

**From:** Judith Reid [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 19 August 2024 16:56  
**To:** Planning Enquiries <planningenquiries@herefordshire.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** OBJECT to Application P241927/PA7

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

To [planning\\_enquiries@herefordshire.gov.uk](mailto:planning_enquiries@herefordshire.gov.uk)

cc councillors: [peter.stoddart@herefordshire.gov.uk](mailto:peter.stoddart@herefordshire.gov.uk)

I am writing to **OBJECT to Application P241927/PA7**

Application for prior notification for a proposed shareable telecommunications base station installation comprising a 25m lattice tower supporting up to 12 no antennas and up to 4 no dishes together with up to 6 no ground-based cabinets, 1 no meter cabinet and ancillary development thereto including compound fencing.

Land at Bromyard Town Football Club Delahay Meadow Sports Ground Bromyard Herefordshire HR7 4NT

**My full address** is JUDITH REID, 32, Deepdene Vale, Dorking, Surrey, RH4 1NL

I have a friend in the area who is concerned about this, but the rollout of 4G/5G is a national policy and therefore a national issue, which concerns locals and non-locals alike.

As this is a new mast, please ensure it is treated as a Prior Approval application which should be fully adjudicated as any other planning application under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. According to 'Changes to permitted development rights for electronic communications infrastructure: technical consultation' of 7 March 2022, paragraph 10, all new masts still require the Prior Approval of the LPA, and community views should be considered.

<https://www.gov.uk/.../changes-to-permitted-development...>"

What training opportunities have the staff had in planning for the new telecom structures? 5G is very different from its predecessors, necessitating new infrastructure / technology. Therefore, additional specialised knowledge is needed. Do you have staff or councillors qualified to make such decisions?

This is a **PURELY SPECULATIVE APPLICATION.**

There is no evidence of consultation or commitment from any of the MNOs. No end users have been identified.

It is interesting to note that in various applications throughout the UK, objections have been raised by the MNOs currently operating in the immediate area. Examples include NEW FOREST - 24/10314, HULL - 24/00417/TEL and LLANDUDNO - 0/51201. In each case, the MNOs categorically stated that they had not been consulted, committed to anything, had no intention of moving to the proposed site and were fully capable of upgrading when necessary, pointing out the SPECULATIVE nature of the proposal and the inevitable proliferation of masts in the area.

This particular application looks just the same.

The ICNIRP certificate is declared on behalf of the big 4 MNOs. If it is the case that none of the MNOs have been consulted, then this statement is highly misleading.

In addition, If an MNO has not yet applied to use this, HOW ON EARTH can ICON TOWER guarantee future safety of the installation (as it does on the ICNIRP certificate)? Who has performed the calculations? What calculations have been done? There is ZERO transparency.

The declaration does NOT conform to what is laid out in the "Code of practice on mobile network development in England" (published Mar-2022) (Annexe C) / NPPF, which states that it should be declared by the "lead operator".

ICON is NOT a lead operator.

It also states that it is "DESIGNED" rather than "shall be OPERATED" to be in FULL COMPLIANCE.

The proposed site is right on top of the football club, which is used by the community (all ages) as well as being approx. 120m from the nearest residential properties to the north (on the corner of B4203 and Burying Lane).

A recent application in Stroud (S.24/1123/FUL) documented at length such a scenario. There were 3 locals, with metal implants, living / working close to the site. Acting in accordance with paragraph 122, the LPA requested additional information regarding power output and exclusion zones. The applicant/agent refused to supply this info.

Refusal to disclose information raises questions as to why such data should be withheld and raises concerns as to the validity of the ICNIRP certificate issued, if key data used in determining safety is not forthcoming.

Why is such information not readily available? This lack of transparency casts doubts on the validity of any ICNIRP certificate.

In view of the speculative nature of **this** application, clearly ICON cannot have info on either power output or exclusion zones, which further emphasises the dubious nature of such a declaration. It makes a mockery of the whole planning process.

As per GPDO Prior Approval legislation, an Operator must be present on the tower. The SSSI states "allow consolidation of their equipment on one tower, which would minimise the overall number of telecommunications installations over time."

How will the council ensure the following?

- there is NOT a proliferation of masts?
- that old base stations are removed?
- if approved, that the installation is not built until there is an operator signed up?

If only one MNO applies or indeed if a smaller MNO applies (who currently does not have a presence in the area), does this mean existing base-stations will continue to be used? Hence there WILL be a proliferation of ground-based masts.

### **SITING and APPEARANCE**

Telecoms installations, antennae, etc are overbearing and unnerving. For many people, including myself, they cause anxiety and stress. The impact of this proposal on the health and well-being of locals (including fear and anxiety of harm) is a material planning consideration, which should be taken into consideration.

A 25m lattice tower is an Industrialising and overly dominant structure, incongruous with such a rural setting. The fact that there are already floodlights and telegraph poles in place at the FC is no excuse to have yet more hideous structures cluttering up the skyline and spoiling the visual amenity of the setting.

The SSSI talks about trees and mature hedgerows shielding the views of the mast. The plans show the tallest tree at 11m high, the SSSI states that the Oak tree is 13m high, and hedgerows are much lower at approx. 3m. This leaves about 12m – 20m in clear view. This will have a detrimental

impact on the immediate visual amenity as well as longer distance views.

The siting is at the local FC which is used by the community (all ages). Locals could well find their enjoyment of using the club replaced by anxiety and distress over the harmful effects of radiation and the oppressive nature of this towering monstrosity. Many people throughout the country have already found their lives suddenly catapulted into a stress-fest when similar installations have been put up. How close to the football club will the cabinets be? Overly large cabinets are noisy and therefore a NUISANCE. Only the other day, I walked past one in my own town, and it was ridiculously loud. These should be sited well away from where people are.

Local people (not telecoms) should have the right to say how it affects the character of their local area. Being visible also means that it is a constant reminder to the residents in the immediate area of its presence which can cause stress.

**The proposed site is within 500m of 'sensitive receptors'**

Right on top of the football clubhouse and pitch, where people of all ages spend considerable time for recreational and work.

Houses to the north on the corner of the B4203 and Burying Lane are approx. 120m away. Brick Barn Farm is approx. 200m away.

Children are deemed sensitive receptors at school, and this should apply everywhere else. Likewise, pre-school children and pregnant women are equally vulnerable.

Elderly individuals are also considered "sensitive receptors" and more likely to have metal implants (e.g. knee or hip replacements). Individuals with metal implants are not covered by ICNIRP guidelines (see below).

The distance of 500m is of particular interest after the New Hampshire Commission (and now Bill) recommended a setback of this distance for telecoms installations from residences, schools, and businesses. Please see below for details.

There are now thousands of studies showing harm to humans and wildlife from 2G – 4G, but the more recent real-life 5G case studies (6 published in 2023, 2 published in 2024 so far) from Sweden (Hardell and Nilsson)

demonstrate, without a shadow of a doubt, that 5G most definitely causes harm to humans, at levels below those given in the ICNIRP guidelines. The cases covered individuals living / working close to 5G antennae as well as a family holidaying close to one, and a young 8yo boy who suffered severe symptoms at school.

Symptoms included severe headaches, tinnitus, nosebleeds, insomnia, anxiety, memory loss, irregular pulse, skin rashes, burning skin etc.

The distances from the antennae ranged from 5m to 125m (2023 cases); just under and over 500m (2 base stations), and 285m (2024 cases).

**These are similar distances to those in this case.**

I appeal to you as a fellow human, to read the short summary of findings which I have included at the foot of my letter.

I have also included studies wrt 4G installations.

LPA's **CAN** lawfully refuse this mast application on health grounds.

Mendip Planning Board refused a 5G monopole in a semi-industrial location in March 2022 on the grounds that 'there is not enough evidence of safety to proceed' after weighing all the information made available to them by objectors.

**2021/1951/FUL**

Please also refer to the section below on liability and health.

Also of great importance are the **SPECIFIC EXCLUSIONS** stated in the ICNIRP guidelines.

**\*\* The ICNIRP Guidelines (2020) specifically excludes individuals with any metal in their body or an active medical device.** The Guidelines state that people with "implantable medical devices" and "metallic implants" in the body are "outside the scope of these guidelines".

This includes pacemakers, metal shunts, children's dental braces ETC

This is of particular concern being SO CLOSE to homes.

ICNIRP states that the effect of RFR inside the body is unpredictable when metal implants are present.

(Examples of metal in the body include metal *pins, plates, rods, discs, screws (hip/knee replacements) Cardiovascular – implantable heart loop recorders, stents and pacemakers. Implants to treat and monitor health conditions, deliver drugs or to restore bodily functions e.g. diabetes related*

*products. Magnetic cerebral spinal fluid shunts. Cochlear implants for hearing loss. Dental work – braces, implants, metal crowns, pins, denture arches, mercury amalgam fillings, copper contraceptive coils, body piercings.)*

For anyone who falls under the above list, and living close to the proposed mast, this can cause fear, anxiety, and distress. As such, these constitute a material planning consideration on the grounds of siting.

The Judicial Review (Cardiff Admin Court Case CO/2498/2023) against Cheltenham Council concerned a mast situated close to a block of flats and care home, and the LPA's role in granting approval for the mast application without giving adequate consideration for the health impacts on a resident with metal implants.

In May-2024, Judge Jarman ruled, in relation to the care home, that the existence of a Declaration of Conformity (ICNIRP certificate) was not sufficient with regard to those with metal implants.

*"The failure on the part of the authority to grapple with potential impacts on medical implants was, in my judgment, an error and this ground succeeds"*

Also, worth noting

**\*\* Self-certification is the telecom company certifying itself, which is a conflict of interest. Such a document unchecked by an independent body, is UNRELIABLE.**

**\*\* Both ICNIRP and OFCOM state that they do not issue certificates or verify / guarantee the safety of any device or installation, and therefore do not verify any such self-certified certificate. This is clearly stated on both websites.**

**\*\* The application lacks transparency. The document declares that the proposed equipment and installation will comply with ICNIRP but does not include the calculations used to draw that conclusion.**

**\*\* Please ask the applicant to provide further information to clarify the technical proposal and substantiate the ICNIRP certificate declaration. In particular, *calculations showing cumulative effects, taking into account other local sources and hotspots.***

**\*\* ICNIRP guidelines (2020) only cover HUMANS, NOT animals, plants or the environment. This is a concerning omission as pollinators are in a drastic decline. Studies have also shown that trees are adversely affected by EMFs.**

**\*\* The International Commission on the Biological Effects of Electromagnetic Fields (ICBE-EMF) challenged the safety of current wireless exposure limits to radiofrequency radiation (RFR) and called for an independent evaluation.**

If we continue to roll out 5G (and also 4G), ignoring the veritable elephant in the room and the genuine concerns of the public, who are rightly worried about the harm these structures will do to their health, then we are heading for a national health crisis in the near future.

Despite, reassurances from the government and telecoms alike, the public are now becoming increasingly aware of the scientific studies which show adverse health effects caused by EMFs at levels well below ICNIRP guidelines. The case studies, mentioned above, not only highlight the reason why members of the public ARE indeed anxious (which is a material planning consideration) but also highlight the need for caution.

### **PLANTS and WILDLIFE**

**As mentioned above, ICNIRP makes NO provision for Wildlife and plants in its guidelines.**

**In view of Biodiversity Net Gain, the impact on plants and wildlife needs to be considered.**

5G can cover miles as documented in the INDUSTRY article by NOKIA <https://www.nokia.com/thought-leadership/articles/spectrum-bands-5g-world/>

- For low band: *"Wireless carriers could serve thousands of customers within hundreds of square miles with just one tower."*
- *For mid-band: "it can carry plenty of data while traveling significant distances."*

Therefore, the impact of this mast could be far-reaching.

### **TREES**

I think that it is wicked that trees are being felled to make room for this installation, especially in view of "sustainability", "climate change" and "biodiversity" concerns.

The mature oak tree is described as "healthy and vibrant" in the "Arboricultural Impact Assessment". Once up and running, further harm could be done to the Oak tree and other trees from radiation. Likewise, the hedgerows. Studies

have shown harm to trees by EMFs, and this should also be taken into consideration. See sources for more information. Trees provide a very positive contribution to the character and appearance of the local area benefiting the mental health and wellbeing of local residents. As such, they should be protected at all costs.

Locals mention bats in the area, which are a protected species. Once again, in view of Biodiversity concerns, these should be considered.

It is interesting to note that loss of biodiversity and wildlife on both Mt Nardi in Australia and on Samos (see below sources) occurred in areas where 4G masts had been erected.

Both record DRAMATIC declines in both volume and species type.

Of particular concern is the detrimental effect of EMFs on pollinators.

### **Considering Liability and Health**

All public authorities have an obligation and duty to act in the public interest and protect people from harm.

There is **NOT a single study to support** the radiation from this technology being safe **for any human over their lifetime.**

Councils rely on the NPPF Paragraph 122 which states that they cannot set health safeguards different from those set by ICNIRP, but please note that

**both the NPPF and ICNIRP are GUIDELINES ONLY, NOT STATUTE.**

As asserted by Lord Gill in the Supreme Court judgment in *Suffolk Coastal District Council v Hopkins Homes Ltd et.al*, **'the guidance given by the Framework (the NPPF) is not to be interpreted as if it were a statute. Its purpose is to express general principles on which decision-makers are to proceed'**

<https://www.supremecourt.uk/cases/docs/uksc-2016-0076-judgment.pdf>

The NPPF is just another material planning consideration and should be considered no more or less important than any other. The whole of the NPPF (not just section 10) applies to telecoms applications, and hence the paragraphs on Health are just as valid for telecoms as for any other type of application.



This means the councils ARE free to investigate health issues, and there are cases where health has been taken into consideration, such as in Mendip.  
In addition, there is the issue of liability for future litigation.

The solicitor for the campaign group "Stop 5G Bath" received a letter from PHE's own solicitors, DLA Piper, (dated 08-Aug-2019) which exempted PHE from all liability in the event of future legal action relating to health effects from 5G if their guidance should turn out to be incorrect or misleading. In this letter they state: **"A public body must determine how much weight to put on the PHE guidance. Equally that body must determine what other evidence from your client or other members of the public or interested parties to consider in making any decision. If it be alleged that a public body now or in the future acted unlawfully in placing reliance on the guidance, that cannot retrospectively taint the guidance with illegality."**

*"PHE's lawyers advise public bodies to balance PHE's guidance with evidence from other sources i.e. not only from ICNIRP. This contradicts the government's own planning regulations which require local authorities to adhere strictly to ICNIRP's guidelines...This gives no choice to public bodies about accepting a potentially catastrophic risk."*

**5G health effects are uninsurable and at the same time recognised by reinsurers as a high impact risk with regard to future litigation.**

*Lloyds of London has refused to insure against health effects from all wireless technology since 2010 (Exclusion 32) and there are currently no insurers in the world who will cover this.*

**5G is rated a high impact risk by reinsurers Swiss Re in their Emerging Risks Report (May 2019)** which states: "To allow for a functional network coverage and increased capacity overall, more antennas will be needed, including acceptance of higher levels of electromagnetic radiation. In some jurisdictions, the rise of threshold values will require legal adaptation. *Existing concerns regarding potential negative health effects from electromagnetic fields*

*(EMF) are only likely to increase. An uptick in liability claims could be a potential long-term consequence..."*

*"As the biological effects of EMF in general and 5G in particular are still being debated, potential claims for health impairments may come with a long latency."*

*These are referred to by **Wera Hobhouse (MP for Bath)** in her letter to DCMS (Feb-2020)*

*More information and sources available on request.*

The insurance industry clearly recognises that potential claims for health impairments may come with a **long latency**. Cases of Cancer Clusters (and other serious adverse effects) are now being recorded in areas in which a mast was installed, approx. 5 – 7 years ago. If this is to happen in your area – then who will be responsible?

The requirement for Local Authorities to reconcile the risks to environmental and public health consequences from radio frequency emitting infrastructure is embedded within the European Electronics Communications Code (EECC). There is a current challenge to the UK government concerning their policies that constrain LPAs to blindly accepting an ICNIRP declaration of conformity. (Case Z2309835, filed 12-Sep-2023)

<https://safetechinternational.org/new-legal-challenge-uk-govt-fail-to-enact-public-health-environmental-obligations-within-european-electronics-communications-code/>

**In addition**, NPPF Paragraph 122 (which states that they cannot set health safeguards different from those set by ICNIRP) **is in conflict with Paragraphs 191 and 135.**

**Paragraph 191**: *"Planning policies and decisions should also ensure that new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects **(including cumulative effects) of pollution on health**, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development"*

RFR non-thermal effects are potentially polluting.

Indeed, **The Pollution Prevention and Control Act 1999**, in Section 1(3), defines 'environmental pollution' as, 'pollution of the air, water or land which may give rise to any harm ... (to include) ... (a) pollution caused by noise, heat or vibrations or any **other kind of release of energy**, and by

*'air' includes air within buildings and air within other natural or man-made structures above or below ground'.*

Clauses (a) and (d) of Section 79(1) of the **Environmental Protection Act 1990**, require local authorities to address "statutory nuisances", defined as

1. *any premises in such a state as to be prejudicial to health or a nuisance,*

*and (d) any dust, steam, smell or other **effluvia** arising on industrial, trade or business premises and being prejudicial to health and a nuisance.*

Further, Local councils have an obligation to safeguard the health of its constituents by virtue of **the National Health Service Act 2006, section 2B.**

*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.***

**Paragraph 135:** *Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments ..... :*

*f) create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being,*

There is no Environmental Impact Assessment. Under Environmental Law and the ruling against Surrey County council **Finch v Surrey County Council [2024] EWCA Civ 187** that emphasised the importance of public participation in environmental decision making, which is an objective not only of the EIA Directive but also central to the Aarhus Convention; the Court identified two issues in relation to public participation, namely: increasing the democratic legitimacy of environmental decision, and serving an educational function. **An EIA should include the effects of the radiation emitted from all the antennae on the proposed mast (which can be regarded as effluvia or as a pollutant) on public health.**

### **SUSTAINABILITY, CLIMATE CHANGE and ENERGY CONSUMPTION**

Humans are part of nature, despite our best efforts to disconnect from it and even control it. Crazy now, with the advent of AI, facilitated by 5G, we are attempting to replace

it, especially in the area of food production and virtual reality.

Sadly, "sustainability" and "climate change" have become buzz-terms to allow the political hijacking of genuine green issues.

Those of us who DO ACTUALLY CARE about the health of our planet, recognise that to bring about some sort of balance and restore Earth to a less vulnerable place, we need to take our foot off the techno-pedal, and listen to and observe the natural world around us and what it is telling us.

Councils are committing to net zero by 2030, but it is well worth looking into the green credentials of 5G. It is FAR from green, contrary to what is being touted. As well as being energy hungry, the infrastructure needed to implement the network uses child labour, poor working conditions and devastation to areas caused by intense mining. The energy consumption from cradle to grave is not sustainable. You cannot have 5G AND net zero or sustainability. They are totally incompatible!

Is the opportunity for constant connection so important to people, that we plunder the earth for its precious metals, leave devastation in its trace, exploit children and poorer communities in the mining process, often in dangerous conditions, and generally pollute our planet? Absolutely not. More importantly, we cannot boast sustainability, whilst this is happening on the other side of the world.

With the big drive for "net zero", "sustainability" etc, it is essential to understand just how **energy-hungry** our technology is, particularly 5G with the huge power requirements of 5G base stations and associated infrastructure. Facilitating the growth of the 5G network by allowing more masts, is in fact counter to the objectives of "net zero".

In the 2020 Study by the Haut Conseil pour le Climat (HCC) – report "Controlling the carbon impact of 5G" December of 2020, the HCC report found that **5G technology will lead to a significant increase in the carbon footprint of digital technology and could add between 2.7 to 6.7 million tonnes of CO2 equivalents per year by 2030.**

[IEEE Spectrum, 5G's Waveform Is a Battery Vampire](#) reports "A 5G base station is generally expected to consume roughly

**three times as much power as a 4G base station.** And more 5G base stations are needed to cover the same area” A 2022 review by the University of Sussex Business School entitled “[The energy use implications of 5G: Reviewing whole network operational energy, embodied energy, and indirect effects](#)” published in Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews finds that **the notion that 5G is green technology is not currently backed up by a strong, publicly available, fully transparent evidence base.** Quoted from a planning application from Clarke Telecom “5G networks, and future mobile generations, will be vital for a range of Internet of Things uses (IoT) and Smart City applications..... The way 5G works, it is closely connected with the Smart City agenda”

These highlight the true reason for 5G: a smart-IoT-vision for the future. There will be no escape. It beggars belief that we prioritise these over our PRECIOUS HEALTH.

Who voted for SMART cities, IoT, autonomous cars? I don't want these, and I don't know anyone else who does. Do your residents?

It may be difficult to imagine considering the green fields in this area, but sadly if we continue to allow such installations, our green spaces will shrink, and even those left will be subject to constant techno-connection with the promise of smart-farming, autonomous cars etc.

There is too much emphasis nowadays wrt to the perceived benefits of online, which has been extrapolated from our behaviours during COVID/lockdown, when we had no choice but to move a lot of our lives online. It is assumed that people want to continue in this fashion, but in fact, many of us prefer REAL connections with people, community, and nature. Many of us do not want to live in a digital world, surrounded by masts.

Using the internet as a means of education, entertainment, and contact has, instead of boosting health and well-being, created social isolation and an addiction to technology, especially in a generation of youngsters who now have serious mental health issues. Moving to a more digital life offers very little “well-being”. We should not be encouraging this behaviour, but instead moving away from it.

### **What about prioritising FULL FIBRE, as stated in NPPF 118?**

According to NPPF 118. "Policies should set out how high-quality digital infrastructure, providing access to services from a range of providers, is expected to be delivered and upgraded over time; and **should prioritise full fibre connections to existing and new developments (as these connections will, in almost all cases, provide the optimum solution).**

### **In summary .....**

What we are seeing is a repeat of what happened with the Tobacco industry, when risks were ignored / denied, until a critical mass of data showing damage was no longer possible to brush under the carpet. The drive for constant connection with 4G/5G etc al is far worse because it will be ubiquitous. There is no escape or relief for anyone.

What is paramount and must override every other consideration must be public safety and avoidance of risk and harm to an unsuspecting public that has given no informed consent. The public is being kept in the dark, just as they were with tobacco and asbestos (covered in the book "Late Lessons from Early Warnings").

Valid concerns of members of the public should be given a thorough and well considered hearing. I urge you to listen to those concerns.

The ICNIRP guidelines on which councils rely so heavily are deeply flawed, and even if all the thousands of health studies showing adverse health effects and harm to wildlife/environment are conveniently ignored, the 8 recent REAL-LIFE case studies showing harm from 5G exposure should surely make everyone sit up and pay attention to what could happen locally, if we allow all these telecom developments to go ahead unchecked.

It is interesting to note that Swansea University has announced that Swansea Bay is to be a "live lab" for 5G, and likewise WM5G (West Midlands 5G) has been a nominated testbed for at least 3 years, and similarly Liverpool, all of which confirms suspicions that the UK population is indeed being used as guinea pigs to test out 5G.

By virtue of the nuisance and credible harm or injury to the local residents and to the local area, being sufficient to



outweigh the benefits of the development, the application should be refused.

I urge you to REFUSE THIS telecoms application (and all future ones) before irreversible damage is done to your locals and the environment.

Interestingly, WHAT3WORDS for the site = "Dizziness, Chaos, Stole" (see GRIDREFERENCEFINDER), which seems highly appropriate for a financially driven development which could do harm to locals, flora, fauna and the environment..

I am happy for you to publish my comments.

Please can you acknowledge receipt of this email.

Best Wishes

Judith Reid

## **SOURCES**

### **New Hampshire Commission**

The **New Hampshire HB522 Commission on 5G** (formed by legislation to explore the environmental and health effects of 5G technology) published their findings after a year-long study in Nov-2020. The commission found that wireless radiation is harmful and **recommended 1,640 feet (500 metres) as a realistic protective setback distance against radiation from masts.** Their recommendation was evidence based, and as such, is **globally applicable.**

Based on the Commission, the U.S. state of **New Hampshire introduced a bipartisan bill (HB1487) in Dec-2023**, requiring measures to be put in place to inform the public about the health risks of radio-frequency radiation (RFR) (including information online, public service announcements, notifications on poles carrying 5G antennae), **wireless antennae to be placed at least 500 metres away from residences, businesses and schools,** replacing Wi-Fi with wired technology in schools.

### **FINAL COMMISSION report**

<http://www.gencourt.state.nh.us/statstudcomm/committees/1474/reports/5G%20final%20report.pdf>

Video of commission member Kent Chamberlin discussing NH Commission Setback Justification 28-Dec-2021 (20 mins) <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DWK74ie7krc>

### **Bipartisan Bill**

<https://legiscan.com/NH/bill/HB1487/2024>

[https://gencourt.state.nh.us/bill\\_status/legacy/bs2016/bill/ext.aspx?sy=2024&id=1797&txtFormat=html](https://gencourt.state.nh.us/bill_status/legacy/bs2016/bill/ext.aspx?sy=2024&id=1797&txtFormat=html)

**8 recently published case-studies demonstrate the real-life effect of 5G on human health. These clearly show that 5G deployment is a serious public safety issue.**

The cases covered individuals living / working close to 5G antennae as well as a family holidaying close to one, and a young 8yo boy who suffered severe symptoms at school. Symptoms included severe headaches, tinnitus, nosebleeds, insomnia, anxiety, memory loss, irregular pulse, skin rashes etc.

The distances from the antennae ranged from 5m to 125m (2023 cases); just under and over 500m (2 base stations), and 285m (2024 cases).

A summary of the first 6 cases can be found here

[https://www.journalserapublications.com/issues/v01/i01/JEPL\\_1020240101001.pdf](https://www.journalserapublications.com/issues/v01/i01/JEPL_1020240101001.pdf)

The more recent cases are here

<http://www.fortunejournals.com/articles/a-woman-aged-82-years-with-electromagnetic-hypersensitivity-since-almost-four-decades-developed-the-microwave-syndrome-after-insta.html>

<https://www.fortunejournals.com/articles/a-woman-aged-82-years-with-electromagnetic.pdf>

and

<https://www.medtextpublications.com/open-access/an-eight-year-old-boy-developed-severe-headache-in-a-1582.pdf>

An excellent summary of the first 7 real-life 5G case studies can be found here

**Summary of seven Swedish case reports on the microwave syndrome associated with 5G radiofrequency radiation, Lennart Hardell and Mona Nilsson, June-2024**

[https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.1515/reveh-2024-](https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.1515/reveh-2024-0017/html?fbclid=IwY2xjawEgeVRleHRuA2FlbQIxMQABHZeg6ToEqT_w0ThGuEMZ-cMc73eAkUVGU7du8JNT-b8ZdK2CQOCr-Jz6TQ_aem_4esr7Pyje9k62298xdJ9tw)

[0017/html?fbclid=IwY2xjawEgeVRleHRuA2FlbQIxMQABHZeg6ToEqT\\_w0ThGuEMZ-cMc73eAkUVGU7du8JNT-b8ZdK2CQOCr-Jz6TQ\\_aem\\_4esr7Pyje9k62298xdJ9tw](https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.1515/reveh-2024-0017/html?fbclid=IwY2xjawEgeVRleHRuA2FlbQIxMQABHZeg6ToEqT_w0ThGuEMZ-cMc73eAkUVGU7du8JNT-b8ZdK2CQOCr-Jz6TQ_aem_4esr7Pyje9k62298xdJ9tw)

**OTHER STUDIES**



### **Case Study showing health effects when working in close proximity to 4G antennae**

Electromagnetic hypersensitivity close to mobile phone base stations – a case study in Stockholm, Sweden

<https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.1515/reveh-2021-0169/html>

Lennart Hardell and Tarmo Koppel From the journal [Reviews on Environmental Health](#)

A 55-year-old previously healthy female office worker changed her workplace in April 2018, when she returned to a building in which she had previously worked. This time her office was situated on the 6th floor close to base stations on the roof, where 4G had been installed a couple of years before her return. She had full time work in the office. At the previous working place, she had had no health problems.

In the study: **Mobile Phone Base Station Tower Settings Adjacent to School Buildings: Impact on Students' Cognitive Health Meo et al, 2019**

This studied phone mast exposure of adolescents, the MPBTS **located within 200 metres** from the school.

*\*MPBTS = Mobile Phone Base Station Tower Settings)*

It was identified that EMFs from MPBSTs were associated with a decrease in fine and gross motor skills and spatial working memory and attention in school adolescents. It was recommended that MPBSTs be installed away from thickly populated residential zones, particularly in or near school buildings.

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6775553/>

### **Why children absorb more microwave radiation than adults – the consequences (Morgan et al, 2014)**

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2213879X14000583>

From the Abstract

*Children absorb more MWR than adults because their [brain](#) tissues are more absorbent, their skulls are thinner and their relative size is smaller.*

*MWR from wireless devices has been declared a possible human carcinogen. Children are at greater risk than adults when exposed to any carcinogen. Because the average latency time between first exposure and diagnosis of a*

*tumor can be decades, tumors induced in children may not be diagnosed until well into adulthood. The fetus is particularly vulnerable to MWR.*

*Belgium, France, India and other technologically sophisticated governments are passing laws and/or issuing warnings about children's use of wireless devices.*

### **Adverse health effects of 5G mobile networking technology under real-life Conditions**

Kostoff, Heroux, Aschner, Tsatsakis

[Toxicology Letters Volume 323](#), 1 May 2020, Pages 35-40,

<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31991167/>

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S037842742030028X>

This article from **2020** looks at studies so far on “wireless radiation”, both LABORATORY-based and EPIDEMIOLOGICAL.

*“Neither 4G nor 5G have been tested for safety in credible real-life scenarios.”*

It emphasises that laboratory studies are done in pristine conditions, not reflective of real-life, usually excluding the pulsing-modulating carrier signal, and looking singly at the radiation stimulus (i.e. not including other toxic stimuli such as chemical, biotoxins, other radiation which would be experienced in real-life and would act synergistically).

Even with these simplified parameters, however, the article states that there are reasons for concern.

*It states that “the results reported in the biomedical literature should be viewed as 1) extremely conservative and 2) the very low ‘floor’ of the seriousness of the adverse effects from wireless radiation, not the ‘ceiling’.”*

*And concludes that “Superimposing 5G radiation on an already imbedded toxic wireless radiation environment will exacerbate the adverse health effects shown to exist. Far more research and testing of potential 5G health effects under real-life conditions is required before further rollout can be justified.”*

### **The evidence demonstrating adverse effects to human health is now overwhelming.**

We are already living in a soup of electro smog. At what critical point do we stand up and say enough is enough? How much more harm needs to be done?

See also

- Compilation of Research Studies on Cell Tower Radiation and Health <https://ehtrust.org/cell-towers-and-cell-antennae/compilation-of-research-studies-on-cell-tower-radiation-and-health/>
- **The BioInitiative 2012 Report**  
<http://www.bioinitiative.org>
- Physicians' Health Initiative for Radiation and Environment <https://phiremedical.org/>

### **EAM v East Sussex County Council (Special educational needs)**

[2022] UKUT 193 (AAC), where the Upper Tribunal required council to secure EHCP for student who is hypersensitive to Wi-Fi signals (UK).

<https://www.localgovernmentlawyer.co.uk/education-law/394-education-news/51400-upper-tribunal-requires-council-to-secure-ehcp-for-student-who-is-hypersensitive-to-wi-fi-signals>

<https://phiremedical.org/education-health-care-plan-ehcp-awarded-aug-2022-for-uk-child-on-the-basis-of-electromagnetic-hypersensitivity-ehs/> includes statements from the parents, child and excerpts from 3 tribunal hearings.

Upper Tribunal judge Jacobs found that the child should be considered disabled by her condition under the Equality Act 2010 and that she required an Education, Health and Care Plan (EHCP).

### **"Why electrohypersensitivity (EHS) is a biologically expected reaction to harmful radiation" (2024)**

Research paper by Paul Hensinger and Bend I Budzinski

<https://www.diagnose-funk.org/aktuelles/artikel-archiv/detail&newsid=2098>

ICBE-EMF PAPER = [https://icbe-emf.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/10/ICBE-EMF-paper-12940\\_2022\\_900\\_OnlinePDF\\_Patched-1.pdf](https://icbe-emf.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/10/ICBE-EMF-paper-12940_2022_900_OnlinePDF_Patched-1.pdf)

### **TREES**

### **\*\* Radiofrequency radiation injures trees around mobile phone base stations (2016)**

[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/306435017\\_Radiofrequency\\_radiation\\_injures\\_trees\\_around\\_mobile\\_phone\\_base\\_stations](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/306435017_Radiofrequency_radiation_injures_trees_around_mobile_phone_base_stations)

And <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27552133>

A detailed long-term (2006-2015) field monitoring study of 120 trees was performed in the cities of Bamberg and Hallstadt (Germany) and demonstrated electromagnetic radiation from phone masts is harmful to trees.

*We selected 60 damaged trees, in addition to 30 randomly selected trees and 30 trees in low radiation areas .....*

*The measurements of all trees revealed significant differences between the damaged side facing a phone mast and the opposite side, as well as differences between the exposed side of damaged trees and all other groups of trees in both sides.....The 30 selected trees in low radiation areas (no visual contact to any phone mast and power flux density under  $50\mu\text{W}/\text{m}^2$ ) showed no damage. Statistical analysis demonstrated that electromagnetic radiation from mobile phone masts is harmful for trees. These results are consistent with the fact that damage afflicted on trees by mobile phone towers usually start on one side, extending to the whole tree over time.*

*Additional photos here (published Mar-2022)*

[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/359481325\\_Tree\\_damage\\_caused\\_by\\_mobile\\_phone\\_base\\_stations\\_An\\_observation\\_guide\\_Photos\\_and\\_RF\\_measurements\\_by\\_Cornelia\\_Waldmann-Selsam](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/359481325_Tree_damage_caused_by_mobile_phone_base_stations_An_observation_guide_Photos_and_RF_measurements_by_Cornelia_Waldmann-Selsam) Additional photos

## **WILDLIFE / INSECTS**

### **5G Cell Towers Cause Massive Insect Decline on the Greek island of Samos (Kordas 2022)**

<https://safetechinternational.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/5G-causes-massive-insectdeclines-on-Samos.pdf>

Diana Kordas lives in a rural area on the Greek Island of Samos. Her paper is “an effort to document what has happened in an area which has cell tower radiation but does not have pesticides or monoculture, which has a rich variety of plant life and is surrounded by wild land. It is based purely on observation”.

The paper opens with the alarming statistics “In 2017, a major German study found that flying insects had decreased over 75% in protected areas over the previous 27 years while ruling out climate change and pesticides. In 2021, the bumblebee was declared **extinct in nine** U.S. states.” Her paper includes tables of species observed.

It is Kordas's opinion that "Cell tower radiation is causing insects to die. An ongoing decline in insect numbers occurred after the introduction of 4G/LTE, and the new 5G network on Samos has caused insect declines to reach a tipping point."

### **Mount Nardi Wildlife Report to UNESCO FINAL (2000-2015)**

<https://www.emrsa.co.za/report-for-the-united-nations-educational-scientific-and-cultural-organization/>

and <https://ehtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/Mt-Nardi-Wildlife-Report-to-UNESCO-FINAL.pdf>

This report was prepared by a naturalist/ethno-botanist, local to the area and detailed the dramatic decline in volume and species variety in the Mt. Nardi area of the Nightcap National Park World Heritage Area (home to ancient forest and endangered plants and wildlife) during a 15-year period (2000-2015) as a result of the introduction of digital technologies, 3G, 4G etc.

### **CLIMATE CHANGE, ENERGY CONSUMPTION and SUSTAINABILITY**

2020 Study by the Haut Conseil pour le Climat (HCC)

"Controlling the carbon impact of 5G" "Dec-2020"

The HCC report found that **5G technology will lead to a significant increase in the carbon footprint of digital technology and could add between 2.7 to 6.7 million tonnes of CO2 equivalents per year by 2030.**

*References to the 2020 Study by the Haut Conseil pour le Climat (HCC) can be found here*

<https://ehtrust.org/science/reports-on-power-consumption-and-increasing-energy-use-of-wireless-systems-and-digital-ecosystem/>

[https://ehtrust.org/5g-is-a-sinking-ship-slow-poor-performance-and-a-power-](https://ehtrust.org/5g-is-a-sinking-ship-slow-poor-performance-and-a-power-hog/?fbclid=IwAR029YFUtklYKlZqnwd6Qjg0kMkt1TCx5QuviYhQgfPRCc1PDzS05NB4LsI)

[hog/?fbclid=IwAR029YFUtklYKlZqnwd6Qjg0kMkt1TCx5QuviYhQgfPRCc1PDzS05NB4LsI](https://ehtrust.org/5g-is-a-sinking-ship-slow-poor-performance-and-a-power-hog/?fbclid=IwAR029YFUtklYKlZqnwd6Qjg0kMkt1TCx5QuviYhQgfPRCc1PDzS05NB4LsI)

<https://www.france24.com/en/europe/20201220-deploying-5g-will-lead-to-spike-in-co2-emissions-french-climate-council-warns>

[IEEE Spectrum](#), [5G's Waveform Is a Battery Vampire](#) reports

"A 5G base station is generally expected to consume roughly **three times as much power as a 4G base station**. And more 5G base stations are needed to cover the same area"

<https://spectrum.ieee.org/5gs-waveform-is-a-battery-vampire>

A 2022 review by the University of Sussex Business School entitled "[The energy use implications of 5G: Reviewing whole network operational energy, embodied energy, and indirect effects](#)" published in Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews finds that **the notion that 5G is green technology is not currently backed up by a strong, publicly available, fully transparent evidence base.**

<https://sro.sussex.ac.uk/id/eprint/103944/2/1-s2.0-S1364032121012958-main.pdf>

On Global Electricity Usage of Communication Technology: Trends to 2030 (Published 2015)

[www.mdpi.com/2078-1547/6/1/117/htm](http://www.mdpi.com/2078-1547/6/1/117/htm)

Green 5G or red alert? 23 November 2020

<https://www.meer.com/en/64080-green-5g-or-red-alert>

With 5G's greatly increased mobile traffic, electricity usage from telecommunications could create up to 23% of global greenhouse gas emissions by 2030; power demand would be the equivalent of 36 nuclear reactors or 7800 massive offshore wind farms worldwide.

*Quoted from a planning application from Clarke Telecom "5G networks, and future mobile generations, will be vital for a range of Internet of Things uses (IoT) and Smart City applications..... The way 5G works, it is closely connected with the Smart City agenda and will enable centralized control of lots of different street infrastructure owned or managed by councils, such as streetlights, water meters and bus stops."*

<https://planning.wakefield.gov.uk/online-applications/>

### **Useful articles**

#### **How green is 5G?**

<https://envirotecmagazine.com/2021/11/08/how-green-is-5g/>

#### **What will 5G mean for the Environment?**

<https://jsis.washington.edu/news/what-will-5g-mean-for-the-environment/>

**Smart tech's carbon footprint (The Ecologist April-2020)** <https://theecologist.org/2020/apr/30/smart-techs-carbon-footprint>

## **The Staggering Ecological Impacts of Computation and the Cloud**

[https://thereader.mitpress.mit.edu/the-staggering-ecological-impacts-of-computation-and-the-cloud/?fbclid=IwAR0dvYDGwxHaT1oASxO58W44bRuhrWSJAbdH4q6z\\_I3Zq9X9cs0ARUt9ORA](https://thereader.mitpress.mit.edu/the-staggering-ecological-impacts-of-computation-and-the-cloud/?fbclid=IwAR0dvYDGwxHaT1oASxO58W44bRuhrWSJAbdH4q6z_I3Zq9X9cs0ARUt9ORA)

Anthropologist Steven Gonzalez Monserrate draws on five years of research and ethnographic fieldwork in server farms to illustrate some of the diverse environmental impacts of data storage.

With [a greater carbon footprint](#) than the airline industry, the cloud as a CARBONIVOIRE, which is also water-thirsty (causing water shortages near datacentres), creates noise pollution with devastating effects on neighbours as well as creating “immortal waste” in e-waste graveyards.

Sent with [Proton Mail](#) secure email.