

## **MAST ACTION UK – LEGAL SERVICES**

**ALAN MEYER – CONSULTANT – HORSEY LIGHTLY  
(SOLICITORS)**

**12-15 Dartmouth Street, London SW1H 9BL**  
**TEL: 020 7222 8844 EMAIL: ameyer@horseylightly.com**

### **MOBILE PHONES – MOBILE NETWORKS – WIFI – SAFETY**

### **DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH/HEALTH PROTECTION AGENCY AND OFCOM RESPONSIBILITIES**

#### **OFCOM CONSULTATION**

Addressing the questions posed in paragraph 1.8 of your Executive Summary Mast Action UK would like to draw your attention to the following points which may possibly be relevant to some members of the UK general population as envisaged in paragraph 119 of the original May 2000 Stewart Report on Mobile Phones and Health.

1. An element of the UK population is to some varying degree Electro Hypersensitive – i.e. somewhere between 3% to 5% based upon the Swedish experience – see paragraph 63 of Mobile Phones and Health 2004 issued by the then NRPB at the instance again of Sir William Stewart.
2. Paragraphs 29 and 30 of the Planning Policy Guidance Circular PPG8 issued on 23 August 2001 make it clear that both local planning authorities and on appeal the Planning Inspectorate, could not take possible health effects or concerns into account. This circular was never stated by Ministers to be compliant with the ECHR as required by Law.
3. On 4 September 2008 the European Parliament by 522-16 resolved that the ICNIRP ‘Guidelines’ were obsolete and did not safeguard the EU’s Precautionary Approach.
4. Purely for the record in 1998 when a 2G mast was erected on the Milford Haven Fire Station 60 metres from the home of an epileptic two year old child, her fitting immediately jumped from a medically controlled two fits a week to 287 per month, until her family moved home away from the 2G mast. Ten years later the Judge in Cardiff High Court ordered the Local Education Authority to provide special needs education tuition at the same child’s home, when a 3G mast was erected too close to her mid-Wales special needs school and caused her again to have many fits a day.

In our experience in advising a number of couples adversely health affected by 2G masts Nicola’s plight was not a one-off situation. With the necessary 3G infilling bringing masts closer to homes there were more cases of affected people having to move home. With quadrupled 3G emission strengths some more people will be likely to be affected.

5. We would also draw your attention to Loscher & Kas 1998 Bavarian cows milk yield and calves birth abnormalities, and to the Schwarzenberg Berne 1996 radio transmitter Survey and Study by Berne University, which revealed the health effects experienced by 4,000 individual people who maintained daily health diaries for four months, caused by the shortwave radio transmissions from the transmitter located within this residential suburb of Berne. The transmitter for these health reasons was then closed down by the Government, despite the views of scientists.
6. Mast Action UK since its establishment in 2000 has helped individuals and local groups to oppose the unnecessary siting and location originally of 2G masts and base stations too close to peoples residences, when available alternative sites were ignored by telecoms operators for economic and ease of access reasons only.

With the infilling of 2G cells to accommodate 3G, more masts and base stations had to be erected even closer to peoples residences.

### **CONSULTATION RESPONSE**

Now this proposal to increase and quadruple the power of the 3G transmissions to improve coverage, and probably broadband delivery, is likely to adversely effect those members of the general population who have health conditions such as EHS, and may over time have other biological health effects, which only a long period of years exposure may reveal. - See again together paragraphs 117 and 119 of the original Stewart Mobile Phones and Health Report and its paragraph 118 and the later statements in paragraphs 63 and 64 of the later Report "Mobile Phones and Health 2004".