

BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET COUNCIL

MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETING

Thursday, 23rd July, 2020

Present:- **Councillors** Rob Appleyard, Tim Ball, Sarah Bevan, Colin Blackburn, Alison Born, Shelley Bromley, Neil Butters, Vic Clarke, Sue Craig, Paul Crossley, Gerry Curran, Chris Dando, Jess David, Tom Davies, Sally Davis, Douglas Deacon, Winston Duguid, Mark Elliott, Michael Evans, Andrew Furse, Kevin Guy, Alan Hale, Liz Hardman, Steve Hedges, Joel Hirst, Lucy Hodge, Duncan Hounsell, Shaun Hughes, Eleanor Jackson, Grant Johnson, Dr Kumar, Matt McCabe, Hal MacFie, Ruth Malloy, Paul May, Sarah Moore, Robin Moss, Paul Myers, Lisa O'Brien, Michelle O'Doherty, Bharat Pankhania, Vic Pritchard, Manda Rigby, Dine Romero, Mark Roper, Richard Samuel, Bruce Shearn, Brian Simmons, Alastair Singleton, Shaun Stephenson-McGall, Karen Walker, Sarah Warren, Karen Warrington, Andy Wait, Chris Watt, Ryan Wills, David Wood and Joanna Wright

Apologies for absence: **Councillors** June Player

14 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Dine Romero declared an 'other' interest in item 10 regarding the amendments to the Planning Delegation scheme as a shareholder of Aequus Developments Limited. [This declaration was made at the start of item 10, after which Councillor Romero withdrew from the meeting for the duration of the item].

The Monitoring Officer granted a dispensation for all Members of the Planning Committee to enable them to debate and vote on item 10 concerning the Planning Delegation scheme.

15 MINUTES - 26TH MAY 2020 AND 16TH JUNE 2020

On a motion from Councillor Dine Romero, seconded by Councillor Karen Walker, it was

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meetings of 26th May 2020 and 16th June 2020 are confirmed as a correct record. [These will be signed by the Chair in due course.]

16 ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL OR FROM THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE

The Chairman informed Councillors that the Council had been shortlisted for a prestigious award by the Municipal Journal for providing 'Leadership in responding to the Climate Emergency' and offered his congratulations to all those involved, and the Cabinet Member leading this work.

The Chairman invited the Leader of the Council to update Councillors on the latest Covid related issues and government funding. Councillor Dine Romero gave an update on 4 issues; finances and compensation schemes (details yet to be

confirmed), plans in the event of a local outbreak (the Local Outbreak Management plan) and the potential role of ward Councillors in this, the use of Local Authority powers (with no additional funding) and economic recovery and renewal.

17 TO ANNOUNCE ANY URGENT BUSINESS AGREED BY THE CHAIRMAN

There were no items of urgent business.

18 URGENT DECISION TO NOTE - AEQUUS LOAN AUTHORISATION

The Council noted that the Council Leader had made an urgent Shareholder decision on 28th May 2020 to authorise an Aequus Bounce Back Business Loan. This decision was made under Part 4G, rule 4 of the Constitution which requires that, following the decision, it will be reported to the next available Council meeting explaining the decision, the reasons for it and why the decision was treated as a matter of urgency.

Further details can be accessed here;

<https://democracy.bathnes.gov.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?ID=1397>

19 QUESTIONS, STATEMENTS, PETITIONS AND DEPUTATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

Statements were made by the following members of the public;

David Redgewell made a statement to Council about transport issues in the South West (a copy of which is attached to the online minutes). David highlighted the need to recover bus services (a WECA function with the involvement of the Cabinet Members), transport funding, cleaning and covid safety on transport infrastructure. Councillor Neil Butters asked David if he was aware of the update from WECA today discussing changes from 2nd August, to which David responded that he was, and he was grateful for the pressure being applied on WECA in this area. The statement was referred to the relevant Cabinet Members.

Mark MacDonnell made a statement to Councillors expressing his concern about the Council's finances and the vulnerable position B&NES finds itself in due to its particular income streams. He called upon the Council to look further ahead in its financial planning. He also expressed concern that the Guildhall remained closed when he felt the Council should be showing leadership and courage to the community. In response to a question from Councillor Richard Samuel asking if Mark was aware that the Financial Recovery plan approved earlier in July was only intended to stabilise the Council's Finances in this financial year and that longer term financial plans would be coming forward in the autumn, Mark responded that he was very glad to hear that. Councillor Paul Myers asked if, as a resident, Mark would feel more reassured if the Council got on with preparing a longer term Covid recovery plan now, to which he replied that he absolutely would. Councillor Karen Walker asked if Mark felt that a 5 year financial plan was needed, to which he replied that he did. Councillor Robin Moss asked Mark if he was aware that Public Health advice was currently to work from home if possible, to which Mark responded that he was

aware but felt that the Council should set an example and show that the city is open by opening up the Guildhall.

Emilio Pimentel-Reid made a statement (a copy of which is attached to the online minutes) as a concerned Bath resident about the future of Bath as a tourism destination. He questioned what measures the Council was taking to attract tourists to visit Bath and called upon the Council to give more support to the independent shops that make Bath unique. He asked for an alternative plan in the light of the Christmas market not going ahead and for further information to be made available about other measures the Council was taking for attracting tourism. Councillor Paul Myers asked if Emilio considered if the new arrangement for tourism (Visit Bath and Destination Bristol combining) would serve the interests of Bath and North East Somerset, to which Emilio responded that he doubted attractions in Radstock and Midsomer Norton would be a priority. The statement was referred to the relevant Cabinet Members.

20 PETITION - STOP 5G IN BATH

Statements were made by the following members of the public at this item;

Fiona Williams, lead petitioner, addressed the Council. She called upon Councillors to halt the rollout of 5G in Bath and North East Somerset. She explained that many of those who had signed had queried the need for the technology in the first place and wondered why there had been no consultation or risk assessments about the rollout. She mentioned Bath being involved in a smart test site, using a frequency which is known to be harmful to bees. Fiona described 5G problems being experienced by phone users in South Korea leading them to revert to 4G and expressed her view that 5G was really about collecting data providing companies with highly detailed and lucrative marketing profiles. This is part of a wider agenda threatening the right to freedom and to privacy. She discredited the claims that 5G provides no danger to health. Surely a precautionary approach is warranted in the Council's duty of care to its residents and she called upon the Council to pause the rollout while investigation takes place on all relevant aspects.

Vanessa Williams-Grey made a statement to Council about the health impacts of 5G, a copy of which is linked to the online minutes. Vanessa called for precautionary measures to be taken, particularly for vulnerable groups. She mentioned a number of studies citing links between health problems and exposure to wireless radiation. The Council has a duty of care to its citizens and must investigate this further.

Sarah Greensides had submitted a statement to Council about wildlife and the environmental aspects of 5G. As Sarah was unable to join the meeting, the Council noted her statement which had been circulated. A copy of which is also linked to the online minutes.

Samantha Davies made a statement to Council about the insurance, liability and risk aspects of 5G, a copy of which is linked to the online minutes. Samantha mentioned the risk of non-ionising radiation exposure and how the insurance industry now did not provide cover for this and are re-writing contracts to reduce their liability.

Samantha called upon the Council to prepare contingency plans against future claims from exposure to radiation exposure.

Paul McLachlan made a statement to Council about the personal effect of 5G on his family's health, a copy of which is linked to the online minutes. Paul described the steps he had taken to establish his electro hyper-sensitivity and asked what effect this will have on the wider population.

Karen Churchill made the closing statement to Council on this issue, a copy of which is linked to the online minutes. Karen described peer review science showing harm, so careful consideration was needed before adding 5G. We are currently relying on telecoms companies self-certifying and there is insufficient regulation. Karen called upon the Council to apply the precautionary principle as described in the petition, risk assess appropriately and establish a working group with them to address this.

Under procedure rule 34, the Chair asked if the Leaders of the 2 larger groups required a 10 minute debate on this issue.

Councillor Dine Romero thanked the petitioners and explained that they would not be able to debate this issue as it was an issue for national government. She recommended the petitioners make contact with their local MPs. She proposed that the petition be passed to the relevant Cabinet Members to respond to the points raised in the petition. Councillor Paul Myers supported this course of action.

21 TREASURY MANAGEMENT OUTTURN REPORT 2019/20

The Council considered the Treasury Management Outturn report 2019/20.

On a motion from Councillor Richard Samuel, seconded by Councillor Mark Elliott, it was

RESOLVED unanimously

1. To note the Treasury Management Report to 31st March 2020, prepared in accordance with the CIPFA Treasury Code of Practice; and
2. To note the Treasury Management Indicators to 31st March 2020.

22 AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION

The Council considered a report seeking amendments to the Constitution regarding the Planning Delegation scheme.

On a motion from Councillor Tim Ball, seconded by Councillor Paul Myers, it was

RESOLVED unanimously

1. To agree the revised Planning Delegation scheme for adoption (attached at Appendix 1 of the report) in relation to the points as described in section 3.1 – 3.3, with the addition of the words “and Vice Chair”, so that the scheme reads

as follows “7. Any applications for which the Council or ADL (Aequus Developments Limited) is the applicant, involving more than two properties, will be reported to the Planning Committee unless the Chair and Vice Chair of the Planning Committee deem them too trivial, in which case they will be dealt with under officer delegation”; and agree that this revision will apply to all Council and ADL applications pending consideration.

[Notes;

1. During debate, an amendment was moved by Councillor Grant Johnson and seconded by Councillor Robin Moss to add wording expressing regret that this change had not come early enough to prevent the building of gas generators. This was lost on a vote of 4 Councillors in favour, 1 abstention and 52 Councillors voting against.
2. Council noted that the Advice note on Bullying & Harassment had already been adopted by Council on 10 October 2019 so no decision was needed.]

23 MOTION FROM THE LIBERAL DEMOCRAT GROUP - ECOLOGICAL EMERGENCY

On a motion from Councillor Jess David, seconded by Councillor Paul May, it was

RESOLVED unanimously that

Council acknowledges that:

1. On 10 October 2019, the Council’s Climate Emergency Progress Report recognised the ecological emergency, noting specifically: species extinction, loss of habitat and the connectivity of habitats, decline in the pollinators that are crucial to food supply, and the loss of and decline in the health and quantity of soil. The Council recognised that the climate and ecological emergencies are both the result of over-exploitation of the earth’s resources and poor land management.
2. The report recognised the long and strong history of work on biodiversity, landscape and ecology in Bath and North East Somerset, including a range of strategies, partnerships and projects, both at local and West of England level that are delivering action related to the ecological emergency.
3. In late 2018, the UN’s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) issued their special report raising the alarm and calling for much more radical and rapid action to reduce carbon emissions from the burning of fossil fuels to avert climate catastrophe, which inspired the School Strikes 4 Climate and Extinction Rebellion and has resulted in over two thirds of UK local authorities declaring a Climate Emergency.
4. In May 2019, the UN’s Intergovernmental Science Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) similarly raised the alarm about the urgent ecological emergency the world also faces. The UK’s State of Nature 2019 report also highlights the critical decline in biodiversity in the UK.

5. The survival of our society and economy depends absolutely on the health of the natural environment and ecosystems, providing, for example, clean water and air, food, timber, flood protection, mental and physical health and well-being and, as is now being recognised, carbon sequestration.
6. In terms of the relationship between the climate and ecological emergencies, both the IPCC and the UK's Climate Change Committee make clear that whilst reducing carbon from fossil fuels is the top priority for tackling the climate emergency, it is also necessary to find ways to increase carbon absorption, or sequestration, by the natural environment, by, for example, tree planting, peatland restoration, different methods of land management and improved agricultural practices that enable carbon to be drawn down into the soil on a large scale.
7. The October Council report recognised Bath and North East Somerset has an opportunity to increase the sequestration of carbon by trees, grassland and soil, and that further work would be needed, involving a range of stakeholders in order to balance this complex set of natural environment issues:
 - a. Increasing biodiversity and protection of habitats and species, including key pollinators and other insects;
 - b. Increasing carbon sequestration;
 - c. Increasing soil quality and quantity, reducing chemical fertilisers and pesticides and preventing soil erosion;
 - d. Increasing local food production, utilising local productive capacity, through less intensive agricultural methods, as a number of local farmers already do;
 - e. Increasing flood defence, natural flood mitigation measures, natural shading as the climate change;
 - f. Protecting our natural landscape and enhancing the natural capital and ecosystem services it provides, whilst enabling sensitive renewable energy development and enabling more people to benefit from time spent in nature.
8. The Government's Climate Change Committee has set a target of doubling tree cover in the UK by 2050. As part of the West of England Nature Partnership, through its Nature Recovery Network, Bath and North East Somerset has an ambition of doing so by 2060. Work is currently underway to produce a West of England Tree and Woodland Plan on how this could be brought forward, taking into account loss of trees through ash die-back.
9. Through the Bathscape Partnership, led by the Council, work is underway to look at the best ways of managing and increasing tree cover in the Bathscape area and the Council will be producing a Tree and Woodland Strategy during 2020-21, for the whole of Bath and North East Somerset.
10. The Government's new Environment Bill will mandate a requirement for 10% biodiversity net gain (BNG), building on the existing National Planning Policy requirement for new development.

11. The West of England Joint Green Infrastructure Strategy 2020-2030 work programme has produced West of England BNG Guidance and work is now underway to produce a road map for implementation. This work will integrate with delivery of the West of England Nature Recovery Network.
12. There are major opportunities for enhancing nature through regional and local strategies and plans, including spatial policies and strategy for the West of England, the Joint Local Transport Plans and the Bath and North East Somerset's Local Plan Partial Review as well as the West of England Nature Recovery Network and West of England Joint Green Infrastructure Strategy.
13. In February 2020, the Bath and North East Somerset Council Corporate Strategy 2020-24 was approved by Council and contains the new core policy 'tackling the climate and nature emergency', noting that this, alongside the other new core policy of 'giving people a bigger say', 'will shape everything we do'.

Therefore, alongside the work already underway, this Council formally declares an ecological emergency and will:

14. Promote its existing core policy of 'tackling the climate and nature emergency' as stated in the B&NES Corporate Strategy and ensure that this policy drives what the Council does.
15. Work with partners locally and regionally in the West of England to drive coordinated leadership and collaborative action on 'tackling the climate and nature emergency'.
16. Ensure the delivery of biodiversity and environmental enrichment and resist destruction of habitats through planning policy and development management.
17. Review the Bath and North East Somerset Green Infrastructure Strategy during 2020-21 and use it as the nature emergency delivery framework and to increase local targets, whilst ensuring these are promoted through local and regional partnerships and embedded in local natural environment delivery projects such as Bathscape and Waterspace and management and connectivity of parks and green spaces and water spaces.
18. Through the Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan Partial Review (2020), consider the potential to increase the percentage of biodiversity net gain beyond that required by the new Environment Bill and promote the same conversation within the West of England.
19. Identify appropriate areas for habitat restoration within Bath and North East Somerset for wildlife.
20. Continue to collaborate with our communities, businesses and other organisations, existing networks and partnerships, schools, colleges and universities, to improve ecological literacy and encourage greater biodiversity, tree-planting and management.

21. Continue to work with our West of England partners to update the existing ecological audit.
22. Continue to support the West of England Nature Partnership, as the region's local nature partnership (LNP), to deliver a Nature Recovery Network at landscape scale.

24 MOTION FROM THE LABOUR GROUP - COMMUNITY CONTRIBUTION FUND

On a motion from Councillor Robin Moss, seconded by Councillor Winston Duguid, it was

RESOLVED that

Council notes:

1. The introduction of Community Contribution Fund by Westminster City Council in 2018 which has given residents in the highest valued properties the opportunity to contribute more to their local community on a voluntary basis. The scheme is managed by a Charitable Trust which allows Gift Aid, and any money raised is spent on local discretionary projects in three specific areas: helping young people; extra support for people who find themselves sleeping on Westminster's streets; and tackling isolation and loneliness across all age groups. Since its introduction, the scheme has generated an additional £1M.
2. That a growing number of councils are preparing to follow Westminster City Council's example.
3. That there are currently 437 Band H properties in B&NES (after allowing for adjustments for discounts applied, this equates to an equivalent of 376 dwellings). The B&NES element of Council Tax for Band H properties (i.e. comprising Council Tax and Adult Social Care Precept but excluding police, fire and parish precepts) is £2,913.76. If all Band H Council Tax payers paid 100% extra, the additional revenue would be about £1.096M.
4. Further notes that the Council Tax team has fielded enquiries from Council Tax payers in other Bands who may be willing to make a voluntary contribution.

Council believes:

5. That addressing the chronic underfunding of local government requires a fair and progressive funding settlement. In the absence of this, the Council, in its community leadership role, should enable residents who wish to pay more for additional projects reflecting local priorities to be able to do so.

Council therefore resolves:

6. To agree in principle to introduce a Community Contribution Fund from 2021/22, but to ask the Corporate Policy Development and Scrutiny Panel to

consider and report back to Council with recommendations on how it might work in practice including:

- a. Whether to adopt an inclusive approach inviting all Council Tax payers to contribute or whether it should be limited to those in Band H;
- b. The vehicle for managing any new Community Contribution Fund;
- c. The mechanism for identifying local priorities for support; and
- d. The means of consulting with residents on the introduction of any such Fund.

[Notes;

1. *The above resolution was carried with 4 Councillors voting against and 54 Councillors voting in favour.]*

25 MOTION FROM THE LABOUR GROUP - BLACK LIVES MATTER

On a motion from Councillor Grant Johnson, seconded by Councillor Dr Kumar, it was

RESOLVED that

Council notes:

- 1 With great sadness the killing of George Floyd in the United States and the justified outpouring of hurt and anger across the globe that followed his death.
- 2 Official figures showing that in 2018-19, the police in England and Wales were three times more likely to arrest a black person than a white person and five times more likely to use force. Black people were more than nine times as likely to be stopped and searched.
- 3 Since 1990, 1,743 people in England and Wales have died following contact with the police. As a proportion of the population, black people are more than twice as likely to die in police custody and force or restraint is more than twice as likely to be involved in their deaths.
- 4 The government's review into the impact of coronavirus has shown that black men and women are nearly twice as likely to die than white people in England and Wales.

Council believes:

- 5 Racism remains a shameful aspect of life in Bath and North East Somerset as elsewhere and must be confronted.

Council therefore resolves:

- 6 To stand in solidarity with protesters who are seeking to challenge the structural racism which exists in our society.
- 7 To play its full part in working to address deep-seated inequalities by:
 - (i) examining the culture of the Council;

- (ii) consulting stakeholders to ensure that the Council meets the needs of those it serves;
- (iii) reviewing its Corporate Equality Commitment and Equality Objectives to include additional specific race equality actions, including establishing a Race Equality Panel, and identifying the means to monitor progress towards race equality; and
- (iv) considering how the work identified above should be taken forward and the timescales and mechanism for reporting back.

[Notes;

1. *During debate, an amendment was moved by Councillor Karen Walker and seconded by Councillor Paul Myers (which had been circulated to all Members) to re-word various points and remove the establishment of a Race Equality Panel. This was lost with 14 Councillors voting in favour and 44 Councillors voting against.*
2. *The above successful resolution was carried with 56 Councillors voting in favour and 2 Councillors abstaining.]*

26 JOINT MOTION - CONSERVATIVE & INDEPENDENT GROUP - 5 YR FINANCIAL PLAN

On a motion from Councillor Richard Samuel, seconded by Councillor Dine Romero, it was

RESOLVED that

1. Council notes and welcomes the decisions taken by the Cabinet to ensure that a balanced budget outcome is achieved for 2020/21 and calls upon the government to fully compensate for losses of commercial income and assistance to outsourced leisure operations currently excluded from the Income Compensation grant announced on 1st July.
2. Councils also notes that the Medium-term Financial Strategy will be revised for approval in the coming months and will, in line with recent practice, cover the period to March 2024.

[Notes;

1. *At the start of the item, Councillor Paul Myers sought clarification (under Constitution Part 4A, rule 36) as to whether the proposed Liberal Democrat amendment which had been circulated to all Councillors was valid on the basis that he considered it negated the original motion. The Monitoring Officer confirmed that it had been deemed valid, as it sought to achieve something which could not be achieved by simply voting against the motion. The Chairman confirmed that, on that basis, he would accept the amendment.*
2. *The original motion was moved by Councillor Paul Myers and seconded by Councillor Colin Blackburn.*
3. *Councillor Robin Moss moved an amendment, seconded by Councillor Liz Hardman, to add the words "which does not put the burden on the most disadvantaged and avoids cutting vital services" to the end of the joint Conservative and Independent motion. This was accepted into the substantive by the mover of the motion.*
4. *The above resolution, when moved as an amendment, was carried with 37 Councillors voting in favour and 18 Councillors voting against.*
5. *The substantive motion was carried with 37 Councillors in favour, 13 Councillors voting against and 7 abstentions.]*

27 QUESTIONS, STATEMENTS, PETITIONS AND DEPUTATIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

There were no items.

The meeting ended at 10.02 pm

Chair

Date Confirmed and Signed

Prepared by Democratic Services

This page is intentionally left blank

David Redgewell statement

Dear Councillors

We are still very concerned about the west of England bus recovery plan but we are pleased with the progress being made by the on bringing back bus services.

From the 2nd August 2020 the 37 trunk route service between Bath Spa bus and coach station to Weston, Kelston, Bitton, Longwell Green, Hanham, St George. Lawrence hill station, Bristol bus and coach station will be restored although

we still have 11 routes still not operational. including route 18 Bath bus and coach station via Keynsham, route 178 Bristol to Radstock via Brislington and Keynsham, route 96 Brislington to Hengrove via Knowle, X2 Bristol bus station to Yatton, Worle and Weston Super Mare.

With government instructions to bring the network level back to 80% we still do not have a proper bus service to Marshfield even after 4 months (route 35).

The Marshfield to Bristol City City Centre bus service stopped operation without any public consultation due to covid 19. As of the 31st March 2020 this was a South Gloucestershire council tendered bus service so can we again ask the WECA mayoral transport authority if this service is going to be retendered or reinstated

We want the Y2 Bristol bus and coach station to Yate bus station and Chipping Sodbury via Fishponds evening service reinstated as well as the T2 service from Bristol Bus and coach station via Gloucester road and Cribbs Causeway bus station to Thornbury as a matter of urgency.

There is an urgent need for these services to be reinstated for local journeys in the evening.

The WECA mayoral transport authority has a duty to provide services under Government guidance on Covid 19 by accessing the bus operators grant but is failing to carry this out with a passenger consultation like Somerset County Council Wiltshire or Gloucestershire County Council have done. The Government is not expecting the transport authority to reinstate evening and weekend services it seems.

Bus grants are helping to restore services in Gloucester, Cheltenham, Stroud, Swindon, Bournemouth, Poole, Christchurch, Cornwall and Plymouth in the South West region.

It is very disappointing that we still have no public enquiry line at the WECA mayoral transport authority.

Since public transport services transferred from Bristol city council, South Gloucestershire County Council and Bath and North East Somerset enforcement of face coverings is required on public transport but it is also the case that exemptions do apply for those who have respiratory/ health conditions including hypertension and masks should be made available to vulnerable public transport users by transport staff to those have been unable to obtain one. The mask wearing opt out is not well publicised by local authorities at bus stops or in the local new media and rigid mask wearing enforcement without the general public being informed of their rights could mean that vulnerable customers being refused travel. Can the issue of proportionate enforcement be raised with Sue Mountstevens, the Police and Crime Sommissioner, and Chief Constable Andy Marsh, Bristol Port Police and the British Transport Police.

As bus regulations have changed to allow 18 passengers on a single decker and 35 on a double decker bus and 60 on a 3 car train on the Bristol Temple Meads, Filton Abbey Wood, Bristol Parkway, Yate, Cam & Dursey, Gloucester and Cheltenham services, the Severn Beach line and the main line to South Wales via Patchway and Pilning we need regular deep cleaning of buses and trains, bus shelters, bus and railway stations and enforcement on face coverings.

Realtime information is still not operational on bus stops, interchanges and bus stations.

We note that there are issues with bus and cycle lane paint markings fading on Metro bus routes and elsewhere which make them unclear for cyclists and other transport users and urge that an audit is carried out to rectify any problems. An example of this at the Lawrence Hill inbound bus lane by Ducie Road on the 37 route. It also appears that not all BANES bus shelters are being cleaned and that the passenger information points at Bath Spa bus and coach station and Wells bus station are still closed even though others at Stroud, Gloucester and Cheltenham have reopened.

Tourism is worth 1.4 billion pound to the economy of Greater Bristol and Bath and is important to public transport.

Western Gateway transport board.

We are also extremely concerned about the consultation of the western gateway transport board plan and the lack of public consultation on this vital regional plan during the covid 19 emergency.

The fact that the region has 2 transport boards is not supported by any environmental or transport group holds us back in the view of the regional Travel Watch South West organisation. We are unhappy that Somerset is split in half as a county a bit like East and West Germany. Partition is good in British history and now exists in the 7 countries of the South West.

This will also impact on local government proposed reorganisation in Somerset.

The issue that concerns us the most is the lack of a clear regional bus and coach network policy. There is no clear investment strategy for Transport interchanges such as Bristol Temple Meads station as a major station in the South West of England or Bristol Parkway, no clear regionally important bus or coach links such as Bristol bus and coach station to Cribbs Causeway bus station and Chepstow bus station, or Bath Spa bus station to Trowbridge, Warminster, Salisbury, Bristol Airport, Churchill, Bridgwater, Taunton, Cullompton, Exeter, Newton abbot, Plymouth apart from the limited South West Falcon coach services or Chepstow bus station to Gloucester bus station link nor are there services from Thornbury to Gloucester bus station. The 376 service from Bristol bus and coach station to Wells, Glastonbury and Street is now running at increased frequency.

We welcome the reference to the Bristol Bath city region bus network and Gloucester Cheltenham bus network.

Bournemouth Poole and Christchurch network.

The plan has no rural transport policy. We welcome the railway policy and reference to Metro West and Regional railway routes but we appear to have no clear priority on station investment with Greater Bristol competing with Bournemouth, Poole and Christchurch Dorset for public transport network investment.

There is again a wish list of rural road improvements in Wiltshire and Dorset. The main railway network from London Paddington, Bristol Temple Meads to Penzance via Taunton, Exeter and Plymouth is seen as less important than a road from Bristol and the M4 to Poole.

Ports and Airports investment are not made clear. Is investment more important in the port of Poole than Weymouth or the port of Bristol, or Bournemouth Airport, Bristol Airport or Exeter Airport.

The region's main focus is not Bristol to Bath and Bournemouth-Poole's road system as the main road and Rail links go to Gloucester Cheltenham, Birmingham, Bristol, Taunton, Exeter, Plymouth and Cornwall or from Bristol to Newport and Cardiff.

Having seen clear investment plans by the Northern Powerhouse and The Midlands Engine, this plan needs considerable work on it and integration with the South West transport board plans. This not a region transport plan for investment post covid 19 having read the West Midlands plan. These concerns are also expressed by Sera South West and Transport for Greater Bristol. The closing date for the consultation is 31st of July 2020.

David Redgewell South West Transport Network and Railfuture Severnside.

This page is intentionally left blank

Council Meeting/ 23 July

Statement: Emilio Pimentel-Reid

STARTS

Hello I'm Emilio Pimentel-Reid

I speak to you as a Bath resident who is concerned about the council's neglect of our future as a tourist destination worth visiting.

We understand that there are plans to create a new management organization to combine the efforts of Visit Bath and Destination Bristol. In this sort of arrangement does anyone actually believe that Bath will be prioritized?

Bath Echo and Manda Rigby claim on the record that only back office functions will be combined to save money. Who is anyone kidding, when Kathryn Davis the Interim chief executive of Visit Bath is also the Head of Tourism -at destination Bristol. What happens to Bath ?

Residents have already expressed anger at the job losses and closure of the Bath Visitor Information Centre - what else will follow from there?

While we lose our welcoming identity in the tourism landscape, the council seems to lack the vision and direction to protect the independent shops that have made Bath unique, instead choosing to subsidise billionaire-owned businesses like House of Fraser/ Jolly's while local retailers are put to the sword.

To makes matters worse, B&NES seems to lack the understanding that in the immediate future people will travel to shops by car while avoiding public transport. Shockingly B&NES has used this very moment to make parking in some of our shopping streets even more difficult - if not impossible.

Today we hear that the Christmas Market will not be taking place this year and yet no alternative plan is offered. This is really bad PR for our city. Surely B&NES should have announced an exciting & considered alternative initiative first? The council already looks like it is completely out of ideas.

Is there a long-term plan? Does B&NES have a strategy? Is there any joined up thinking and where can we read about it?

To the vast majority of residents who love our city this does not appear to be the case.

ENDS

This page is intentionally left blank

Statement to Full Council – Bath and North East Somerset Council Health effects from 5G

The current government advice from Public Health England on potential health effects from 5G is that *“the overall exposure is expected to remain low relative to guidelines and, as such, there should be no consequences for public health.”*

But in February this year, PHE posted on their website “uncertainties in the science suggest some additional level of precaution is warranted” and “excessive use of mobile phones by children should be discouraged”. This advice has not been promoted in any public health information campaign and yet surely the public have a right to be informed about this?

Today, in bringing this petition to pause the rollout of 5G, we are asking for just such a **precautionary approach**. This is to protect the public, especially vulnerable groups such as children, unborn babies, pregnant women, the elderly, those with chronic health conditions and the electrically sensitive, from possible health effects.

We are told that there is no scientific basis for opposing 5G on health grounds. However, the December 2018 issue of The Lancet cited an evaluation of nearly 2300 studies which found that 68% demonstrated significant biological or health effects associated with exposure to electromagnetic fields.

The official position is that non-ionising radiation, such as that used in 5G, is safe as it does not have sufficient power to cause a heating (thermal) effect on the body. To measure such effects, the telecoms industry use a water-filled dummy's head subjected to very short exposures, nothing like real-life conditions!

A study from May 2020 into adverse health effects of 5G technology under real-life conditions concluded that it would not only affect the skin and eyes, but would have adverse effects over the entire body. These include cumulative effects from other toxic exposures, chemical and biological. They also looked at the impact of pulsed signals used in 5G, which are not covered by industry testing.

A recent review of research on health effects in populations living within 400 metres of a mobile mast found evidence of cancer clusters and other adverse health effects in 32 out of 33 studies [links below].

Another [major study has found a clear link between exposure to wireless radiation and infertility.](#)

In 2011, the World Health Organization classified the radiofrequency and microwave emissions from wireless technology as a class 2B possible carcinogen. There are now calls for a reclassification to class 2A (probable) or even class 1 (definite) carcinogen.

It's not only cancer. Radiofrequency radiation affects our cells long before cancer develops. Our body reacts with oxidative stress and inflammatory processes.

When the exposure is repeated or prolonged, these mechanisms are maintained and may cause effects including sleep disorders, cognitive impairment - eventually leading to dementia - and disturbed reproductive function causing infertility. They also cause damage to cells and DNA.

The consequences for health can be all the more serious because:

- exposure is repeated and/or prolonged,
- radiation from wireless technologies is not constant but is pulsed and polarized,
- some individuals may be more vulnerable, especially children, due to their thinner skulls and the fact that their lifetime exposure will be longer.

The Council has a duty of care to all its citizens, and liability for public health, but surely above all a responsibility to its most vulnerable, including future generations.

Thank you.

Not for reading out – reference only

Reference 1. Worldwide list of all peer-reviewed scientific studies of human health around mobile phone base stations, as of end May 2020. Out of 33 studies, 32 (or 97%) report health problems.

- 1. Santini et al. (2002) Five hundred and thirty people living near mobile phone base stations in France reported headaches, sleep disturbances, discomfort, irritability, depression, memory loss, and concentration problems. These effects were more pronounced the closer people lived to the mast.*
- 2. Navarro et al. (2003) This Spanish study found that the greater the power density of microwaves in the home, the more severe were complaints of depression, fatigue, sleeping disorders, concentration problems, headaches, irritability, memory problems, loss of appetite, nausea, audio and visual dysfunction, dizziness, and cardiovascular problems.*
- 3. Bortkiewicz et al. (2004) This Polish study 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."*
- 4. Eger et al. (2004) 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 cellphone masts within 400 metres, compared with people living further away.*
- 5. Rösli (2004) This Swiss survey study reported that out of 429 questionnaires returned, 394 people reported symptoms from mobile phone tower exposure. Fifty-eight percent of these symptomatic people suffered headaches, 19% nervous stress, and 18% fatigue, while concentration difficulties were the most common complaint.*
- 6. Wolf and Wolf (2004) 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 cellphone mast for a period of between three and seven years. Among women in the 350-metre group, the increase in cancer was 10 times the norm, compared with people living in other areas of the city.*
- 7. Hutter et al. (2005) Three hundred and sixty-five people living near 10 cellphone masts in urban and rural Austria were studied. Reported symptoms of radiation included: headache, vertigo, tremors, cold hands and feet, exhaustion, difficulty concentrating, stress, and the urge for sleep. Radiation levels were 0.2 to 0.4 volts per metre, hundreds of times lower than legal US exposure standards of 47 to 61 volts per metre. Higher exposures showed higher percentages of health complaints.*
- 8. Abdel-Rassoul et al. (2006) Residents living beneath or adjacent to a long-established mobile phone mast with numerous antennas in Egypt reported significantly higher occurrences of headaches, memory changes, dizziness, tremors, depressive symptoms and sleep disturbance than did a control group.*
- 9. Meyer et al. (2006) compared the cancer incidence among 177,428 persons living in 48 municipalities in Bavaria between 2002 and 2003 in relation to base station coverage. "Cancer incidence was not found to be elevated in municipalities with cellular telephone relay stations. The cancer incidence was highly variable in areas without any relay station." This is the only study of human health around base stations that did not find any problems.*
- 10. Preece et al. (2007) A study of three villages in Cyprus found "a considerable excess of migraine, headache and dizziness, which appears to share a gradient with radiofrequency exposure" that was mostly due to mobile phone base station radiation.*

11. Eger et al. (2009) The Bavarian town of Selbitz conducted a health survey of 251 residents exposed to cell tower radiation at no more than 1 volt per metre. The study found a significant correlation, depending on dose exposure, for: insomnia, depression, cerebral symptoms, joint illnesses, infections, skin changes, heart and circulation disorders, disorders of vision/ hearing, and gastrointestinal problems.
12. Kundi and Hutter (2009) This important independent review of base station studies reported "strong indications that long-term exposure near base stations affects wellbeing. Symptoms most often associated with exposure were headaches, concentration difficulties, restlessness, and tremor. Sleeping problems were also related to distance from base station or power density."
13. Leitgeb et al. (2008) This study looked at the sleep patterns of 43 subjects when true- and sham-shielded from base station radiation in their homes. Four of the subjects showed dramatic changes in sleep patterns when exposed to the radiation.
14. Augner and Hacker (2009) This study examined relationships among 57 subjects to see if they were affected by living near base stations. Those reporting living near base stations "had significantly higher concentrations of alpha-amylase in their saliva, higher rates in symptom checklist subscales somatization, obsessive-compulsive, anxiety, phobic anxiety, and global strain index PST (Positive Symptom Total) ... EMF-related health concerns cannot explain these findings."
15. Elliott et al. (2010) For this study, researchers from Imperial College London looked at almost 7,000 children and explored whether there was any correlation between a mother living near a mobile phone base station during her pregnancy and that child's risk of developing cancer. While the study claimed not to find a pattern, there was in fact a 16% increase in childhood leukaemias at intermediate distances from towers.
16. Khurana et al. (2010) 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."
17. Levitt and Lai (2010) This independent review looked at reports and studies indicating "headaches, skin rashes, sleep disturbances, depression, decreased libido, increased rates of suicide, concentration problems, dizziness, memory changes, increased risk of cancer, tremors, and other neurophysiological effects in populations near base stations."
18. Dode et al. (2011) 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 cellphone 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.
19. Buchner et al. (2011) In this study conducted in Bavaria, Germany, urine samples of 60 study participants were analysed for their adrenaline, noradrenaline, dopamine, and phenylethylamine (PEA) levels before and after the activation of a new GSM cell tower. After activation, the stress hormone levels increased significantly, while dopamine and PEA levels decreased substantially. Sleep problems, headaches, allergies, dizziness, and concentration problems were common. This study indicates that base station radiation induces radical dose-responsive changes in human stress hormones.
20. Li et al. (2012) This Taiwanese study focused on childhood tumours in relation to RF exposure from cell towers erected between 1998 and 2007. Researchers calculated the annual power emitted by all 71,185 cell towers in Taiwan and compared the calculated exposure of populations in each irradiated township: "This study noted a significantly increased risk of all tumours in children with higher-than-median RF exposure to mobile phone base stations."
21. Eskander et al. (2012) This Egyptian cellphone tower study focused on the changes in human hormone profiles. Blood samples were taken from volunteers prior to the installation of a base station. Following installation, ongoing samples were taken which showed a significant decrease in volunteers' ACTH, cortisol, thyroid hormones, prolactin for young females, and testosterone levels.
22. Navarro et al. (2013) An extension of their earlier study, this found significant correlations with lack of appetite; lack of concentration; irritability; and trouble sleeping. Controls for demographic factors and other possible risk factors were applied. Concerns about exposure did not affect the strong and direct association between exposure and sleep disorders.
23. Shahbazi et al. (2014) This Iranian study was conducted on 250 randomly selected people living near cell towers. Statistically significant symptoms included: nausea, headache, dizziness, irritability, discomfort, nervousness, depression, sleep disturbances, memory loss, and lack of libido among people living within 300 metres of the cellphone towers, compared with those living further away. While this paper appears to have been retracted for no given reason, it is recorded here for interest, given the health situation in Iran with the COVID-19 outbreak.
24. Gandhi et al. (2014) This case-control study evaluated genetic damage in individuals living in the vicinity of cellphone towers. The blood of irradiated subjects showed significantly elevated DNA damage compared with non-irradiated control subjects matched for gender, age, and other factors. Females were especially affected by cellphone tower DNA damage.
25. Shiniyo et al. (2014) This study documents the myriad serious health effects suffered by condominium inhabitants living under rooftop antennas in Japan, who were examined by medical professionals. Every single one of a long list of illnesses suffered by the residents during their years of exposure improved after the antennas were deactivated. The symptoms ascribed to microwave radiation include numerous neurological dysfunctions, eye damage, severe fatigue, and tumours.
26. Meo et al. (2015) This Saudi Arabian study examined 159 students with varying exposure to base station radiation and found significantly elevated levels of glycolated haemoglobin (HbA1c) and risk of type 2 diabetes among those with high exposures.
27. Pachua (2014) This Indian study looked at 64 adults living at varying distances from a base station. Complaints of fatigue, nausea, dizziness and muscle pain were significantly higher from those living within 50 metres of the base station.

28. Golati et al. (2016) Scientists studied 116 persons exposed to radiation from mobile towers and 106 control subjects. The researchers looked for DNA damage in peripheral blood lymphocytes using alkaline comet assay and micronucleus assay in mouth tissue cells. They found significant DNA damage among cellphone tower subjects as compared with the non-irradiated control group, including increased micronucleus frequencies. Micronuclei are known precursors for cancer.
29. Prakash et al. (2016) This study of 181 inhabitants of Bangalore found that "headache, irritability, nausea, appetite loss, discomfort, sleep disturbance, depression, memory loss difficulty in concentration and dizziness, etc., are more frequently observed symptoms of ill-health in the exposed groups. It is concluded that the cell phones and cell phone tower radiation are a strong risk factor for all the adverse health effects."
30. Singh et al. (2016) This Indian study examined the general health and salivary function of 20 persons living near base stations and 20 on their periphery. "It was unveiled that a majority of the subjects who were residing near the mobile base station complained of sleep disturbances, headache, dizziness, irritability, concentration difficulties, and hypertension. A majority of the study subjects had significantly lesser stimulated salivary secretion ($P < 0.01$) as compared to the control subjects."
31. Siersma et al. (2016) Medical scientists from Denmark and Sweden launched an electronic questionnaire posted to special interest websites. The questionnaire requested feedback on symptoms suffered by people exposed to cell phones, Wi-Fi, occupational radiation, energy-saving light bulbs and cell towers. Of 60 respondents, significant associations were noted for both chronic exposure to Wi-Fi and for cell tower exposure. Symptoms associated with tower antennas included: cognitive, head, eye, body and skin problems. The report noted: "Mobile phone towers seem to be the most problematic of the various EMF exposures."
32. Zothansiana et al. (2017) looked at cultured human peripheral blood lymphocytes of individuals residing in the vicinity of mobile phone base stations, compared with healthy controls. This Indian study matched the groups for various demographic data including age, gender, dietary pattern, smoking habit, alcohol consumption, duration of mobile phone use and average daily mobile phone use. The 40 exposed subjects showed significantly higher frequencies of micronuclei, changes in glutathione, and increased oxidative stress, compared with controls.
33. Meo et al. (2018) This Saudi Arabian study examined 217 students at two schools with varying exposures to base station radiation. Significant impairment in motor screening tasks and spatial working memory tasks was identified among the group of students who were exposed to high levels of base station radiation. "High exposure was associated with delayed fine and gross motor skills, spatial working memory, and attention in school adolescents compared to students who were exposed to low RF-EMF."

Reference 2: Isabel Wilke: Biological and pathological effects of 2.45 GHz radiation on cells, fertility, brain, and behaviour (January 2018)

Statement to Full Council – Impact of 5G on Wildlife & the Environment (Sarah Greensides)

The telecoms industry has produced safety guidelines for human beings exposed to wireless radiation. However, there are no equivalent safety guidelines for wildlife.

The higher frequencies used in 5G technology are known to be particularly damaging to insect and bird populations.

A 2018 study showed how the shorter wavelengths in higher frequencies are absorbed more easily by insects' bodies, creating a heating effect. There were increases in absorbed power up to 370% when the insects, including honeybees, were exposed to these frequencies, with detrimental effects on their behaviour and health.

As part of the Bristol is Open smart city 5G programme, we are told that “within the City of Bath... 60 GHz mmWave fronthaul network capacity exists between the Guildhall and Roman Baths sites”. 60 Gigahertz is a high frequency.

There is already convincing evidence that 3G and 4G cause harm to wildlife, in particular our birds and pollinating insects such as bees who use electromagnetic fields for navigation and migration, and may be an important factor in colony collapse disorder. 4G will continue to be used alongside 5G.

In a 2010 study, researchers “compared the performance of honeybees in cell phone radiation exposed and unexposed colonies. A significant decline in colony strength and in the egg laying rate of the queen was observed. The behaviour of exposed foragers was negatively influenced by the exposure, there was neither honey nor pollen in the colony at the end of the experiment.”

A 2013 review of 113 peer reviewed studies showed that in 70% of the studies, wireless radiation had a significant effect on birds, insects, other vertebrates, other organisms and plants. The greatest impact was on development and reproduction of birds and insects.

We are told that smart cities and interconnected gadgets will mean we are more energy efficient and can monitor air pollution and traffic flows. Yet ‘smart’ technology is carbon intensive, requiring mining of raw materials, manufacture and transportation, as well as waste from disposal of old gadgets and appliances. In 2018-19, data centres for the Internet and the servers that power them, produced more carbon emissions than aviation.

And what about trees? There has already been felling of thousands of healthy mature trees in areas earmarked for 5G, including along railway lines as Network Rail has plans for 5G across the entire rail network. Research by the University of Surrey refers to trees as an obstruction as their wet foliage can block the shorter wavelengths used in 5G. Felling of mature trees is at odds with climate change mitigation which requires the planting of more trees and the preservation of existing ones.

In a time of climate emergency, and when scientists have declared an insect apocalypse and when forests are under threat, is it not reckless in the extreme to roll out street level Wi-Fi,

4G and 5G on our lamp posts and other street furniture, to install towers in our fields and antennas along our railway lines? Biodiversity is a key goal in the Local Plan. Can we allow our desire for ever greater connectivity to triumph over sustainability?

At the very least, we are requesting that Bath and North East Somerset Council carry out an Environmental Impact Assessment on the effects of this technology.

Thank you.

Environmental Health Trust – links to numerous peer-reviewed scientific studies

<https://ehtrust.org/science/bees-butterflies-wildlife-research-electromagnetic-fields-environment/>

Full Council Statement – Samantha Davies The Insurance Industry, Liability and 5G risks

Back in the 1990s, Lloyds of London had a near death experience when claims for harm caused by asbestos began to come in. This flood of claims nearly destroyed Lloyds. They have no intention of repeating this.

Their original risk analysis in 2010 regarding non-ionising radiation was based on a concern that it was becoming the new asbestos. In 2015, they introduced their **Exclusion Clause 32** for their underwriters. Its purpose is to “*exclude cover for illnesses caused by continuous longterm non-ionizing radiation exposure i.e. through mobile phone usage.*” It is standard across the industry.

Swiss Re, the world’s second largest re-insurer, took a similar view. Then in last year’s Emerging Risks Report, they added 5G along with the Internet of Things as a high impact risk, anticipating an uptick in claims relating to health effects as well as cyber-security from the rollout of this technology.

The Insurance Industry has performed their “*Due Diligence*” and conducted risk analysis based on peer reviewed science and quite clearly see the potential for financial loss.

The asbestos claims only affected a small vocational group. The potential claims against the wireless industry and increasingly end users could be from the general population at large.

Given the scale of infrastructure being rolled out for 5G, insurance companies could stand to make very large profits. And yet although they can insure, from 2015 under Exclusion Clause 32, it became near impossible to get cover for harmful effects from non-ionising radiation.

The insurance industry are voting with their feet and are simply walking away from 5G and non-ionising radiation in general.

Parallel to this, Central Association of Agricultural Valuers (CAAV) has warned landowners of the hidden risks and responsibilities associated with having telecoms masts on their land.

ICNIRP guidelines are mandatory in the UK, but mast operators are only required to self-certificate compliance when they make a planning application.

The guidelines state that exclusion zones for workers and the public should be mapped by the operator. **However, there is no legal requirement for operators to notify owners, site neighbours or the public of the exclusion zone boundaries, meaning that neither the owner nor the planning authority is able to assess the effect of the mast on buildings, land, people or other activities.**

For landowners, this means there can be unforeseen issues with managing liabilities for a site, which could lie within the exclusion zone unbeknown to them, potentially putting workers, visitors or the public at risk.

Historically, operators often accepted all liabilities as part of a mast agreement and paid a market rent. But now they are seeking agreements at much lower rents and to reduce their financial exposure by capping their liabilities at £5m. This means the site owner would be forced to pick up any excess liability.

So finally, two requests of Bath and North East Somerset Council:

- 1/ Approach national government for a bond to indemnify/ insure the Council as some kind of protection against future claims.
- 2/ Conduct contingency/ scenario planning for Health/ Liability/Financial issues arising from exposure to Class 2B carcinogenic non-ionising radiation.

Thank you.

Paul McLachlan statement

Over a year ago, I was involved in implementing a WIFI network for over 100 desktop users. The office previously had desktops all hard wired. As part of the implementation, we created WIFI access points around the building and swapped the hard wired desktop units for individual laptops, each plugged in to docking stations. The laptops were either always on charge when plugged in to the docking stations or on WIFI when staff wanted to roam around the office and in meeting rooms.

A month after the implementation, I started to suffer badly from anxiety. This led me to sometimes not being able to think or get my words out while in the office. I started to work from home, and realised when I wasn't in the office I was fine.

I had always been into keeping fit and eating healthy, but these two topics became more of a disorder. The more anxious I became, the more I would spend on studying nutrition. I even implemented a water filter in our house, looking for every possibility on what was causing me to feel so bad.

Eventually, I came to the conclusion that all of this was caused by the stress of my job, and so I decided to hand in my notice. I started another role as a consultant working from home.

I started to research about Electro sensitivity and at first thought it was all one big joke. But it also scared me stupid! If I found out I was electro sensitive, how was I going to support my family? It had to be something else. My health check-ups were fine, I was regularly exercising and eating healthily, and I could now rule out stress at work, as my new job was a lot less intensive.

I decided to use logical methods to try to disprove the illness. One area I could never relax in was my kitchen, so I decided to switch off the electric flooring. Within a day of switching it off, I could relax in the area. I then started to reduce EMF and WIFI in my house. Again, in the rooms I managed to reduce it, the symptoms subsided.

I sometimes used to wake up in severe mental and physical pain. I decided to turn off the electric from the mains at night. I recommend everyone to go home and try this just for one night and see if it makes a difference how you feel in the morning. I started to have the best sleep I have ever had in my life and continue to do so. What I also noticed was my son stopped grinding his teeth at night after years of problems. As a family, we all got a good night's sleep.

I now have no WIFI and all equipment cabled. The anxiety has subsided, but as part of my job, I sometimes visit company offices where I frequently get severe neck and jaw pain and the anxiousness returns. I also have to be careful about when choosing places to stay when working away. I am currently learning and fast, how to reduce these risks.

What I was finding was once exposed to any type of EMF or high electric frequency, I seem to take longer to recover. Over the past year I have contacted other sufferers

who have the same symptoms and used the same preventions I have to stop any mental or neurological disorders. My conclusion is, this is very real. I feel normal when not exposed, symptoms return when exposed. The big question I have is what is all this radiation actually doing to all of us?

After Bath announced that 5G will be introduced in the City, I wanted to make the council aware of the pain this will cause so many people. It affects us all in the long term, our children especially. As a family living in Bath, we do not consent to the rollout.

Full Council Statement (Karen Churchill)

We would like to see Bath and North East Somerset Council take an active role in applying the precautionary principle to all wireless technology, including when making planning decisions about masts.

The current Public Health England guidelines rely on ICNIRP (the International Commission for Non-ionising Radiation Protection) but their suitability for protecting the public's health is under serious scrutiny from many angles.

As of 6 July 2020, 393 scientists have lodged an appeal to the EU regarding 5G.

ICNIRP were ruled unreliable by a court of Turin, particularly their assessment of the US National Toxicology Program study, which found electromagnetic fields from non-ionising radiation caused two types of cancer.

Italy, Poland and Russia have set safety exposure levels 100 times lower than ICNIRP.

ICNIRP are a very small self-appointed group, mostly engineers, and do not have health risk analysis specialists on their review board. They have been shown in a report from EU members of parliament published this month to have conflicts of interest with financial links to industry.

Their guidelines state that people with metal implants of any kind, including pacemakers, fillings, teeth braces and dental implants are not protected (please see below). The government are not informing us about this in their blanket assurances; already there are accounts of people with metal plates in their bodies experiencing burns and blisters after small cells were erected near their homes.

Michael Mansfield QC is currently leading a legal case which addresses ICNIRP's exposure levels being way too high to protect health, he has looked at all the evidence and judged there is a case to answer. (<https://actionagainst5g.org/>)

With all the other pressures we are all under, it is tempting to think other current COVID issues are more important, locally what can we do anyway?, it's not up to us to make a judgement call on the science etc.

It is tempting to believe the BBC when they say it is safe, but they are heavily invested in 5G and they are receiving multiple solicitors' letters for their factual errors about the science.

It is even tempting to fall into believing we need 5G to process health data and for tracking apps to help tackle the pandemic and climate emergency BUT if the so-called solutions using 5G and wireless technologies have devastating short term and long term health effects, we must bring this into the balance when weighing up the options.

We need to learn from the smoking and asbestos history. The government didn't have it handled then and they don't have it handled now. The scale of 5G makes it imperative we act now.

The consequences of not doing so are immense; the parallels with smoking end when you think of 100,000 satellites overhead. We will not have the "ban smoking in pubs" option to manage the health risks down the road after installing wireless tech everywhere.

While we wait for the Michael Mansfield court case to address this worrying situation, we appeal to you in Bath and North East Somerset to activate the systems of oversight you can apply, including asking all wireless suppliers to risk assess against science showing harm from non-thermal effects using ISO compliance which they are committed to. Please make the fitting decision, declare and activate the precautionary principle as outlined in the petition.

Martin Luther King's words: "Our lives begin to end the day we become silent about things that matter."

a) Metal Implant reference

THE COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION,

Official Journal of the European Communities 30. 7. 1999 L 199/59

(1999/519/EC) COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION of 12 July 1999 on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)

13 "Adherence to the recommended restrictions and reference levels should provide a high level of protection as regards the established health effects that may result from exposure to electromagnetic fields but such adherence may not necessarily avoid interference problems with, or effects on the functioning of, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers and defibrillators, cochlear implants and other implants; interference problems with pacemakers may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels and should therefore be the object of appropriate precautions which, however, are not within the scope of this recommendation and are dealt with in the context of legislation on electromagnetic compatibility and medical devices".