Gmail

Planning - <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>

AWDM/0580/23 Yeoman Road Worthing - OBJECTION

1 message

Barbara [redacted] 6 June 2023 at 14:20
To: Gary Peck <gary.peck@adur-worthing.gov.uk>, Planning - <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>

Dear Gary,

Please register this email as a further objection to application AWDM/0580/23 Yeoman Road Worthing.

The Erroneous ICNIRP Declaration certificate:

The ICNIRP "safety" certificate is based on guidelines which categorically do NOT apply to, or protect anyone with metal in their bodies. Here is the relevant statement from ICNIRP regarding its EMF safety guidelines: "*However, some exposure scenarios are defined as outside the scope of these guidelines. Medical procedures may utilize EMFs, and metallic implants may alter or perturb EMFs in the body, which in turn can affect the body both directly (via direct interaction between field and tissue) and indirectly (via an intermediate conducting object)*".

Please also note ICNIRP's disclaimer on their website. They even go so far as to say they're not accountable for their guidelines: "*ICNIRP e.V. undertakes all reasonable measures to ensure the reliability of information presented on the website, but does not guarantee the correctness, reliability, or completeness of the information and views published. The content of our website is provided to you for information only. We do not assume any responsibility for any damage, including direct or indirect loss suffered by users or third parties in connection with the use of our website and/or the information it contains, including for the use or the interpretation of any technical data, recommendations, or specifications available on our website.*"

The fact that the ICNIRP certificate does NOT apply to a large proportion of residents with any form of metal in their bodies is an acute safety issue which needs to be taken seriously and addressed. Doing so would NOT result in setting health safeguards different from ICNIRP (as per NPPF) but is in fact applying ICNIRP exactly as stated from a SAFETY perspective.

There are many scenarios in which metal is used in the human body for medical reasons:

Surgical – metal pins, plates, rods, discs, screws e.g. scoliosis surgery and joint replacement of knees and hips. Urinary, gynaecological and intestinal repairs – e.g. mesh repairs and copper contraceptive coils. 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. What about body piercings?

There are very few of us that do not have some metal in our bodies and none of us know when we may need it in the future. These people are not covered by the ICNIRP certificate of "safety". This is especially relevant given the applicant's attachments to the application regarding health which are designed to try to allay health concerns but which ignore the latest published case studies from 2023 which reveal real-life harm from 5G masts – see abstracts below:

Any health and safety information has now been superseded by 3 recently published case studies which demonstrate the real-life effect of 5G deployment on human health. These case studies indicate a clear and unequivocal issue of serious public safety.

The abstracts for these three case studies are included below. The conclusions of these studies need to be considered in conjunction with the fact that the ICNIRP "safety" certificate is based on guidelines which categorically do not apply to, or protect, anyone with any metal in their body.

1. **Development of the Microwave Syndrome in Two Men** Shortly after Installation of 5G on the Roof above their Office by Nilsson M of the Swedish Radiation Protection Foundation, Sweden and Hardell L. of the Environment and Cancer Research Foundation, Sweden. Published in the Annals of Clinical Case Reports February 2023.

Abstract: The 5th generation, 5G, for wireless communication is rolled out without previous studies on potential effects on human health and the environment. In this case study we describe two men, case 1 and case 2, working in three office rooms close to base stations. After the deployment of 5G, both men developed symptoms typical for the microwave syndrome, e.g., headache, tinnitus, dizziness, balance disorder, concentration and attention deficiency, and fatigue. Radiofrequency Radiation (RFR) after the 5G deployment was measured in the three offices. In office one maximum (peak) RFR during one minute varied from 463 to 1,180,000 µW/m2, in office two from 6,230 to 501,000 and in office three from 13,700 to 613,000 µW/m!

The symptoms disappeared in both men within a couple of weeks (case 1) or immediately (case 2) after leaving the office for other offices with much lower maximum peak RFR emissions, maximum for case 1 =16 and for case 2 =2,920 µW/m2. This case report may be regarded as a provocation study on health from 5G RFR.

The clinical picture in both men was clearly related to the exposure, although the exposures were well below the guidelines recommended by ICNIRP that are claimed to protect against all health effects. We conclude that the guidelines for RFR exposure based only on tissue heating by ICNIRP are inadequate to protect human health and that 5G appears to provoke symptoms of microwave syndrome in previously healthy people -

2. **Microwave Syndrome after Installation of 5G Emphasizes the Need for Protection** from Radiofrequency Radiation by Nilsson M of the Swedish Radiation Protection Foundation, Sweden and Hardell L. of the Environment and Cancer Research Foundation, Sweden. www.gavinpublishers.com/article/view/case-report-the-microwave-syndrome-after-installation-of-5g-emphasizes-the-need-for-protection-from-radiofrequency-radiation.

Abstract: In this case, report two previously healthy persons, a man aged 63 years and a woman aged 62 years, developed symptoms of the microwave syndrome after installation of a 5G base station for wireless communication on the roof above their apartment. A base station for previous telecommunication generation technology (3G/4G) was present at the same spot since several years. Very high radiofrequency (RF) radiation with maximum (highest measured peak value) levels of 354 000, 1 690 000, and >2 500 000 µW/m2 were measured at three occasions in the bedroom located only 5 meters below the new 5G base station, compared to maximum (peak) 9 000 µW/m2 prior to the 5G deployment. The rapidly emerging symptoms after the 5G deployment were typical for the microwave syndrome with e.g., neurological symptoms, tinnitus, fatigue, insomnia, emotional distress, skin disorders, and blood pressure variability. The symptoms were more pronounced in the woman.

Due to the severity of symptoms, the couple left their dwelling and moved to a small office room with maximum (peak) RF radiation 3 500 µW/m2. Within a couple of days, most of their symptoms alleviated or disappeared completely. This medical history can be regarded as a classic provocation test. The RF radiation levels in the apartment were well below the limit proposed to be “safe” below which no health effects would occur, recommended by the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation (ICNIRP).

These now presented symptoms of the microwave syndrome were caused by non-thermal effects from RF radiation and highlight that the ICNIRP guidelines used in most countries including Sweden do not protect human health. Guidelines based on all biological negative effects from RF radiation are urgently needed, as well as monitoring human health, not the least due to rapidly increasing levels of exposure.

3. **Case Report: A 52-Year Healthy Woman Developed Severe Microwave Syndrome Shortly After Installation** of a 5G Base Station Close to Her Apartment by Nilsson M of the Swedish Radiation Protection Foundation, Sweden and Hardell L. of the Environment and Cancer Research Foundation, Sweden. www.stralskyddsstiftelsen.se/third-study-on-5g-and-development-of-the-microwave-syndrome/.

Abstract:
In this case report we present a woman aged 52 years who developed health problems consistent with the microwave syndrome after installation of a 5G base station facing her apartment at 60 meters’ distance. These symptoms consisted of e.g., headache, dizziness, concentration difficulties, fatigue, arrhythmia, skin burning and nose bleeding corresponding to the microwave syndrome. High radiofrequency (RF) radiation levels were measured in her apartment especially in the part closest to the base station. In her living room at the window 17 500 to 758 000 µW/m2 peak levels were obtained during 10 measurements, each over 1 minute. At the place of her sofa in her living room peak levels from 36 800 to 222 000 µW/m2 were measured.

It is noteworthy that very high radiation was found at the balcony facing the base station. All ten measurements at that place yielded within 10-15 seconds peak levels >2 500 000 µW/m2, which is the highest measurable level with the meter used in this study. At the playground about 40 meters from the base

station peak levels of 1 120 000 µW/m2 and 479000 µW/m2 were measured, respectively. After temporally leaving the apartment for another dwelling with much lower RF radiation, 96 to 2 810 µW/m2 peak levels, almost all symptoms disappeared within a short time. After moving back to her own apartment the symptoms reappeared.

This study is in line with the results of our two previous case studies showing that installation of 5G caused an extreme increase in exposure and rapid development of the microwave syndrome. These case studies indicate that implementation of 5G cannot be done without the risk of harmful effects on human health.

A former member of ICNIRP Dr James Lin has just published a study "*Incongruities in recently revised radiofrequency exposure guidelines and standards*".

This is his conclusion:

"*The rapid proliferation of cellular mobile telecommunication devices and systems is raising public health concerns about the biological effects and safety of radiofrequency (RF) radiation exposure. There is also concern about the efficacy of promulgated health safety limits, rules, and recommendations for RF radiation used by these devices and systems. The recently revised RF exposure limits adjust only for heating with RF radiation. These limits are devised largely for restricting short-term heating by RF radiation to raise tissue temperatures. They disregarded decisions by scientific organizations such as IARC. Furthermore, the limits are based on obsolete information, circumvent important animal data, and even more so in the case of mm-wave radiation from 5G mobile communications for which there is a paucity of health effects studies in the published literature. They are flawed and are not applicable to long-term exposure at low levels. Instead of advances in science, they are predicated on misguided assumptions with outdated exposure metrics that do not adequately protect children, workers, and the public from exposure to the RF radiation or people with sensitivity to electromagnetic radiation from wireless devices and systems. Thus, many of the recommended limits are debatable and absent of scientific justification from the standpoint of safety and public health protection.*"
doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2023.115369

Case law, acknowledged by Three's agents in other applications, suggests that public perceptions of health risks can be a material planning consideration within the land-use planning system. Below is an excerpt from a Barrister's advice on this issue.

"***Public health concerns are in fact material considerations in the determination of an application for planning permission and accordingly a failure to have regard to them is a public law error, and a breach of the duty in section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990*:**

1. **In Newport BC v Secretary of State for Wales [1998] Env. L.R. 174** the court held that it was a material error of law for the Secretary of State on an appeal to conclude that a genuinely held public perception of danger (in that case from a public waste treatment plant) which was unfounded could never amount to a valid ground for refusal of planning permission. Hutchinson L.J. held: "*I would say that local fears which are not, in fact, justified can rank as part of the human factor and could be given direct effect as an exceptional or special circumstance*".

2. **In Trevett v Secretary of State for Transport, Local Government and the Regions [2002] EWHC 2696** (Admin), a challenge to a decision made on appeal to grant planning permission for three telecommunications masts, Sullivan J held that the Inspector had properly followed the Newport approach and had recognised that the perceived adverse effects on health of the public could justify a refusal of planning permission.

3. **T Mobile UK Ltd v First Secretary of State [2004] EWCA Civ 1763 (Pill, Mummery and Laws L.JJ.**; 12th November 2004) concerned an appeal proposal for telecommunications infrastructure which complied with ICNIRP guidelines. The court held it would be open to the decision-maker to identify some exceptional circumstance whereby, despite compliance with ICNIRP guidelines, health concerns should constitute a material consideration justifying refusal.

Best,

Barbara Lowe

[redacted]