

1.1 Five Public Questions have been received in the following terms:

5G Technology

(i) **Thorston Manderlay:**

“Who is going to be held accountable for any future health issues in either individuals or groups of people related to 5G?”

Is it not true that the person or persons held responsible will be the one (or ones) whose signature (or signatures) appear on the permits?”

(ii) Supplementary

“In your‘ response to petition to halt the rollout of 5G’ you state that you (and the government) take the advice from Public Health England. On their website PHE refer to research and studies regarding the safety of RF, including Non-Ionising Radiation. My question is, what are these researches and studies and, most importantly, who conducted them? Thousands of doctors and scientists the world over have drawn attention in hundreds, if not thousands, of peer reviewed papers to the total lack of INDEPENDENT studies about the long-term effects of Non-Ionising Radiation in humans (not to mention wildlife). If PHE claim that studies have been done, they need to state who did them and why as well as their lengths and specific remits. Shouldn’t a decision which potentially affects the health and wellbeing of many generations to come be based on thorough, independent research and studies?”

(ii) **Silvia Cabrera Hidalgo**

“If 5G is so safe, how come that leading insurers the world over, including Lloyds of London (!), refuse to insure in their policies against any negative health effects caused by wi-fi technologies including 5G?”

(ii) Supplementary

“What about the increasing number of people already sensitive to EMF? I know someone who is and their life has exponentially got worse ever since the launch of 3 and 4G.Nausea, headaches, dizziness & nerve pain on a daily basis. With 5G on top of this life will become intolerable to these people. And, as I said, their numbers are increasing.”

(iii) **Irina Blossie**

“The European Commission’s Scientific Committee on Health, Environmental and Emerging Risks (SCHEER) assessed potential effects on wildlife from increases in electromagnetic radiation. 5G technology was classified as an ‘emerging issue’ and given the highest ranking as an environmental hazard. It highlighted the concern that since health and safety issues remain unknown, it leaves the possibility of unintended biological consequences to the environment. The EKLIPSE report “The Impacts of EMR on Wildlife” confirms harm from EMR on wildlife. Bees are at a greater risk and in decline. What is HWB planning to do to protect wildlife in the city?”

(iv) **Emma Gomez**

THE ICNIRP does not guarantee the correctness, reliability, or completeness of the information published on its website for guideline purposes. The content is provided for information only. ICNIRP do not assume any responsibility for any damage, including direct or indirect loss suffered by users or third parties in connection with the website and the information it contains including any technical data, recommendations, or specifications available and an insurance company (Swiss Re) has listed 5G as a ‘high impact risk’. Their white paper wording as follows.

Existing concerns regarding potential negative health effects from electromagnetic fields (EMF) are only likely to increase. An uptick in liability claims could be a potential long-term consequence. <https://es-ireland.com/2019/06/17/may-2019-swiss-re-classifies-5g-as-high-impact-emerging-risk-in-white-paper/>

Therefore, if an insurance company will not take the risk then why would Brighton and Hove risk the health and lives of the residents of Brighton and Hove. Who is taking responsible for damages caused by forcing me to be tortured by 5G pollution against my will?

Improvement in Health

(v) **Mr Kapp**

“Why isn’t improvement in health included in the Council’s 3 year plan (published in the Argus on 18.1.20) when £454million of public money is devolved from central government to our Clinical Commissioning Group this year, which together with £126mpa makes £580mpa for health and social care, which will probably rise next year to £600mpa, the dispersion of which should be decided by all councillors at the budget meeting on 27.2.20?”

We had information given to the July board about social prescribing but not the detailed funding as to how this works. I have had similar emails from people who run various things like Nordic walking wanting to know how they

can get involved (which could be short hand for how can they get funding to run such services).

However, the Board is not the funding controller for social prescribing nor is the CCG – this comes from the national pocket.

Will the HWB agree to take a paper raising the question of ‘whether or not licenced social prescribing providers should be paid as pharmacists are paid for drugs?’

