



**EM Radiation Research Trust Question and background information submitted to Sefton Council to be considered at the Council Public Meeting on 12<sup>th</sup> September 2024 at Southport Town Hall at 6.30pm. Agenda for Council meeting here:**

<https://modgov.sefton.gov.uk/documents/g11516/Public%20reports%20pack%2012th-Sep-2024%2018.30%20Council.pdf?T=10>

For the attention of: David McCullough, Bill Esterson MP, Cllr. Karen Cavanagh, Cllr. Carol Richards, Cllr. Peter Harvey, Mayor Cllr. June Burns

Cc. Brian Stein CBE Chairman EM Radiation Research Trust

**Sent via Email from Eileen O'Connor, Director EM Radiation Research Trust:**

[eileen@radiationresearch.org](mailto:eileen@radiationresearch.org)

I am a resident living in Sefton and the Director for the EM Radiation Research Trust Charity.

**We request a review of wireless radiation exposures from 2G, 3G, 4G, 5G and the IOT to be undertaken by Sefton Council as a matter of urgency.**

**Will Sefton Council revisit the request from Councillor David Irving at the 20/1/2022 Council meeting calling for the Council to site 5G masts at a safe distance from schools?**

Sefton residents previously raised concerns about 5G via objections against masts with a petition that was presented to the Council meeting on 20 January 2022 calling for **Sefton to Stop the 5G rollout**. This meeting had a very low turnout with only 25 councillors attending out of the 66. At the end of the debate, Councillor David Irving proposed an amendment to site 5G masts at a safe distance from schools, however it was not seconded, and the amendment failed. If a majority of councillors had attended, there is a strong chance that the amendment might have been seconded, and the subsequent debate may have led to it being adopted.

### **Reasons for concern and especially for children**

The EM Radiation Research Trust(RRT) recently called for a full investigation into the 4G LTE phone mast that is situated right next to Millstead Primary School, Everton after visiting the area with RF/EMF radiation measurements expert Glynn Hughes who recorded the highest peak reading he has ever taken in the UK at 1,554932  $\mu\text{W}/\text{m}$ . This reading corresponds with readings recorded by Professor Lennart Hardell and Mona Nilsson of the Swedish Radiation Foundation who published seven case reports that include a total of 16 persons aged between 4 and 83 years that developed microwave syndrome within a short time after being exposed to 5G base

stations close to their dwellings. Most prevalent symptoms were sleeping difficulty, headache, fatigue, irritability, concentration problems, loss of immediate memory, emotional distress, depression tendency, anxiety/panic, burning and lancinating skin, cardiovascular symptoms, pain in muscles and joints <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/38889394/>

The RRT letter was sent to the UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA), Cllr. June Burns Mayor of Sefton, Cllr. Richard Kemp CBE Mayor of Liverpool, Kim Johnson MP and other public officials calling for a full investigation into the deaths of the two children. Download here: [Base-Station emissions and health concerns \(radiationresearch.org\)](https://radiationresearch.org/base-station-emissions-and-health-concerns)

We received a response from the UKHSA on 30<sup>th</sup> August 2024 which does not address many of the concerns raised in the RRT letter calling for an investigation into the published research demonstrating risks associated with the biological effects associated with wireless technology. **We therefore cannot rely on the UKHSA and call on Sefton Council to investigate the risks associated with this technology and to seek advice from all experts in this field. The health and wellbeing of residents is paramount.**

I would like to draw your attention to The International Declaration on the Human Rights of Children in the Digital Age. This important Declaration was delivered to the Secretary General of the United Nations on World Children's Day, November 20, 2023. The Declaration calls for the protection of Children from Involuntary Exposure to Non-Ionizing Radiation (NIR) and highlights a large and growing body of independent, peer-reviewed [scientific studies](#) demonstrated that man-made NIR has adverse biological effects. [The Declaration | ICD \(thechildrensdeclaration.org\)](#)

In May 2020, the EM Radiation Research Trust received support from Robert F. Kennedy Jr., and Dafna Tachover calling on the UK Prime Minister Boris Johnson and political leaders to protect the public and especially our children from the 'proven harms' of wireless radiation and 5G. This Open letter of Complaint is a response to an article published by the UK children's online newspaper First News claiming that 5G is safe. The Radiation Research Trust is still waiting to receive a response from the UK Government and First News. [RFK, Jr. Joins EM Radiation Research Trust in Calling Upon UK Prime Minister to Halt 5G Deployment • Children's Health Defense – Radiation Research](#)

### **The UK Stewart Report 2000**

In 2000 the UK Government set up a committee to investigate the impacts of RF/microwave radiation. The committee was chaired by Sir William Stewart, Chairman of the UK Health Protection Agency and formerly Chief Scientific Adviser to the Government. This important investigation called for a precautionary approach due to the scientific uncertainties.

- **Section 1.18** There is now scientific evidence, however, which suggests that there may be biological effects occurring at exposures below these guidelines.
- **Section 1.19** We conclude therefore that it is not possible at present to say that exposure to RF radiation, even at levels below guidelines, is totally without potential adverse health effects, and that the gaps in knowledge are sufficient to justify a precautionary approach.

- **Section 1.42** The beam of greatest RF intensity should not be permitted to fall on any part of the school grounds or buildings without agreement from the school and parents.
- **Section 1.53** Children may be more vulnerable because of their developing nervous systems, the greater absorption of energy in the tissues of the head and a longer lifetime of exposure.

### **Research has continued to raise concerns since the 2000 Stewart Report.**

- Thousands of Peer-reviewed studies, including the \$30 million U.S Toxicology Program and the world's largest animal study on RF mobile phone mast radiation by the Ramazzini Institute confirms a wide range of statistically significant DNA damage, brain and heart tumours, infertility, and RF/microwave radiation sickness injury symptoms.
- In 2011 the WHO/IARC classified Radiofrequency Electromagnetic Fields as a class 2B carcinogen (possibly carcinogenic to humans) The same classification as DDT and lead in Petrol. [https://www.iarc.who.int/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/pr208\\_E.pdf](https://www.iarc.who.int/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/pr208_E.pdf)
- The late Professor Yury Grigoriev said “A situation has emerged that cumulative EMF exposure of children may be comparable to adult exposure and may be equal to levels of occupational exposure of workers. The current standards are outdated and inadequate. Urgent action is needed to curb the negative impact from this physical agent.” <https://www.radiationresearch.org/news/important-information-from-professor-yury-grigoriev/>
- EMA v East Sussex County Council (Special educational needs). The Upper Tribunal Judge Jacobs found that a child suffering with electrosensitivity should be considered disabled under the Equality Act 2010 and required an Education Health, and Care Plan (EHCP) <https://phiremedical.org/news/>
- Article written by Debra Fry the mother of a 15-year-old electrosensitive girl who committed suicide. **Why Die for Wifi? My Child Did – Will Yours?** <https://www.radiationresearch.org/news/why-die-for-wifi-my-child-did-will-yours/>
- Health effects of electromagnetic fields on Children Jin-Hwa Moon MD,PhD [Health effects of electromagnetic fields on children - PMC \(nih.gov\)](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31111111/)

### **Concerns regarding the Government's use of ICNIRP**

There are concerns regarding government's use of the ICNIRP 2020 radiation guidelines as highlighted in the paper by Einar Flydal et al. (2022) **Self-referencing authorships behind the ICNIRP 2020 radiation protection guidelines. This paper concludes:** “From our findings we draw the conclusion that the referenced literature used in ICNIRP 2020 to underpin its guidelines is neither varied, nor independent or balanced, and is by no means “consistent with current scientific knowledge”, as claimed by ICNIRP 2020 [2 p. 484]. ICNIRP 2020 bases this claim within this small network only, a claim that runs contrary to the majority of biology-

oriented researchers and publications within this research field. Hence, our review shows that the ICNIRP 2020 guidelines fail to meet fundamental scientific quality requirements as to being built on a broad, solid, and established knowledge base, uphold a view contrary to well established knowledge within the field, and therefore **cannot offer a basis for good governance when setting RF exposure limits for the protection of human health.**” <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/35751553/>

ICBE-EMF group called for a moratorium on 5G. A peer-reviewed paper on October 18, 2022, presented a scientific case for revision of the ICNIRP limits. 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 is calling for an independent evaluation. This paper warns about the risks of exposure to radiation from 5G technology and claims that existing exposure limits for wireless radiation are inadequate, outdated, and harmful to human health and wildlife. The ICBE-EMF group reports that exposure limits for RF radiation set by ICNIRP and the FCC are based on invalid assumptions and outdated science. <https://ehjournal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12940-022-00900-9>

### **We are told that councillors must base decisions for phone masts based on planning policy.**

#### **The key messages are:**

- Councils should support next generation mobile technology (such as 5G)
- Councils should not impose a ban on new electronic communication development
- Councils must determine planning applications on planning grounds only; and Councils should not seek to set health safeguards different from the International Commission Guidelines for public exposure.

We would like to point out was that the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is a set of guidelines and is not legally binding. It is our view that the main priority of local councils should be the best interests of residents, not simply to follow government guidance slavishly. Regarding 5G installations, it is the duty of the Council to take into consideration all evidence relating to potential effects on residents’ health, rather than relying exclusively on government and industry guidance.

In a landmark legal ruling in November 2021, campaigners in Brighton and Hove succeeded in overturning local authority approval for a 5G mast to be sited close to a primary school. At judicial review, it was found that the Council “failed to address the health impacts” of the mast. This finding has significant implications for all councils dealing with 5G applications, as it means there is a legal responsibility to investigate possible effects on health. The technology cannot simply be assumed to be safe.

Moreover, the approach taken recently by Glastonbury Town Council is evidence that not all Councils feel constrained to adhere rigidly to government guidance in relation to 5G applications. In response to concerns raised by residents, Glastonbury Town Council set up a 5G Advisory Committee and carried out a six-month investigation, after which they resolved

unanimously to continue their adoption of the Precautionary Principle; opposing the roll-out of 5G until further information is made available on the safety or otherwise of the technology.

**We therefore contend that the Council should be advised that not only is there is NO legal requirement to support 5G technology, but it is also the duty and responsibility of the Council to conduct a full safety investigation and risk assessment before approving 5G applications.**

Respectfully Submitted,

Eileen O'Connor

Charity Director for the EM Radiation Research Trust