

Printed on: 04/02/2022 09:10:12

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/5946/P	Frances Stonger	03/02/2022 14:40:13	OBJ	<p>I object based on information in the link below to opinion piece in British Medical Journal highlighting the concerns about transmitter density &amp; the unknown effects on human health as more people are exposed to RF-EMFs</p> <p>There are different biological effects from each kind of transmission. More worryingly 5G systems is not a consistently defined term &amp; can comprise quite different specific technologies &amp; components. Also permitted maximum safety limits vary around the world. There are suspected adverse health effects which have yet to be investigated. The government agenda is for economic gains &amp; is promoting the roll out of 5G as a benefit to lifestyle &amp; a consumer convenience ignoring widespread health concerns.</p> <p><a href="https://www.bmj.com/company/newsroom/stop-global-roll-out-of-5g-networks-until-safety-is-confirmed-urges-expert/">https://www.bmj.com/company/newsroom/stop-global-roll-out-of-5g-networks-until-safety-is-confirmed-urges-expert/</a></p> <p>There is fierce controversy, fuelled by four key areas of scientific uncertainty and concern:</p> <p>The lack of clarity about precisely what technology is included in 5G; and a growing but far from comprehensive body of laboratory research indicating the biologically disruptive potential of RF-EMFs</p> <p>An almost total lack (as yet) of high quality epidemiological studies of the impact on human health from 5G EMF exposure</p> <p>Mounting epidemiological evidence of such effects from previous generations of RF-EMF exposure at lower levels</p> <p>Persistent allegations that some national telecomms regulatory authorities haven't based their RF-EMF safety policies on the latest science, amid potential conflicts of interest</p> <p>5G uses much higher frequency (3 to 300GHz) radio waves than in the past and it makes use of very new—and relatively unevaluated, in terms of safety—supportive technology to enable this higher data transmission capacity, points out Professor Frank.</p> <p>Its inherent fragility means that transmission boosting (cell) antennae are generally required every 100–300 m—which is far more spatially dense than the transmission masts required for older 2G, 3G and 4G technology, using lower frequency waves, he says.</p> <p>A dense transmission network is also required to achieve the (everywhere/anytime) connectivity promised by 5G developers.</p>
2021/5946/P	D Kerrol Williams-Alonga	03/02/2022 11:55:46	OBJ	<p>We the residents of Highgate Road Estates have made it quite clear on a number of occasions, that we do not want mast/antennas etc. of any kind on the roof, balcony or anywhere else on our Estate.</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>We are all aware of the negative impact such devices/technology can have on ones health and wellbeing. My family strongly object!</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/5946/P	Frances Sanger	03/02/2022 14:40:10	OBJ	<p>I object based on information in the link below to opinion piece in British Medical Journal highlighting the concerns about transmitter density &amp; the unknown effects on human health as more people are exposed to RF-EMFs</p> <p>There are different biological effects from each kind of transmission. More worryingly 5G systems is not a consistently defined term &amp; can comprise quite different specific technologies &amp; components. Also permitted maximum safety limits vary around the world. There are suspected adverse health effects which have yet to be investigated. The government agenda is for economic gains &amp; is promoting the roll out of 5G as a benefit to lifestyle &amp; a consumer convenience ignoring widespread health concerns.</p> <p><a href="https://www.bmj.com/company/newsroom/stop-global-roll-out-of-5g-networks-until-safety-is-confirmed-urges-expert/">https://www.bmj.com/company/newsroom/stop-global-roll-out-of-5g-networks-until-safety-is-confirmed-urges-expert/</a></p> <p>There is fierce controversy, fuelled by four key areas of scientific uncertainty and concern.</p> <p>The lack of clarity about precisely what technology is included in 5G; and a growing but far from comprehensive body of laboratory research indicating the biologically disruptive potential of RF-EMFs</p> <p>An almost total lack (as yet) of high quality epidemiological studies of the impact on human health from 5G EMF exposure</p> <p>Mounting epidemiological evidence of such effects from previous generations of RF-EMF exposure at lower levels</p> <p>Persistent allegations that some national telecomms regulatory authorities haven't based their RF-EMF safety policies on the latest science, amid potential conflicts of interest</p> <p>5G uses much higher frequency (3 to 300GHz) radio waves than in the past and it makes use of very new—and relatively unevaluated, in terms of safety—supportive technology to enable this higher data transmission capacity, points out Professor Frank.</p> <p>Its inherent fragility means that transmission boosting (cell) antennae are generally required every 100–300 m—which is far more spatially dense than the transmission masts required for older 2G, 3G and 4G technology, using lower frequency waves, he says.</p> <p>A dense transmission network is also required to achieve the (everywhere/anytime) connectivity promised by 5G developers.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/5946/P	Frances Sanger	03/02/2022 14:40:07	OBJ	<p>I object based on information in the link below to opinion piece in British Medical Journal highlighting the concerns about transmitter density &amp; the unknown effects on human health as more people are exposed to RF-EMFs</p> <p>There are different biological effects from each kind of transmission. More worryingly 5G systems is not a consistently defined term &amp; can comprise quite different specific technologies &amp; components. Also permitted maximum safety limits vary around the world. There are suspected adverse health effects which have yet to be investigated. The government agenda is for economic gains &amp; is promoting the roll out of 5G as a benefit to lifestyle &amp; a consumer convenience ignoring widespread health concerns.</p> <p><a href="https://www.bmj.com/company/newsroom/stop-global-roll-out-of-5g-networks-until-safety-is-confirmed-urges-expert/">https://www.bmj.com/company/newsroom/stop-global-roll-out-of-5g-networks-until-safety-is-confirmed-urges-expert/</a></p> <p>There is fierce controversy, fuelled by four key areas of scientific uncertainty and concern.</p> <p>The lack of clarity about precisely what technology is included in 5G; and a growing but far from comprehensive body of laboratory research indicating the biologically disruptive potential of RF-EMFs</p> <p>An almost total lack (as yet) of high quality epidemiological studies of the impact on human health from 5G EMF exposure</p> <p>Mounting epidemiological evidence of such effects from previous generations of RF-EMF exposure at lower levels</p> <p>Persistent allegations that some national telecomms regulatory authorities haven't based their RF-EMF safety policies on the latest science, amid potential conflicts of interest</p> <p>5G uses much higher frequency (3 to 300GHz) radio waves than in the past and it makes use of very new—and relatively unevaluated, in terms of safety—supportive technology to enable this higher data transmission capacity, points out Professor Frank.</p> <p>Its inherent fragility means that transmission boosting (cell) antennae are generally required every 100–300 m—which is far more spatially dense than the transmission masts required for older 2G, 3G and 4G technology, using lower frequency waves, he says.</p> <p>A dense transmission network is also required to achieve the (everywhere/anytime) connectivity promised by 5G developers.</p>