


COUNCIL – 12TH SEPTEMBER 2024

QUESTIONS RAISED BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

1	COUNCIL QUESTION FROM: Mr. Jeff Holloway	
	MEETING DATE:	12 September 2024
	TO:	Cabinet Member - Public Health and Wellbeing
	SUBJECT:	Pollution
	QUESTION: From where I live, 1-2 miles on Hawthorne Road, Bootle, between Linacre Lane and Marsh Lane, there are two sites that in my opinion are causing serious pollution and health issues for residents that live in this area including my house. The dust our Hoover is picking up is not normal dust but I believe it is cement dust from spot mix on Hawthorne Road and a hard-core breaking yard opposite. Why are two companies allowed to work within an area where there are hundreds of homes and both companies emit thousands of tons of possible poisonous dust a week in and around the surrounding area? When there are industrial areas by the docks these companies could use, I find it quite disturbing that Sefton Council and the environment department are not looking into the health of Sefton residents.	
	Response:	
	<p>“In response to the question from Mr Holloway related to dust emissions from the Spotmix concrete batching process and the crushing and screening process opposite, operated by Dowhigh, I can advise, that due to their potential to emit certain pollutants both processes fall under the Local Air Pollution Prevention and Control Regime (Environmental Permitting Regulations 2016-as amended) which is administered and enforced by Local Authorities.</p> <p>These processes are required to comply with strict environmental controls (based on national standards) which are designed to minimise air pollution and ensure any health and nuisance impacts are mitigated.</p> <p>In accordance with the Environmental Permitting Regulations, Sefton Council has issued the operators of these processes with an Environmental Permit which contains a number of specific conditions controlling how the sites operate and ensures emissions including dust are minimised.</p> <p>Officers from Environmental Health undertake regular compliance inspections to ensure the businesses are operating in accordance with their permits and pollutants are effectively controlled.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that residential premises are located close to the businesses, however, the sites have the benefit of historical planning permission.</p> ”	

	No recent complaints have been received by the Council regarding these sites but following the concerns raised by Mr Holloway I have asked the Environmental Health and Licensing Service Manager to arrange for the businesses to be inspected and following this, provide Mr Holloway with a comprehensive update”.	
2	COUNCIL QUESTION FROM: Eileen O’Connor	
	MEETING DATE:	12 th September 2024
	TO:	Cabinet Member – Housing and Highways Cabinet Member – Public Health and Wellbeing <i>DELETE CABINET MEMBERS AS APPROPRIATE</i>
	SUBJECT:	*5G/phone masts safety concerns especially for children
	<p>QUESTION: The enclosed question and additional information sent to David McCoullough, Bill Esterson, Mayor June Burns and my local councillors. This question is for the next Council meeting due to be held on 12th September at Southport Town Hall. I wish to attend the next Council meeting in-person, in order to raise a supplementary question.</p> <p>Kind regards Eileen O’Connor</p> <p>From: eileen@radiationresearch.org <eileen@radiationresearch.org> Sent: 02 September 2024 11:32 To: 'David McCullough' <David.McCullough@sefton.gov.uk>; 'ESTERSON, Bill' <bill.esterson.mp@parliament.uk>; 'Karen Cavanagh' <Karen.Cavanagh@sefton.gov.uk>; 'Carol Richards' <Carol.Richards@sefton.gov.uk>; 'Peter Harvey' <Peter.Harvey@sefton.gov.uk>; 'mayorsoffice@sefton.gov.uk' <mayorsoffice@sefton.gov.uk> Cc: 'Brian Stein' <brian.stein61@hotmail.com> Subject: FW: Questions and Information for Sefton Council on 5G</p>	
	 <p style="text-align: right;">Contact</p> <p>address: Chairman Mr. Brian Stein CBE, EM Radiation Research Trust, Chetwode House, Leicester Road, Melton Mowbray, Leicestershire, LE13 1GAUK</p> <p style="text-align: center;">2nd September 2024</p>	

For the attention of: David McCullough David.McCullough@sefton.gov.uk Bill Esterson MP bill.esterson.mp@parliament.uk, Cllr. Karen Cavanagh Karen.Cavanagh@sefton.gov.uk, Cllr. Carol Richards Carol.Richards@sefton.gov.uk, Cllr. Peter Harvey peter.harvey@sefton.gov.uk Mayor Cllr. June Burns mayorsoffice@sefton.gov.uk
Cc. Brian Stein CBE Chairman EM Radiation Research Trust
Sent via Email from Eileen O'Connor, Director EM Radiation Research Trust: eileen@radiationresearch.org
I am a resident living in Sefton and the Director for the EM Radiation Research Trust Charity.

We request a review of wireless radiation exposures from 2G, 3G, 4G, 5G and the IOT to be undertaken by Sefton Council as a matter of urgency.

Will Sefton Council revisit the request from Councillor David Irving at the 20/1/2022 Council meeting calling for the Council to site 5G masts at a safe distance from schools?

Sefton residents previously raised concerns about 5G via objections against masts with a petition that was presented to the Council meeting on 20 January 2022 calling for Sefton to Stop the 5G rollout. This meeting had a very low turnout with only 25 councillors attending out of the 66. At the end of the debate, Councillor David Irving proposed an amendment to site 5G masts at a safe distance from schools, however it was not seconded, and the amendment failed. If a majority of councillors had attended, there is a strong chance that the amendment might have been seconded, and the subsequent debate may have led to it being adopted.

Reasons for concern and especially for children

The EM Radiation Research Trust(RRT) recently called for a full investigation into the 4G LTE phone mast that is situated right next to Millstead Primary School, Everton after visiting the area with RF/EMF radiation measurements expert Glynn Hughes who recorded the highest peak reading he has ever taken in the UK at 1,554932 $\mu\text{W}/\text{m}$. This reading corresponds with readings recorded by Professor Lennart Hardell and Mona Nilsson of the Swedish Radiation Foundation who published seven case reports that include a total of 16 persons aged between 4 and 83 years that developed microwave syndrome within a short time after being exposed to 5G base stations close to their dwellings. Most prevalent symptoms were sleeping difficulty, headache, fatigue, irritability, concentration problems, loss of immediate memory, emotional distress, depression tendency, anxiety/panic, burning and lancinating skin, cardiovascular symptoms, pain in muscles and joints <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/38889394/>

The RRT letter was sent to the UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA), Cllr. June Burns Mayor of Sefton, Cllr. Richard Kemp CBE Mayor of Liverpool, Kim Johnson MP and other public officials calling for a full investigation into the deaths of the two children. Download here: [Base-Station emissions and health concerns \(radiationresearch.org\)](https://radiationresearch.org)

We received a response from the UKHSA on 30th August 2024 which does not address many of the concerns raised in the RRT letter calling for an investigation into the published research demonstrating risks associated with the biological effects associated with wireless technology. We therefore cannot rely on the UKHSA and call on Sefton Council to investigate the risks associated with this technology and to seek advice from all experts in this field. The health and wellbeing of residents is paramount.

I would like to draw your attention to The International Declaration on the Human Rights of Children in the Digital Age. This important Declaration was delivered to the Secretary General of the United Nations on World Children's Day, November 20, 2023. The Declaration calls for the protection of Children from Involuntary Exposure to Non-ionizing Radiation (NIR) and highlights a large and growing body of independent, peer-reviewed [scientific studies](#) demonstrated that man-made NIR has adverse biological effects. [The Declaration | ICD \(thechildrensdeclaration.org\)](#)

In May 2020, the EM Radiation Research Trust received support from Robert F. Kennedy Jr., and Dafna Tachover calling on the UK Prime Minister Boris Johnson and political leaders to protect the public and especially our children from the 'proven harms' of wireless radiation and 5G. This Open letter of Complaint is a response to an article published by the UK children's online newspaper First News claiming that 5G is safe. The Radiation Research Trust is still waiting to receive a response from the UK Government and First News. [RFK, Jr. Joins EM Radiation Research Trust in Calling Upon UK Prime Minister to Halt 5G Deployment • Children's Health Defense – Radiation Research](#)

The UK Stewart Report 2000

In 2000 the UK Government set up a committee to investigate the impacts of RF/microwave radiation. The committee was chaired by Sir William Stewart, Chairman of the UK Health Protection Agency and formerly Chief Scientific Adviser to the Government. This important investigation called for a precautionary approach due to the scientific uncertainties.

- **Section 1.18** There is now scientific evidence, however, which suggests that there may be biological effects occurring at exposures below these guidelines.
- **Section 1.19** We conclude therefore that it is not possible at present to say that exposure to RF radiation, even at levels below guidelines, is totally without potential adverse health effects, and that the gaps in knowledge are sufficient to justify a precautionary approach.
- **Section 1.42** The beam of greatest RF intensity should not be permitted to fall on any part of the school grounds or buildings without agreement from the school and parents.
- **Section 1.53** Children may be more vulnerable because of their developing nervous systems, the greater absorption of energy in the tissues of the head and a longer lifetime of exposure.

Research has continued to raise concerns since the 2000 Stewart Report.

- Thousands of Peer-reviewed studies, including the \$30 million U.S Toxicology Program and the world's largest animal study on RF mobile phone mast radiation by the Ramazzini Institute confirms a wide range of statistically significant DNA damage, brain and heart tumours, infertility, and RF/microwave radiation sickness injury symptoms.
- In 2011 the WHO/IARC classified Radiofrequency Electromagnetic Fields as a class 2B carcinogen (possibly carcinogenic to humans) The same classification as DDT and lead in Petrol. https://www.iarc.who.int/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/pr208_E.pdf
- The late Professor Yury Grigoriev said “A situation has emerged that cumulative EMF exposure of children may be comparable to adult exposure and may be equal to levels of occupational exposure of workers. The current standards are outdated and inadequate. Urgent action is needed to curb the negative impact from this physical agent.”
<https://www.radiationresearch.org/news/important-information-from-professor-yury-grigoriev/>
- EMA v East Sussex County Council (Special educational needs). The Upper Tribunal Judge Jacobs found that a child suffering with electrosensitivity should be considered disabled under the Equality Act 2010 and required an Education Health, and Care Plan (EHCP) <https://phiremedical.org/news/>
- Article written by Debra Fry the mother of a 15-year-old electrosensitive girl who committed suicide. Why Die for Wifi? My Child Did – Will Yours?
<https://www.radiationresearch.org/news/why-die-for-wifi-my-child-did-will-yours/>
- Health effects of electromagnetic fields on Children Jin-Hwa Moon MD,PhD [Health effects of electromagnetic fields on children - PMC \(nih.gov\)](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/2011/01/Health-effects-of-electromagnetic-fields-on-children/)

Concerns regarding the Government's use of ICNIRP

There are concerns regarding government's use of the ICNIRP 2020 radiation guidelines as highlighted in the paper by Einar Flydal et al. (2022) Self-referencing authorships behind the ICNIRP 2020 radiation protection guidelines. This paper concludes: “From our findings we draw the conclusion that the referenced literature used in ICNIRP 2020 to underpin its guidelines is neither varied, nor independent or balanced, and is by no means “consistent with current scientific knowledge”, as claimed by ICNIRP 2020 [2 p. 484]. ICNIRP 2020 bases this claim within this small network only, a claim that runs contrary to the majority of biology-oriented researchers and publications within this research field. Hence, our review shows that the ICNIRP 2020 guidelines fail to meet fundamental scientific quality requirements as to being built on a broad, solid, and established knowledge base, uphold a view contrary to well established knowledge within the field,

and therefore cannot offer a basis for good governance when setting RF exposure limits for the protection of human health.” <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/35751553/>

ICBE-EMF group called for a moratorium on 5G. A peer-reviewed paper on October 18, 2022, presented a scientific case for revision of the ICNIRP limits. The International Commission on the Biological Effects of Electromagnetic Fields (ICBE-EMF) challenged the safety of current wireless exposure limits to radiofrequency radiation (RFR) and is calling for an independent evaluation. This paper warns about the risks of exposure to radiation from 5G technology and claims that existing exposure limits for wireless radiation are inadequate, outdated, and harmful to human health and wildlife. The ICBE-EMF group reports that exposure limits for RF radiation set by ICNIRP and the FCC are based on invalid assumptions and outdated science.

<https://ehjournal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12940-022-00900-9>

We are told that councillors must base decisions for phone masts based on planning policy.

The key messages are:

- Councils should support next generation mobile technology (such as 5G)
- Councils should not impose a ban on new electronic communication development
- Councils must determine planning applications on planning grounds only; and Councils should not seek to set health safeguards different from the International Commission Guidelines for public exposure.

We would like to point out was that the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is a set of guidelines and is not legally binding. It is our view that the main priority of local councils should be the best interests of residents, not simply to follow government guidance slavishly. Regarding 5G installations, it is the duty of the Council to take into consideration all evidence relating to potential effects on residents' health, rather than relying exclusively on government and industry guidance.

In a landmark legal ruling in November 2021, campaigners in Brighton and Hove succeeded in overturning local authority approval for a 5G mast to be sited close to a primary school. At judicial review, it was found that the Council “failed to address the health impacts” of the mast. This finding has significant implications for all councils dealing with 5G applications, as it means there is a legal responsibility to investigate possible effects on health. The technology cannot simply be assumed to be safe.

Moreover, the approach taken recently by Glastonbury Town Council is evidence that not all Councils feel constrained to adhere rigidly to government guidance in relation to 5G applications. In response to concerns raised by residents, Glastonbury Town Council set up a 5G Advisory Committee and carried out a six-month investigation, after which they resolved unanimously to continue their adoption of the Precautionary Principle; opposing the roll-out of 5G until further information is made available on the safety or otherwise of the

	<p>technology.</p> <p>We therefore contend that the Council should be advised that not only is there is NO legal requirement to support 5G technology, but it is also the duty and responsibility of the Council to conduct a full safety investigation and risk assessment before approving 5G applications.</p> <p>Respectfully Submitted,</p> <p>Eileen O'Connor Charity Director for the EM Radiation Research Trust Website address: https://www.radiationresearch.org/ Email: eileen@radiationresearch.org</p>
	<p>Response:</p>
	<p>Review of evidence around safety 5G and public health impacts</p> <p>Sefton Council public health team have consulted with colleagues in the UK Health Security Agency who provide expert guidance on health protection matters, including advice regarding non-ionising radiation impacts on health. Th UK Health Security Agency have reviewed the evidence and provided the information below in relation to the safety and health impacts of radio waves, including 5G.</p> <p>Review of current evidence</p> <p>The health effects of exposure to radio waves have been researched extensively over several decades, and very many publications can be found in scientific journals and elsewhere.</p> <p>Guidelines set by International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) on limiting exposures to electromagnetic fields (EMF) have been developed based on careful analyses of the accumulated evidence. ICNIRP published updated guidelines on exposure to radio waves in 2020.</p> <p>UKHSA is aware that different groups have concerns about EMFs and where they have proposed alternative limits, these do not appear to have a scientific rationale based on health effects in the same way as the ICNIRP guidelines. In formulating its advice, UKHSA aims to draw out a consensus position based on the totality of the scientific evidence through a process of systematic, critical and impartial review of the published literature.</p> <p>UKHSA bases its opinion on evidence reviews from authoritative bodies that consider the whole-range of evidence available, taking account of the scientific quality and relevance of individual studies to human health, in developing their conclusions. The typical types of evidence reviewed are the human laboratory and epidemiological studies, animal studies and cellular studies. This is the approach adopted by officially mandated authoritative organisations such as, ICNIRP and the World Health Organization (WHO). UKHSA is not aware, therefore, that these initiatives are driven by any scientific evidence that has been overlooked in its own advice.</p>

	<p>Summary of evidence and public health impacts</p> <p>Many exposure measurements have been made at publicly accessible locations near to base stations and these have consistently been well within the ICNIRP guidelines.</p> <p>It is possible that there may be a small increase in overall exposure to radio waves when 5G is added to an existing network or in a new area. However, the overall exposure is expected to remain low relative to guidelines and, as such, there should be no consequences for public health.</p> <p>Further information</p> <p>Please see the following webpages containing UKHSA’s published advice on 5G and mobile phone base stations:</p> <p>https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/5g-technologies-radio-waves-and-health/5g-technologies-radio-waves-and-health.</p> <p>https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/mobile-phone-base-stations-radio-waves-and-health/mobile-phone-base-stations-radio-waves-and-health</p>	
3	COUNCIL QUESTION FROM: Stephen Kelly	
	MEETING DATE:	12 September 2024
	TO:	Cabinet Member – Housing and Highways
	SUBJECT:	Planning application DC/2022/01727 - ICNIRP safety guidelines
	<p>QUESTION:</p> <p>The validity of the International Community for Non-ionized Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) Safety Guidelines for 5G mast planning does not form a robust technical and legal liability case based on the document content, and as detailed in the communication sent to Sefton Council Planning Department 4th September 2024.</p> <p>Based on this the ICNIRP document should not be referenced by the planning Department as blanket approval in relation to health impact upon resident as a result of non-ionised EMF radiation exposure from 5G communication installations.</p> <p>All current 5G installations must be reviewed in response to this and applications in review and approval status must be suspended until sufficiently quantitatively evidence becomes available to protect the residents of Sefton and specifically affected by the site currently under construction in College Road, Crosby?</p> <p>Please find a detailed explanation in the body of this email (below) communicated to Sefton Council Planning department.</p> <p>I wish to draw to your attention the recent approval upon appeal planning application DC/2022/01727 by Sefton Council planning department.</p> <p>The initial planning application was rejected, further to this Sefton Council Planning and building control have approved the appeal based on geographical location of the proposed site.</p> <p>At the initial application an objection was raised based on health concerns by a local resident Eileen O’Connor (See attached letter from The EM Radiation research Trust</p>	

Charity 13th September 2022) this letter references the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection INCRIP.

These guidelines were used as reference by the planning team and considered to be sufficient for justification for approval in relation to health matters relating to the local community.

At this point I must draw your attention misinterpretation of the INCRIP guidelines and the consequential hazard to human health and the risk posed to the local community and more widely the Sefton residents regarding current and other planned sites.

It is widely acknowledged amongst the scientific community concerned with exposure to non-ionizing EMF radiation that the INCRIP safety guidelines must not be used for the blanket justification of 5G installations. The INCRIP document provides no quantifiable scientific research-based evidence as the basis for its conclusion. The reason for this point is that document scope and ambiguity of wording are as follows:

1. The document scope is based on the “protection of humans”, environmental impact on wildlife is outside of the scope, therefore is not considered. What measures are the council taking to ensure no impact on local wildlife as none have been taken as part of the planning application?

INTRODUCTION

THE GUIDELINES described here are for the protection of humans exposed to radiofrequency electromagnetic fields (EMFs) in the range 100 kHz to 300 GHz hereafter “radiofre-

2. The document acknowledges that adverse effects are associated with EMF exposure. The limits of exposure must be controlled. No risk mitigation actions are detailed in the planning application by the applicant. Members of the public which have medical procedures or metallic implants etc are outside of the scope of the document. There is no risk mitigation to prevent exposure to the many residents who come under this category.

PURPOSE AND SCOPE

The main objective of this publication is to establish guidelines for limiting exposure to EMFs that will provide a high level of protection for all people against substantiated adverse health effects from exposures to both short- and long-term, continuous and discontinuous radiofrequency EMFs. However, some exposure scenarios are defined as outside the scope of these guidelines. Medical procedures may utilize EMFs, and metallic implants may alter or perturb EMFs in the body, which in turn can affect the body both directly (via direct interaction between field and tissue) and indirectly (via an intermediate conducting object). For example, radiofrequency ablation and hyperthermia are both used as medical treatments, and radiofrequency EMFs can indirectly cause harm by unintentionally interfering with active implantable medical devices (see ISO 2012) or altering EMFs due to the presence of conductive implants. As medical procedures rely on medical expertise to weigh potential harm against intended benefits, ICNIRP considers such exposure managed by qualified medical practitioners (i.e., to patients, carers and comforters, including, where relevant, fetuses), as well as the utilization of conducting materials for medical procedures, as beyond the scope of these guidelines (for further information, see UNEP/WHO/IRPA 1993).

3. The document goes on to mention scientific based evidence as the basis for the document, however the word “unlikely” is used on 7 occasions in the body of the text. The use of the word “unlikely” undermines the technical credibility of such a document **and therefore must not be taken as quantifiable fact.**

The document forms no robust technical or legal argument based on the ambiguity of wording alone.

The INCRIP organisation perspective is that of industry-based argument and not a scientific led study into the effect on human physiology. (See attached document Scientists warn of potential serious health effects of 5G September 11, 2017).


The scientific community have highlighted the lack of quantifiable testing to establish the safety posed by non-ionised radiation exposure long and short term, and in the case of 5G technology this evidence does not exist. It appears that those responsible for the decisions regarding the approval of such constructions in the public are as are not aware that such evidence does not exist. This is a misinterpretation of the guidelines that has potential consequences for the residents of our communities that no individual is acknowledging within Sefton Council.

It is stated “Safety guidelines” protect industry — not health”. And based on the evaluation of the document content INCRIP guidelines are obsolete and hold no scientific credibility.

As a concerned resident –I expect Sefton Council to mitigate all potential and actual risk to its residents by immediately reviewing the current 5G mast installation in the borough and suspend all applications in the review and approval stage until further conclusive evidence can be presented.

This letter presents the case for risk mitigation and the protection of the health of Sefton residents and specifically those impacted by the installation related to planning application DC/2022/01727 by Cornerstone Telecommunications

Attachments:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EILEEN_O_CONNOR Objection.PDF • ICNIRPrfgdl2020 • Scientist_5G_appeal
	Response:
	<p>“The Government have clearly set out the need to ensure that planning policies and decisions support the expansion of electronic communications networks, including next generation technology (such as 5G). They have made it clear that local planning authorities should not impose a ban on new electronic communications development.</p> <p>It is the Government’s firm view that the planning system is not the place for determining health safeguards. In the Government’s view, if a proposed mobile base station meets the ICNIRP guidelines for public exposure it should not be necessary for a local planning authority to consider further the health aspects and concerns about them. With every planning application received by the authority, the operator must include a certificate of compliance with these radiation levels. Without this certificate, the application would not be determined or considered acceptable.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that there are various studies questioning the acceptability of the ICNIRP. Sefton Council public health team have consulted with colleagues in the UK Health Security Agency who provide expert guidance on health protection matters, including advice regarding non-ionising radiation impacts on health.</p> <p>Th UK Health Security Agency have reviewed the evidence and provided information to Sefton in relation to the safety and health impacts of radio waves, including 5G.</p> <p>Considering the advice from the UK Health Security Agency, Sefton Council recognised that many exposure measurements have been made at publicly accessible locations near to base stations and these have consistently been well within the ICNIRP guidelines.</p> <p>It is accepted that it is possible that there may be a small increase in overall exposure to radio waves when 5G is added to an existing network or in a new area. However, the overall exposure is expected to remain low relative to guidelines and, as such, there should be no consequences for public health.</p> <p>The Local Planning Authority cannot agree to reviewing permissions already granted or suspend decisions on subsequent applications received in the Borough as there are no planning grounds to do so”.</p>
4	<p>COUNCIL QUESTION FROM: Maria Walsh, Merseyside Residents Association</p> 
	<p>MEETING DATE: 12th September 2024</p>

	TO:	Cabinet Member Health, Wellbeing and Inclusion
	SUBJECT:	“Climate Emergency” declared by Sefton Council July 2019
	<p>QUESTION:</p> <p>“Where is the evidence for declaring a ‘Climate Emergency’, and where are the ‘Cost Benefit Analyses’ for all of the policies resulting from this declaration?”</p> <p>For clarity, and to be as helpful as possible in providing you with information, I have set out below the background and available evidence with regard to this issue:</p> <p>On 18th July 2019 Sefton Council declared a “Climate Emergency”. I submitted an FoI to Sefton Council, and received a response dated 19th June 2023. My FoI asked what Sefton’s definition of a ‘Climate Emergency’ is and asked for Sefton to disclose the evidence to support the Council’s decision to make this declaration. The answer I received was that the Council had <i>“Not formally defined ‘Climate Emergency’”</i> and that <i>“The declaration was member led and the data and evidence that members accessed is not held centrally”</i>. This is an astonishing response given that you have made the life changing decision (for your residents) of declaring an ‘Emergency’, yet you do not have a formal definition of this emergency – nor do you have any evidence! Sefton Council then went on to produce various policies including the ‘Climate Emergency Strategy’, a ‘Climate Emergency Action Plan’ and a ‘Low Carbon Transport Policy’ – all without even having a definition of what the ‘Climate Emergency’ is - nor possessing any evidence!</p> <p>All of these policies will have a dire effect on your residents. In pursuing these cult-like diktats you are responsible for enacting policies based on modelling rather than observation (i.e. flawed science). It is critical to understand the distinction between modelling and observation. In science, models are nothing more than opinions - they are not evidence. For example, there are almost one hundred different climate models none of which amount to evidence. All that matters in science is evidence derived from observation. This cult like dogma will result in the waste of hundreds of millions of pounds of financial resources, intrusion into the private lives of the people of Sefton and, in the process, the impoverishment of the people - with endless excuses for oppressive taxes, and the erosion of their freedoms. Your obsessive focus on Net Zero polices forgoes any, and all, considerations of costs and benefits to the people of Sefton and is, thus, both absurd and dangerous. You are accountable to the people of Sefton for the policy decisions you make and you, therefore, have a responsibility and a duty to fully consider the position of those scientists who provide evidence for their theories through observations. You have a duty to listen to the climate realists as well as the climate alarmists - the future well-being of the people of Sefton depends upon you doing so. I would also point out that this includes your friends and family! (I would also remind you of a very simple fact most of us were taught in Junior School – photosynthesis: the process of plants converting CO2 into oxygen – without which the planet will die!)</p>	

May I also draw your attention to your responsibilities as a Councillor with regard to the Councillor Code of Conduct, in particular this clause:

*“2.3 Consider all matters with an open mind and make decisions based upon weighing the best evidence before me, fairly and on merit. Where you have been involved in campaigning in your political role on an issue which does not impact on your personal and/or professional life, you should not be prohibited from participating in a decision in your role as Member. However, you must ensure that your integrity is not compromised. You may be pre-disposed to a number of outcomes to a decision, based upon your, philosophy, beliefs or **political allegiance** (including any application of a Group whip), but this must not predetermine your actions or the outcome of a decision you are to make. **You must always remain open to the potential for further evidence or argument to alter any previously expressed or held viewpoint at the time of making your decision.** For this reason, particularly in relation to contractual matters or those affecting individuals’ civil rights, it is often best to be cautious about how or if your views are expressed before coming to make a decision.”*

I have enclosed three documents for your attention:

1. **A copy of the Clintel Declaration:** The Climate Intelligence (Clintel) foundation is an independent foundation informing people about climate change and climate policies. Clintel was founded in 2019 by Emeritus Professor of Geophysics, Guus Berkhout, and science journalist Marcel Crok. They issued a declaration in 2019 stating that there is **NO CLIMATE EMERGENCY**. For further details regarding the 1,944 scientists and experts who have signed this, and their evidence, please see their website:

[World Climate Declaration There is no climate emergency \(clintel.org\)](https://clintel.org)

2. **A copy of a letter from a concerned citizen of Leeds** to all 99 Leeds City Council councillors: The subject matter - the flawed science behind CO2 - is of grave importance. It is not only relevant to Leeds but the entire country because many councils have declared a ‘Climate emergency’ and are rolling out associated ‘Net zero’ policies. Consequently, the contents of the attached letter should be of the utmost concern to you, particularly the sections referring to lack of evidence and flawed science. I urge you to read the letter (including the content accessed via the links), watch the video and review the Conclusion, asking yourself what are the consequences for your residents of pursuing Net Zero policies based on flawed science?



2024-08-22_LetterTo
LeedsCouncil.docx

3. **“Absolute Zero”:** A document commissioned by the UK Government in 2019. I would refer you, in particular, to the diagram on pages 6 & 7. This refers to aspirations of closing all airports, the cessation of all shipping and the removal of all Beef & Lamb by 2049. Please read the rest of this

document and you will realise how insane this whole ideology is.

You may also wish to explore “Personal Carbon Allowances - PCAs” – a system of allocating “Carbon Credits” which will track and surveil our every move – preventing us from leaving the house when we have used up our “Personal Allowance”.

“The UK government has not officially introduced personal carbon allowances yet. However, there has been ongoing discussion and research on the topic. Personal carbon allowances (PCAs) would involve giving individuals a set amount of carbon credits that they could use for activities like household energy use and personal travel. [If someone uses less than their allowance, they could sell the excess; if they need more, they could buy additional credits¹².](#)”

[Personal carbon allowances white paper | The Carbon Trust](#)



2019-11-29-Absolut
e-Zero.pdf

Response:

Thank you for your question regarding the “**Climate Emergency**” declared by Sefton Council July 2019.

Where is the evidence for declaring a ‘Climate Emergency’

The evidence accessed by Members, included the report produced by The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) which is the United Nations body for assessing the science related to climate change. The IPCC was set up in 1988 by the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) and United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) to provide policymakers with regular assessments of the scientific basis of climate change, its impacts and future risks, and options for adaptation and mitigation. IPCC assessments provide a scientific basis for governments at all levels to develop climate related policies, and they underlie negotiations at the UN Climate Conference – the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).

The assessments are policy-relevant but not policy prescriptive: they may present projections of future climate change based on different scenarios and the risks that climate change poses and discuss the implications of response options, but they do not tell policymakers what actions to take. The work is undertaken by hundreds of leading scientists, with all work rigorously cross checked and verified before publication.

In their report “Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change 1.5C report” (2018) [Global Warming of 1.5 °C — \(ipcc.ch\)](#) the IPCC outline the risks associated with a 1.5 or 2 degree Celsius of warming, directly attributed to the release of greenhouse gases into the atmosphere through human activity. This included increased likelihood of temperature extremes, increased risk of drought/fires and extreme precipitation, impacts on biodiversity, more incidents of extreme weather, invasive species migration, sea level rises and acidification of oceans as they absorb increased amounts of carbon.

This and subsequent reports suggest that disadvantaged and vulnerable populations are least likely to be able to respond to any negative consequences of climate risks, and likely to be impacted most.

Sefton as a low-lying coastal authority must take account of any particular risks to

the local population in particular those most vulnerable.

Elected members are presented with information when considering decisions which are from sources that are credible, reliable, written by experts in that field, up to date and not biased. The sources include the UK Government, IPCC, UN. Elected members are fully aware and compliant with the Council's code of conduct.

Definition of "Climate Emergency" – as mentioned this was not provided in the FOI response as it was not specifically defined within the member declaration.

There is no one definition of climate emergency but it is broadly accepted to mean there is a need for increased action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and be better prepared for the current and future effects of a changing climate. The Climate Emergency (unep.org) the United Nations provide additional information and an expanded definition.

and where are the 'Cost Benefit Analyses' for all of the policies resulting from this declaration?"

The current strategy was developed to ensure that actions were focused on Council operations and not the wider Sefton Community. Within the declaration the Council encourage others to adopt a similar approach to act and encourage the community to reduce emissions and be better prepared e.g. insulating homes which may also have financial and health benefits. Therefore, there is no obligation on residents, local businesses etc. to undertake any particular actions.

The strategy includes work to meet a net zero carbon target by 2030 which focuses on specific council actions, as well as the work to ensure the Council is better prepared to cope with any changes anticipated by a changing climate.

The UK government have set a national net zero target (2050) with a series of interim targets including a 2030 target (reduce carbon emissions by 68% 1990 baseline). This is to align with international commitments including the Paris Agreement's nationally determined contributions (NDCs). The Council's climate emergency strategy is therefore proportionate to national and international commitments, in particular, in the context of the wider Sefton area.

All work carried out to date by the Council has been from within existing resources. Investments made have been as a result of successful external funding applications, which in turn have brought additional future benefits at no cost to the Council.

The mitigation elements of the strategy (Net zero carbon by 2030) have some key actions identified these include:-

- Agile working; where an increased number of staff work at home. This has allowed the Council to utilise office space more efficiently, has reduced emissions from commuting and has been well received by staff.
The decisions made by members on agile working have been fully scrutinised by senior staff and worker representatives and have provided a financial saving as well as a reduction in emissions.
- Upgrade of Bootle and Southport Town Halls; the roof insulation and external glazing improvements were funded through a successful Public Sector Decarbonisation Fund programme, with some match funding from the Council to ensure roof repairs and external painting at Southport were completed in the same time period. Reports to senior officers and members were completed to obtain permission to bid, to accept the funding and reports provided on the outcomes and ongoing management of the programme of work. The work has achieved energy savings which has reduced emissions and future costs, as well as helping to reduce the liability of future maintenance.
- LED Street lighting programme; This 4-year programme was fully assessed as an invest to save programme. The savings made from using less electricity (and fewer emission) are used to repay the loan amount with future savings accruing directly to the Council. Reports to members to agree to this programme and review progress are available online.
- All other/future work set out within the strategy as based around securing

	external funding or providing a full cost benefit analysis which is reported through the usual Council's governance processes.
--	--