56 v/m

## **E. LIABILITY**

The liability aspect seems to keep cropping up into all of the things being imposed on us.

Public Health England and ICNIRP are now both using a disclaimer to free themselves from any liability from anyone who follows their advice in regards to the installation and implementation of the microwave radiation.

This means that individual councillors and officers could be liable for damages if people start to make personal injury claims. So pointing this out to them should make them think twice about the consequences of this technology and their role in allowing it to go ahead.

Similarly with smart meters, the insurance companies are unwilling to underwrite cover for the energy companies against the health risks.

This means the energy companies themselves would be liable for any health claims.

Therefore they are likely to remove the smart meters if people point out health concerns to them.