

Telephone Masts Review

Submissions made by members of the Public

11/01/07

Hello!

There is absolutely no peer-reviewed evidence of any sort of threat whatsoever to health arising from telephone masts and the government should do what it can to calm and dissipate groundless fantasies and fears by disseminating and identifying sources of factual information.

13/01/07

Hi I write to put my name forward as a concerned individual, I have spoken with the JMMCG, and basically I was concerned before reading the findings that the group have done so well to unearth, but after reading some of their findings I find myself very concerned and feel that we need to be looking at some of the evidence that they have found and also take the time to listen to some of the experts that they seem to have done well to find.

I was also interested to hear that Radio 103 arrange a phone pole on this topic, I am not sure how many people called in but I know that 42% were very concerned, 26% were concerned and wanted to know more and 10% didn't know how they felt and the remainder did not care one way or another (yet I would say). It may be worth finding out from 103 how many people called in.

I hope you note our individual concerns and look at evidence fairly from BOTH sides.

Kind Regards

11/01/07

Hello,

Here are my views on the review of mobile phones mast in jersey

1. A complete waste of time & money for the scrutiny panel to review.
2. There is **NO** scientific evidence to prove the "mobile" transmitters are dangerous to public health.
3. The Transmitters and mobile phones both use the same power to transmit about 5 watts.
4. The only reason the transmitters are so big is so they prove a better service.
5. Mobile phones frequency's are slightly higher then TV transmitters and there not dangerous to human health.
6. As long as the transmitters are not an eye sore to the local view I don't have any problem with them.

Thanks

10/01/07

Dear sir

I have a son who was born with a blood disorder, which makes his immune system constantly lower than an other healthy child, he tends to be sensative to many things, my concern is the health and safety of the emmissions from these masts,as i have read and researched many cases of this, and am not convinced of the safety of these things.

I hope you will take this into consideration when making your final decision.

14/01/07

Dear Sir. I live at the vineries Maufant, st savior's I write in regard to the mast that has been past in field 99. I am very disappointed that this is going ahead as most of the houses in and around this field objected to it. I am sure many other islanders feel the same as there are so many going up around the island. The health risks are unknown at this time. Also why so many, because I have a mobile my self and it work fine with the mast we all ready have.

15/01/07 Wot? Another 24 Masts?!!

Masts. I don't envy Sen Cohen's multi-facetted dilemma. Nevertheless, surely we really must let a bit of Common Sense intervene against all this rampant Commercialism.

For a fair number of years *JT* has provided the Island with a more than adequate Mobile Phone service, with really very few blind spots, albeit it has, like their land-line service, been a bit expensive. *Cable & Wireless* with *Sure* seems, apparently, to be already providing a very adequate Mobile Phone Service with those Masts which it is already working from/to. Competitors in the **land-line** scene use all the original *JT* hardware, as they do with Mobiles up till the Mast Relays.

Radiation from Masts may or may not prove a health hazard. **But, that apart, what an unenvironmental, profligate waste of effort and resources erecting a whole lot more Masts, many of which may ultimately be switched off anyway, once the competitive dust settles!**

Jersey is **such** a small constituency. Perhaps you should invite these people to go and seek a more lucrative pasture elsewhere, and make do with what hardware is **already** in operation on the Island?

15/01/07

Sirs ,

With reference to the agreed erection of twentysix more telephone masts in the island I urge you to consider the following.

The Stewart report of 2000 concludes 'that it is not possible at present to say that exposure to RF radiation, even at levels below national guidelines is totally without potential adverse health effects, and that the gaps in knowledge are sufficient to justify a precautionary approach'. it also recommends that a Precautionary approach to the use of mobile phone technologies be adopted until much more detailed and scientifically robust information on any health effects becomes available'.

I can find no information to convince me that the adverse affects of Pulsed EMR have been discounted, only information warning of the adverse Biological effects of EMR.

ICNIRP considered only the thermal effects of EMR and not the non thermal effects produced by the lower frequencies emitted by Telephone base stations, therefore their standards are obsolete in this discussion.

I am sure that I do not need to provide an exhaustive list of the the reported adverse effects to health from pulsed EMR as these are clearly documented on the many websites relating to EMR. There are only six studies on the effects of phone masts on peoples' health and each shows detrimental effects on humans. Epidemiological studies near base stations show that the incidence of cancer increases and general well-being decreases with the proximity to masts.

The Island already has a network of telecoms masts and of TETRA base stations. We must NOT jeopardise our health further. increase the burden on

our health service nor reduce our enjoyment of life for the sake of allowing competition from other Telephone Companies in to the island. We do not need it!

We can, for once, be pro-active in protecting our population from the dangers of EMR because the information is already out there warning us of the dangers to health. We must not ignore it. The idea of erecting masts and then removing them if Mr Syvret 'considers them a danger to people nearby' is ridiculous. Do not do it at all. We must learn from and heed the lessons of the past to avoid laying our government open to massive compensation claims from islanders who will, in future, be able to throw the book at those who blindly followed the sales and marketing hype of multinational telephone companies.

sources used:

JEP

www.mastsanity.org

www.tetrawatch.net

www.neilcherry.com/

www.radiationresearch.org/Dr Hyland

17/01/07

I am very concerned about the number of mobile phone masts going up on our Island. I suffered from M.E. for many years and it has left me very sensitive to the environment, i.e chemicals and electricity being a couple of things.

I run a business with my husband and I find it very hard trying to keep in good health. I don't drink or smoke. I eat a healthy diet, I exercise, but it doesn't take much to trigger off the M.E. Last year I got rid of our cordless phones at home and at work as I felt these were bad for our health. This was before the reports in the papers saying that they were emitting radiation 24/7. The problem with these phone masts is that we cannot switch them off like the cordless phones. I don't see why a small Island needs all these masts. I realise that we have to move forward and people will not want to be without their mobile phones, but surely two companies is enough and their masts should not be placed next to schools or homes.

Thank you for taking time to read my letter.

18/01/07

I feel very strongly that our government has put big business before the health of the population of our beautiful Island. We do not need three or maybe four companies competing for mobile phone business in order for our phone bills to be reduced perhaps by a few pence per month. For this privilege we have to triple or quadruple the number of masts and the microwave emissions. We all know that these masts are not good for our health and even the companies know this. I have in my possession a report by T-Mobile which admits the fact that masts are detrimental to health and could even cause cancer and tumours. The telecom companies CANNOT prove the masts are safe. In Salzburg, Austria, they have a maximum power emission very significantly less than that proposed by Planning and they still manage to use their phones! We will be become one of the most irradiated places in the world

Not only are the emissions from the masts unsafe but also has the states thought about the fact that houses with masts near them will be considerably devalued. Most of the population of Jersey struggle to afford a house and now, through no fault of their own, those who's houses are near a mast could lose a considerable amount of capital when selling, if they can sell. I know of three houses where the masts are approximately 50 metres from their kitchen window. What is that doing to their health and their pockets when it comes to selling?

We can only hope that our states members will take time to look at all the information available and

not just turn a blind eye. They must be held responsible for all the health problems that will no doubt occur in the future. Only they have it in their hands to stop this madness.

19/01/07

Dear Sir/Madam,

As a concerned Jersey resident I would like to register my anxiety at the proposed increase in telephone masts for the island from a health point of view. There is a school of thought from healthcare professionals that phenomenal health risks exist for people living in close proximity to these masts. Why are we proposing to increase our masts when health-conscious countries are reducing theirs?

I am firmly opposed to increasing the number of masts. If it means paying more for phone-calls, so be it.

19/01/07

I would like to know the stance that could be taken if Human Rights was argued? People can chose to have a mobile and they can turn them off, but no one can turn the masts off. Also the sight of the masts are not determined by the people themselves. For example we campaigned against the mast on Rue a la Don as a whole estate, as some of us have children who have low immune systems and some are ex cancer patients. The outcome seemed pre determined which leads on to the question of who would be responsible if licences were revoked, we did not get a clear answer to this tonight.

Everyone asks those opposed to masts to prove they are safe, why doesn't someone ask the telecommunication companies to prove they are safe, what is a managed risk and who chooses this, do they have a mast outside their window?

26/01/07

This was sent to a discussion board on mast sanity, good quotes of Stewart report

"..Sir William Stewart's report, which found that mobiles did cause 'subtle biological changes' in the body, but their significance is not yet known."

"There are two direct ways by which health could be affected as a result of exposure to RF radiation."

".. rather little research specifically relevant to these emissions has been published in the peer- reviewed scientific literature... as yet there has been little opportunity for any health effects to become manifest."

"There is now scientific evidence, however, which suggests that there may be biological effects occurring at exposures below these guidelines."

"Therefore it is not possible at present to say that exposure to RF radiation, even at levels below national guidelines, is totally without potential adverse health effects, and that the gaps in knowledge are sufficient to justify a precautionary approach."

Sir William Stewart : "..because of the current uncertainties we recommend a continued precautionary approach to the use of mobile phone technologies"

I really don't see how anyone could scientifically say our worries are ridiculous, there simply isn't any proof that it's safe. Those who dismiss the whole issue with a laugh are welcome to their opinion but they don't know the whole story yet and the joke could well be on them in the long run.

22/01/07

Dear Sir/Madam

I am writing to express my grave concern at the proliferation of mobile telephone masts on Jersey. I am shocked that such a thing is being allowed to happen when the risks to the public, and especially to children, from this intensive programme of mast-building are completely unknown. There is sufficient concern in the scientific community to warrant extreme caution. The States would surely not sanction the use of a drug which had not been adequately tested – why then is it happy to agree to a long-term experiment on children's health, without the informed consent of the people of Jersey? We cannot opt out of this as individuals, as would be possible in other health studies; the States therefore has a responsibility to err on the side of caution and refuse planning applications until evidence for the masts' safety is unequivocal

23/01/07

As the youth worker for St Lawrence youth club, I am concerned over the possibility of a

phone mast being placed so near to the community and sport centre - which houses the local youth group with young people aged 8 - 25years. Not to mention other groups such as the mother and toddlers. I would like to know if the mast is safe for our young people's health and if there is ANY doubt about this issue that the mast be place far away from resident and school areas - which this mast does not seem to be. Health must be a priority over any other concern, financial or technological.

23/01/07

Further to our conversation on Friday at St Brelade, I am sending an application regarding the mast to be located in field 467, less than 300metres from the Nursery department of St Lawrence Primary school and also only approximately 150 metres from the Community Centre. Mother and toddler groups and youth groups meet regularly in the latter building but neither the youth worker nor indeed the organiser of the toddler group had any idea that the planning application had been made, let alone approved.

There is no doubt that many people have grave concerns regarding the possible impact on childrens health and development, would it not be wise for Jersey to follow the example of Greece and New South Wales, Australia where the governments have passed legislation to prevent any mobile phone masts being erected within 500 metres of any school. With the proposed high density of phone masts for Jersey, would it not be in the best interest of our island's children to introduce the same legislation here rather than using them as guinea pigs?

24/01/07

I know many people who have felt very ill after installing a cordless phone. When removing this phone they have felt better. I am one of those people so I know the effects they have on health. In surveys they have said that a cordless phone base unit is like having a low powered mobile phone base station in your house. I got rid of all my cordless phones but I cannot switch off a mobile phone base station if one is put up near my home.

26/01/07

Dear Panel

It has become without limitation extremely confusing on the disadvantages or lack of a problem regarding the scientific evidence. It is clear this is a usual spin tactic to enable the public to eventually be warn down to a state of capitulation. In my view the overwhelming evidence so far is that in our confined space too many of these masts are likely to be detrimental. We have young politicians today who will be around when the first medical case is diagnosed and no doubt running for cover will be the answer. More importantly it is the question of competition. You have said that the people want more competition, that is true to a degree, but it is more to do with private monopolies like CI Traders that I think they refer. Three phone companies in Jersey is far too much and indeed for this small community is far too many and at some point one or two will go out of business putting peoples lives at risk and providing yet a remainder monopoly. I am all for free market but sometimes monopolies are required provided you can legislate i.e. an Ofel, to control prices. We should be protecting Jersey Telecoms and certainly should only have two players in the market. Tesco is another issue, why put others out of business, there needs to be a realistic debate on competition.

We have not needed these phone masts up to now so why change for changes sake? I don't see Mr Syvret objecting, has something changed!