



Ministry of Housing,
Communities &
Local Government

Proposed reforms to the National Planning Policy Framework and other changes to the planning system

Consultation (16 December 2025-10 March 2026)
Response by M. Bevington, Electrosensitivity UK,
4th March 2026.

93) Do you agree that the updated policies provide clearer and stronger support for the rollout of 5G and gigabit broadband?

Strongly disagree

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree

It has been known since the 1880s that the main primary effects of radio frequency radiation as used in 5G are adverse non-thermal effects, such as cardiovascular harm. This was confirmed in a study in 1953 showing cancer and electromagnetic hypersensitivity symptoms from RF radiation. Cancer caused by RF radiation was confirmed conclusively in 2018 by two substantive studies and has been confirmed by the World Health Organisation's review on cancer caused by RF EMFs. The IARC's classification of RF like 5G rated it in 2011 as a 2B carcinogen and now worldwide experts state and the latest evidence requires that it is classified as a class 1 known carcinogen.

It is therefore essential for the health of local residents and others that 5G masts and antennas are sufficiently restricted in power and sited sufficiently far from residents and people passing by on foot or in vehicles so that the 5G RF radiation complies with long-term and non thermal guidelines, such as those promulgated by Bioinitiative, EUROPAEM, IGNIR etc. ICNIRP guidelines are unscientific and do not provide protection since they are in practice only for heating effects and short-term exposures of 6 or 30 minutes, whereas cancers, infertility, EHS and EHS symptoms are non-thermal and sometimes long-term. In addition, even for the current ICNIRP guidelines, all 5G masts should show exclusion zones for people excluded from both ICNIRP's short-term and thermal guidelines, such as those with metal implants, active or passive, metallic dental amalgam restorations etc.

95) Do you agree the supporting information requirements are proportionate and sufficient without creating unnecessary burdens?

Strongly disagree

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree

If LPAs are to approve a 5G mast, since LPAs are responsible under the Health and Social Care Act 2012 for improving the health of local residents in their area, as also required under the EECC Annex I(3)(b) (transposed into UK law via SI 2020/1419) where authorisation of networks must ensure a high level of protection for public health, LPAs must specifically state and record how the proposed 5G masts or antennas meet the requirements of Bioinitiative, EUROPAEM or IGNIR. This should be a central and key requirement of all NPPF considerations.

The ICNIRP guidelines follow the 'captured' agencies supporting the wireless industry, not the mainstream independent scientists who compose the International Commission on the Biological Effects of EMFs which regard ICNIRP's heating-only and only short-term guidelines as unscientific and not providing public protection. The ICNIRP and the UN agency WHO still follow Schwan's 1953 military-industrial 'conspiracy' denying established RF adverse effects as known since the 1880s and admitted in many other countries and in their use in regular for therapeutic hospital procedures.

The UKHSA recognises that its unscientific reliance on ICNIRP is not accepted by other scientists since Ashley Dalton, MP, then a minister at the DHSC, wrote in February 2026 that “UKHSA acknowledges the difficulty in development of exposure protection guidance – the interpretation of studies of potential health effects is a matter of judgement, and there is a spectrum of opinion within the scientific community and elsewhere”. It is essential for NPPF that that the UKHSA adopts the mainstream independent scientific opinion and rejects the ICNIRP's heating-only myth promulgated by Schwan in 1953 and still held by 'captured' agencies.

158) Do you agree with the approach to planning for healthy communities in policy HC1, including the expectation that the development plan set local standards for different types of recreational land, drawing upon relevant national standards?

Strongly disagree

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree

The approach of 'planning for healthy communities' required LPAs to ensure that all RF exposures including 5G masts or antennas meet the requirements of the relevant, protective and scientific international biological guidelines, such as Bioinitiative, EUROPAEM or IGNIR. People with EHS who are allergic to RF EMFs can be forced to leave their homes if their home is excessively polluted by RF EMFs or restrict their living to parts of the house or garden to areas compliant with these guidelines. As explained above, the ICNIRP guidelines are unscientific and do not provide protection according to the mainstream independent scientists and the experience of people with EHS.

Moreover, some people with EHS are unable to continue living in built-up areas made toxic by current high levels of RF EMFs and have to try to find areas in woods or hills free of 5G or 4G masts. However, this is becoming increasingly difficult.

Further, children with EHS are sometimes unable to attend school if the school has WiFi or is near a 5G mast.

It is therefore essential that in 'planning for healthy communities' LPAs should ensure that they follow the mainstream science and not the ICNIRP's heating-only myth as part of the 1953 industrial-military conspiracy. Other countries have banned WiFi in primary schools to safeguard their children. The NPPF should require LPAs to adopt similar basic health and safety standards to promote healthy communities.

165) Do you agree with policy P1 as a basis for identifying and addressing relevant risks when preparing plans?

Strongly disagree

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree

Any policy for 'Clean, Liveable and Healthy Places' should recognise the need to reduce pollution emitted by RF EMF transmitters, such as from 5G and 4G masts. It has been conclusively shown that people living near such sources of pollution have more established EHS symptoms including disturbed sleep and up to ten times the number of cancers compared with people living further away. Mainstream independent studies have convincingly shown that people near sources of pollution like 5G or 4G masts have irreparable chromosomal damage. The mainstream independent ICBE-EMF has stated that the ICNIRP heating limits are unscientific and do not protect people.

169) Do you agree policy P5 provides sufficient basis for addressing possible malicious threats and other hazards when considering development proposals?

Strongly disagree

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree

Policy P4 should specify that 'hazardous installations' include RF antennas such as 5G masts in addition nuclear sites which are also EMF hazards which also cause harm like RF by damaging DNA through non-thermal frequencies. In The European Commission's Reflex study showed comparable DNA damage from 24 hours of mobile phone exposure and the equivalent of 1,000 chest X-rays.

184) Are there any further issues for planning policy that we need to consider as we take forward the implementation of Environmental Delivery Plans?

Answer

Many studies have shown that RF EMFs such as those from 5G and 4G harm the ability of migratory birds to navigate according to the earth's geomagnetic fields, and harm the ability of honey bees to locate their hives and sources of nectar. Other studies show how trees and plants are adversely affected by RF EMFs typical of phone masts. Other studies show how RF EMFs affect bacteria and viruses, rendering many living systems less able to protect themselves from such threats. LPAs should be required by NPPF to include such environmental factors into all planning decisions.

187) Do you agree with the approach to plan-making for the historic environment, including the specific requirements for World Heritage Sites and Conservation Areas, set out in policies H1 – H3?

Strongly disagree

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree

Plan-making for the historic environment, including specific requirements for World Heritage Sites and Conservation Areas, should also include the requirement to limit any RF EMF exposure to the international biological guidelines, such as Bioinitiative, EUROPAEM and IGNIR, so that such sites and areas are accessible to all and do not prevent access by people who are allergic to RF EMF.

224) Do you have any views on the impacts of the above proposals for you, or the group or business you represent and on anyone with a relevant protected characteristic?

Yes

a) If so, please explain who, which groups, including those with protected characteristics, or which businesses may be impacted and how.

People especially sensitive to RMFs, such as the 1.2% to 30% of the population who are hypersensitive to EMFs, need specific reassurance that they can access all public and work places, including schools, hospitals, shops, theatres etc and places with high intensity LED lighting. Discrimination against this proportion of the population should be made illegal, as it has been shown to be under specific laws such as the Health and Safety at Work Act 1974 and the Equality Act 2010. An updated NPPF should specifically ensure the equal access of such people to all areas of life and not require them to become unemployed or restricted in where they can live.

Your response has been submitted

Your response ID is ANON-C9BS-2JZ7-X.

Thank you. Your response has been submitted successfully.