

Oct 11, 2021

## Objection - 2021/3621/P

The installation of 1 No. antenna located behind replacement Glass Reinforced Plastic (GRP) louvres, 1 No. GPS module mounted on south east face of tower and ancillary works

Dear Mr Chana,

Please can I bring your attention to the following matters and appeal to you to reject this planning application. I am an associate of a gentleman living 170m from this mast and am likely to visit him in his home. Also, I write as a fellow citizen on behalf of the children attending the adjacent Montessori School.

### 1) Application Errors

- The title of the application indicates the addition of 1 antenna, however there are 3 additional upgraded antenna with a consequent significant increase in radiation. (It is clear from the drawings from the additional cabinets in the proposed plan how extensive the additional equipment is in terms of power output).
- Avison Young are quoting are using out of date version of the National Planning Policy Framework, the A0355 Planning Statement, page 9/10 of what the NPPF paragraphs are not pertaining to the correct version of the NPPF. The quoted content NPPF 80,112, 113, 114, 115 is therefore incorrect.
- The papers do not declare the new antenna to be 5G. Only by looking at the health documents presented with the application can it be deduced this is a 5G mast application therefore the proposal is misleading.
- No exclusion zone or compliance diagrams have been provided. There are no power and frequency specifications. Even though they are not officially a requirement, the Council is unable to inform the public where the “no entry” and the zones are which are only to be occupied for a maximum of 8 hours continuously are. They are unable to check whether the Telecoms have labelled these subsequent to installation. In other words no oversight of the plan is possible.

### 2) Siting

- The mounting of the gps units on the outside of the church which although small will deface the Grade 11 listed building. The wires will be visible running up the facade.

### 3) Missing Consultations

- The Montessori school just 45m from St Marys church spire housing the antenna has not been consulted. This is contrary to the code of best practice as when there have been

previous objections from the community it is recommended that schools are consulted. There were objections to the previous application for this site.

- There are 2 further schools within 500m, Acol nursery (142m) ,St Marys Church of England 170m and Hello Student accommodation (285m) who have not been consulted.

*“Operators should seek to discuss and agree with local planning authorities in advance which particular schools and colleges should be consulted. In any cases of doubt, consultation with the school or college should be undertaken. .”*

*n determining whether a school or college should be consulted the following factors should be taken into account by operators and local planning authorities:*

- *The proposed site is on school/college grounds;*
- *The proposed development would be seen from the school/college or its grounds;*
- *The site is on a main access point used by pupils/students to the school/college;*
- *There is a history of concern about base stations within the local community;*
- *The local planning authority has requested consultation with the school/college;*
- *The school/college has requested that it be included in any consultation*

Children have developing nervous systems and ICNIRP say they do not have the data yet to determine how the RFR will affect the different stages of development. Their skulls are thinner and they absorb more radiation. (*Prof Tom Butler, [On the Clear Evidence of the Risks to Children From Non-Ionizing Radio-frequency Radiation.](#)*)

Please weigh this fact and all evidence in Tom Butlers report against the statements made in the Code of Best practice about health implications from base stations.

#### 4) Liability

- In order to safeguard themselves against liability claims the council needs to decide how much weight to put on the ICNIRP guidelines.
- There are mounting numbers of people becoming sick from exposure to wireless radiation, there is now a medical diagnosis called ICD-W90. Lloyds of London will not insure against damage from non-ionising radiation, they know the risks are too high.
- Courts are now recognising the links to acoustic neuroma and to microwave sickness/ EHS (Electrohypersensitivity too) at exposure levels BELOW the ICNIRP guidelines. (Appendix 1)
- In August 2019 letter **Public Health England solicitors DLA Piper clarified:-**

*“The Guidance [on PHE website] is not maintained and revised by PHE for the explicit purpose of any other body undertaking any other statutory function. If in any other context regard is had to the Guidance, that is entirely a matter for the discretion of the relevant body and it must determine what weight to place on the Guidance given the clear indication as to the sources from which the advice and recommendations in the Guidance are derived. **Equally, that body must determine what other evidence from your clients 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”. 8 August 2019

Evidence about Health Concerns.

There are 4 documents supplied with the application aimed at informing and allaying “fears” about health concerns.

- 1) Glossy Document about ICNIRP "Allaying health concerns" Cornerstone "Community Information Documents",
- 2) Safety Guidelines on electromagnetic fields from antennas
- 3) Health Summary
- 4) Mobile phones and health: research reviews

There are false and misleading statements in these documents which need to be fully noted.

A UK government-sponsored survey found that 4.0% (2,680,000 people in the UK) are sensitive to RF wireless radiation and EM fields, and 1.8% (1,206,000) are severely affected, while another survey estimated 0.65% (435,000) are denied full access to work or education because of their sensitivity to EMFs and RF wireless radiation, like 5G.

This information is not available anywhere within the 4 documents and ANY health impacts from wireless radiation is completely downplayed in these 4 documents. Public concern in the face of these numbers of people suffering from exposure to wireless radiation is justified.

I invite you to read carefully the following document by ElectroSensitivity UK, which presents a case on behalf of those who are electro hyper-sensitive. It also explains that ‘individual planners and regulators’ in a number of countries have been held personally legally liable for the negative effects of radiation from masts that have been approved even when these were compliant with ICNIRP advice regarding short-term thermal effects (p.5). ES-UK (2018) Adverse Health Effects of Mobile Phone Masts and Planning Policy, [Link](#)

It is vital that incorrect statements in Cornerstone’s documents about there being no health consequences to 5G are corrected.

Please also consider very specifically that there are court judgments that ICNIRP guidelines are unreliable. A very recent US FCCVCHD August 2021 judged that science revealing non thermal effects and evidence from electrosensitives must not be set aside by regulators. (Appendix 1)

### **Summary of misleading/untrue statements from supporting documentation re Health**

From 1) "Allaying health concerns" glossy brochure

**"The use of small 5G base stations in towns and cities will reduce exposure of radio waves to individual smartphone users."**

This statement doesn't account for the proliferation of devices that the base stations are intending to support so the exposure when all devices are considered will be greatly increased.

This statement may be inferring that by having more small cells the exposure to field radiation will be less but the 4G and 4gLTE field radiation will still be mostly present so again it is misleading to promote the use of small cells as reducing exposure.

From 3) “Health Summary”

The levels of RF exposure from base stations and wireless networks are so low that the temperature increases **are insignificant and do not affect human health"**

There are health effects which happen not from heating and it is not true that RFR exposure from base stations do not affect health. Please see the proximity studies Appendix 2.

From 4) Mobile phones and health: research reviews "UK radio base station installations have been surveyed by independent bodies and found to be **hundreds and sometimes thousands of times below these guidelines.**"

This is misleading the public.

Readings of around 1/10th ICNIRP have been seen regularly across the UK.

Specifically outside the Bath College Building, readings of 10 V/m have been taken.

Readings of 6V/m by a 4G mast were recorded BEFORE upgrading to 5G in Radstock. Please see Appendix 3.

Other countries (Italy, Russia, Poland, Turkey, China) have adopted the Justification principle in line with the ethics of ICRP, (international Commission for radiological protection, ICNIRP's parent organisation) and set guidelines 100's lower than ICNIRP.

Italy have a limit of 6V/m so even before adding 5G in Radstock this more ethical exposure limit has been reached.

### Detailed response to misleading/untrue statements from supporting documentation re Health

STATEMENT from Cornerstone	RESPONSE
<p>This Government document is referenced in paragraph 2 of the Health Summary.  <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/5g-technologies-radio-waves-and-health/5g-technologies-radio-waves-and-health">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/5g-technologies-radio-waves-and-health/5g-technologies-radio-waves-and-health</a></p> <p>"Their use is not new, and they have been used for point-to-point microwave links and some other types of transmitters that have been present in the environment for many years. ICNIRP guidelines apply up to 300 GHz, well beyond the maximum (few tens of GHz) frequencies proposed for 5G.</p> <p>Exposure to radio waves is not new</p> <p>health-related research has been conducted on this topic over several decades.</p> <p>In particular, a large amount of new scientific evidence has emerged since the year 2000 through dedicated national and international research programmes that have addressed concerns about rapidly proliferating wireless technologies.</p>	<p>The proliferation and densification of use of these frequencies is new.</p> <p>Exposure to 26Ghz for the residents in the area of this planning application is new.</p> <p>Health research on this frequency transmitted with this technology ie beam formed pulsed radiation has not been conducted over several decades if at all.</p> <p>The frequencies and power from this plan has not been declared and there are no studies for this type of installation available.</p> <p>Much research has largely been ignored by the organisation ICNIRP who have set the guidelines.</p> <p>The <a href="#">2018 NTP</a> study found a clear link between DNA damage and cancer and wireless radiation at exposure levels which DO NOT cause tissue heating.</p> <p>A Court in Turin <a href="#">ruled</a> that ICNIRPs evaluation of this research was unreliable.</p> <p>The <a href="#">US court</a> (August 2021) ruled that this research must be evaluated and accounted for, regulators ignoring this research is unlawful.</p>

Priyanka Bandara, David O Carpenter, Planetary electromagnetic pollution: it is time to assess its impact, (The Lancet Planetary Health, This recent evaluation of 2266 studies (including in-vitro and in-vivo studies in human, animal, and plant experimental systems and population studies) found that most studies (n=1546, 68.2%) have demonstrated significant biological or health effects associated with exposure to anthropogenic electromagnetic fields. Volume 2, Issue 12) 2018

Fewer studies have been carried out at higher frequencies

It is not correct to assume the mechanisms are the same if they have not been studied.

but the biophysical mechanisms that govern the interaction between radio waves and body tissues are well understood at higher frequencies and are the basis of the present ICNIRP restrictions.

There is clear and unequivocal evidence that both ionising and non ionising radiation causes oxidative stress, it is an accepted bio mechanism initiating cancer, but by introducing a “threshold” criteria and not adopting justification and optimisation ICNIRP are avoiding setting guidelines which are protective of cancer.

Deterministic risks by definition do not have a threshold. ICNIRP are breaking ethical principles set out and agreed to at their inception with their parent organisation ICRP.

The main change in using higher frequencies is that there is less penetration of radio waves into body tissues and absorption of the radio energy, and any consequent heating, becomes more confined to the body surface.

This is supposition and there is evidence that the sweat glands act as mini transmitters and cause the frequencies to be carried deeper into the body.

<https://ehtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/Yuri-Feldman-and-Paul-Ben-Ishai-Abstract.pdf>  
Research on the biological effects of extremely high-frequency RFR (Zalyubovskaya, 1977)

It is possible that there may be a small increase in overall exposure to radio waves when 5G is added to an existing network or in a new area.

This statement is not relevant to the neighbours and residents to this particular mast.

They will be exposed to radiation in their homes many hours a day that previously they were not exposed to, of a type that is new, ie been formed. This will be a significant increase not a small increase for them. The frequency and power output from this site and those figures and their specific effects are important. The term overall is misleading.

However, the overall exposure is expected to remain low relative to guidelines and, as such, there should be no consequences for public health.

PHE is committed to monitoring the evidence applicable to this and other radio technologies, and to revising its advice, should that be necessary.

After a thorough review of the available scientific findings, the World Health Organisation reported: "To date, the only health effect from RF fields identified in scientific reviews has been related to an increase in body temperature (> 1 °C) from exposure at very high field intensity found only in certain industrial facilities, such as RF heaters.

The guidelines have been ruled unreliable in the Court of [Turin](#) scientists doctors and engineers There is a worldwide appeal by scientists and doctors to change the guidelines, for them to be lowered to reflect the science of non thermal effects. [Link](#)

It is not an accurate statement that there "should be no consequences for public health" Consequences from exposure to base stations are already fully evidenced.

There is no evidence that PHE has monitored the evidence and their lack of ongoing assessment of the science is now subject to Judicial Review proceedings. [Actinagains5g.org](#).

Taking just one study [Lopez](#) Jan 2021, a mathematically statistically significant increase in headaches and sleep disturbances was measured in residents living near to base stations. This study confirms previous studies which look at health effects within 500m of a mast. See references below. Appendix 2.

Pink -INCORRECT statement.  
The science clearly shows that there are mechanisms of harm which are not related to a rise in temperature.  
The [2018 NTP](#) study has proven this. This study spent the first year setting up the experiment such that there was no rise in temperature in the tissues in order to isolate the non thermal effects. Cancers and DNA changes occurred with no rise in temperature

[Tom Butler – Submission on 5G for the Action Against 5G Judicial Review Case](#)

Russell CL. [5G wireless telecommunications expansion:Public health and environmental implications.](#) Environmental Research. April 2018.

Di Ciaula, [Towards 5G communication systems: Are there health implications?](#), Int J Hyg Environ Health. 2018 Feb 2.

Ronald N. Kostoff, Paul Heroux, Michael Aschner, Aristides Tsatsakis, [Adverse health](#)

<p>The levels of RF exposure from base stations and wireless networks are so low that the temperature increases are insignificant and do not affect human health"</p>	<p><a href="#">effects of 5G mobile networking technology under real-life conditions</a>. Toxicology Letters, Volume 323, 2020, Pages 35-40,</p> <p>This statement is false. The proximity studies Appendix 2 and, the <a href="#">Lopez</a> study contain extensive evidence that exposure to wireless radiation near base stations can cause significant harmful health impacts.</p> <p>This statement that the increases in temperature are insignificant may be true for some people but for those with metal in their body in the form of implants, teeth braces, pacemakers the interaction of the RFR and the metal may cause localised tissue heating and the ICNIRP guidelines highlight that temperature rises of tissue cannot be predicted when metal is in the body and so the guidelines exposure levels are not protective for those with metal implants.</p>
<p>The Advisory Group on Non-ionising Radiation (AGNIR) summarised that “although a substantial amount of research has been conducted in this area, there is no convincing evidence that RF field exposure below guideline levels causes health effects in adults or children.” “Health Effects from Radiofrequency Electromagnetic Fields – RCE 20”, 2012</p>	<p>This statement was made in 2012, ten years ago.</p> <p>There has been significant science since then and I refer you once again to the proximity papers and the review papers.</p>
<p>In addition, the Swedish Radiation Safety Authority has provided a review of the epidemiological, human and cellular experimental data in this area, taking into account the scientific quality of the studies. This review, part of an annual series, covers studies published from October 2015 up to and including March 2017. This evaluation is published in the report “Recent Research on EMF and Health Risk - Twelfth report from SSM’s Scientific Council on Electromagnetic Fields, 2017” and notes that “no new health risks have been identified.”</p>	<p>This review is now out of date.</p> <p>1) As of 2019, the WHO IARC advisory committee recommends a re-evaluation. Due to the publishing of new research ( Hardell and Carlberg 2017, Miller et al. 2018 Coureau et al., 2014 , Lerchl 2015, Falcioni et al.2018) over the last decade, the WHO/IARC advisory committee released a report last year recommending wireless radiation be re-evaluated by 2024 as a “high priority.”</p>
<p>Statement from Cormerstone community information sheet “<b>Mobile phones and health: research reviews</b></p>	
<p>UK radio base station installations have been</p>	<p>This is a misleading statement readings are</p>

<p>surveyed by independent bodies and found to be hundreds and sometimes thousands of times below these guidelines.</p>	<p>seen in the order of tenths of ICNIRP in the UK.,  Readings independently taken in the City of Bath recorded 10 V/m outside the University Building. 6V/m have been recorded in Radstock in front of a 4G mast before additional radiation was added by a proposed upgrade. See the Radstock report in Appendix for details.  This is just one example.</p>
---	--

## 5) Conclusions

- The schools have not been consulted according to the code of Best Practice.
- Relying on an ICNIRP certificate (NPP118) for protecting yourself from later liability claims and for fulfilling your duties to protect the public from harm is insufficient. The information presented in this objection provides sound reasons why this policy needs to be questioned and it supports a decision that this proposal would be an “incompatible and unacceptable use of the site” due to the risks to health created by wireless radiation.
- PHE guidance states that radiofrequency radiation is regulated through planning policy. Further, the **European Electronic Communications Code (EECC)** that was brought into UK law in late December 2020 contains recitals regarding public health. (106, 110). Please be sure your responsibilities as a competent authority in regard to these are clarified and fulfilled. The EECC code recitals make human public health imperative and require reconciliation of the environmental and public health concerns taking precaution into account.

The Supreme Court case *R (Wright) v Resilient Energy Severndale Ltd. and Forest of Dean Council* [2019] UKSC 53 underlines that no single policy should be treated as statute .

- Churches are meant to be a sanctuary. How can this be so when sitting within the church one does not know whether one will be inside an exclusion zone and also when one has seen science indicating a statistically significant increase in headaches, nausea, lack of concentration and sleep problems within 500m of a base station?
- It is a fair and reasonable conclusion from the evidence presented in this objection that the children and students of the 4 schools and residents within 500m of this mast will be likely to suffer detrimental health effects should this proposal proceed.

The Precautionary Principle is defined as follows “*When human activities may lead to morally unacceptable harm that is scientifically plausible but uncertain, actions shall be taken to avoid or diminish that harm.*”

Thank you for your consideration of these matters and I appeal to you to object this planning proposal.

Thank You.  
Karen Churchill  
15 Rode Hill, Rode, Frome, Somerset BA11 6PS



## APPENDIX

- 1) COURT CASES REVEALING NEED TO QUESTION ICNIRP CERTIFICATION
- 2) SCIENCE REVEALING HEALTH EFFECTS FROM BASE STATIONS
- 3) READINGS AT 1/10TH OF ICNIRP LEVELS COUNTERING CORNERSTONES CLAIMS OF CURRENT EXPOSURE LEVELS of 1/1000 and 1/100 th ICNIRP LEVELS BEING RECORDED ACROSS UK

### 1) COURT CASES

- 1) In AUGUST 2021 The US courts ruled that evidence of non-thermal effects which happen below ICNIRP guideline levels must be considered. [Link](#)
- 2) The Appeals Court of Turin ruled the ICNIRP unreliable and subject to conflicts of interest [Link](#)
- 3) District Court of Gelderland ruling by deduction concludes the ICNIRP limits unprotective [Link](#)

### 2) SCIENCE REVEALING HEALTH EFFECTS FROM BASE STATIONS

#### ***There is enough medical and scientific evidence for liability of telecoms companies to be an issue***

As use of mobile phones increases, both the density of base stations and their power output is expected to increase the global human RFR exposure. Although direct causation of negative human health effects from RFR from cellular phone base stations has not been finalized, there is already enough medical and scientific evidence to warrant long-term liability concerns for companies deploying cellular phone towers.

*Pearce, J [Limiting liability with positioning to minimize negative health effects of cellular phone towers](#) 2019*

***Lopez Jan 2021***, a mathematically statistically significant increase in headaches and sleep disturbances was measured in residents living near to base stations. This study confirms previous studies which look at health effects within 500m of a mast

#### ***Research shows headaches in people living near mobile phone masts at radiation levels well below PHE/ICNIRP safety standards***

A cross-sectional study of 365 randomly selected inhabitants living in urban and rural areas for more than one year near to 10 selected base stations. Total HF-EMF and exposure related to mobile telecommunication were far below recommended levels. Distance from antennae was 24-600 m in the rural area and 20-250 m in the urban area. Despite the influence of confounding variables, including fear of adverse effects from exposure to the base stations, there was a significant relation of some symptoms, especially for headaches.

*Hutter et al [Subjective symptoms, sleeping problems, and cognitive performance in subjects living near mobile phone base stations](#) 2006*

#### ***Research conducted on people living near masts show increase in headaches, sleep problems, depression, memory loss, irritability, concentration, discomfort, headaches, dizziness, tremors, blurred vision, nausea, lack of appetite, circulatory complaints***

People living near mobile phone masts reported more symptoms of headache, sleep disturbance, discomfort, irritability, depression, memory loss and concentration problems the closer they lived to the installation. Study authors recommend that the minimal distance of people from cellular phone base stations should not be < 300m.

*Santini et al. [Investigation on the health of people living near mobile telephone relay stations: Incidence according to distance and sex](#) 2002*

### ***Residents living under rooftop antennas suffer illnesses which improve when antennas are removed.***

This Japanese study showed statistically significant adverse health effects from electromagnetic radiation from mobile phone antennas. 107 out of 122 residents of a building with cell phone antennas on the rooftop for 11 years were medically examined before and after the antennas were removed. (*The residents had no prior knowledge about possible effects.*) In several cases, significant effects on the inhabitants' health could be proven. The health of these inhabitants was shown to improve after the removal of the antennas, and the researchers could identify no other factors that could explain this health improvement.

*Shiniyo et al. [Significant Decrease of Clinical Symptoms after Mobile Phone Base Station Removal –An Intervention Study](#) 2014*

### ***Residents living near mobile phone masts report poor concentration, stress and headaches.***

This Swiss survey study reported that out of 429 questionnaires returned, 394 people reported symptoms from mobile phone tower exposure. 58% percent of these symptomatic people suffered headaches, 19% nervous stress, and 18% fatigue, while concentration difficulties were the most common complaint.

*Rööslü [Symptoms of ill health ascribed to electromagnetic field exposure--a questionnaire survey](#) 2004*

This study found that living nearby mobile phone base stations (cell antennas) increased the risk for neuropsychiatric problems such as headaches, memory problems, dizziness, tremors, depression, sleep problems and some changes in the performance of neurobehavioral functions.

*Abdel-Rassoul et al [Neurobehavioral effects among inhabitants around mobile phone base stations](#) 2007*

This study (involving a questionnaire survey) confirmed that residents living close to mobile phone masts reported "Various complaints mostly of the circulatory system, but also of sleep disturbances, irritability, depression, blurred vision, concentration difficulties, nausea, lack of appetite, headache and vertigo. The study shows relationships between the incidence of individual symptoms, the level of exposure, and the distance between a residential area and a base station. This association was observed both in persons who linked their complaints with the presence of the base station and those who did not notice such a relation."

*Borkiewicz et al. [Subjective symptoms reported by people living in the vicinity of cellular phone base stations: review](#) 2004*

### ***Increased risk of cancer has been observed near mobile phone masts***

This study, commissioned by the German Federal Agency for Radiation Protection, compiled medical histories between 1994–2004 of people living in Naila, Bavaria. The study found a threefold increase in malignant tumours for people exposed for five years or more to cell phone masts within 400 metres, compared with people living further away.

*Eger et al. [The Influence of Being Physically Near to a Cell Phone Transmission Mast on the Incidence of Cancer](#) 2004*

A pilot study was conducted in Hennen, Germany, to investigate the cancer incidence adjacent to a mobile phone base station. The authors concluded that a statistically significant increase of cancer incidence was observed 5 years after the base station had started operating.

*Eger H, Neppe F., [Incidence of cancer adjacent to a mobile telephone basis station in Westfalia](#) 2009*

A Tel Aviv University study of 622 people living in Netanya, Israel, revealed an overall fourfold increase in the incidence of cancer among residents living within 350 metres of a cell phone mast for a period of between three and seven years.

Wolf and Wolf [Increased Incidence of Cancer Near a Cell-phone Transmitter Station](#) 2004

This study looked at 7191 deaths by cancer in Brazil's third-largest city, Belo Horizonte, between 1996 and 2006. The highest rate of deaths from cancer was found among those who had lived within 500 metres of cell phone masts; there was a 35% increase in cancers for those living within 100 metres. There were high rates of prostate, breast, lung, kidney and liver cancer among the victims living closest to masts.

Dode et al. [Mortality by neoplasia and cellular telephone base stations in the Belo Horizontemunicipality, Minas Gerais state, Brazil](#) 2011

**An independent review concludes 8/10 studies show increase in neurological symptoms or cancer within 500m at RFR levels well below PHE/ICNIRP safety levels.**

This independent review looked at ten epidemiological studies: "We found that eight of the 10 studies reported increased prevalence of adverse neurobehavioral symptoms or cancer in populations living at distances under 500 metres from base stations. None of the studies reported exposure above accepted international guidelines, suggesting that current guidelines may be inadequate in protecting the health of human populations."

Khurana et al. [Epidemiological evidence for a health risk from mobile phone base stations](#) 2010

**3) READINGS AT 1/10TH OF ICNIRP LEVELS COUNTERING CORNERSTONES CLAIMS OF CURRENT EXPOSURE LEVELS of 1/1000 and 1/100 th ICNIRP LEVELS BEING RECORDED ACROSS UK**

READINGS TAKEN IN RADSTOCK showing 10% ICNIRP levels before installation of 5G upgrade.

PHE uses ICNIRP guidelines as safety limits the current "safe" limit is set at 57 V/m. Note readings 3.5-6V//m and 4.5-6V/m.

Inside House Ground	Outside House Rear	Outside House Front (Shadow)	Side of House Inline to mast	Carlingford End Terrace	Down to Road	On Road	Round-about	Minor Road	Up Hill 1	Up Hill 2	Radstock Football Ground
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
V/m	V/m	V/m	V/m	V/m	V/m	V/m	V/m	V/m	V/m	V/m	V/m
0,5 – 1,5	4,5 – 6,0	0,2	6,0	4,5 – 6,0	2,0	0,2	0,2	0,5	3,0 – 6,0	0,1	No signal
$\mu\text{Wm}^2$	$\mu\text{Wm}^2$	$\mu\text{Wm}^2$	$\mu\text{Wm}^2$	$\mu\text{Wm}^2$	$\mu\text{Wm}^2$	$\mu\text{Wm}^2$	$\mu\text{Wm}^2$	$\mu\text{Wm}^2$	$\mu\text{Wm}^2$	$\mu\text{Wm}^2$	$\mu\text{Wm}^2$
100 - 1 000	50 000 - 100 000	10	50 000	10 000	25 000	50	50	100	2 500 - 5 000	10	1

Notes:

1/ Readings taken on Thursday 4th March at Radstock location shown on the map

2/ Readings taken with an Acoustimeter RF Meter Model AM-10

3/ The structure of the house does attenuate the signal down (1 & 3) compared with direct line of sight with the mast (2 & 4)

3/ V/m Volt metres is a peak signal preferred measurement for monitoring Bio effects.

4/ Signal strength and power are a function of the amount of RF traffic being transmitted from the mast and will vary accordingly.

5/ PHE uses ICNIRP guidelines as safety limits the current “safe” limit is set at 57 V/m.

