

JMMCG

*1. Ulimately who in the States should be answering our health concerns on these antenna/masts and EMR. Is the Planning Department the wrong department?*

There are two ways the health implications of this type of equipment are considered. Firstly under the licence agreement that the JCRA has given, the companies must comply with certain health safeguards. This is governed by the Health Protection Department of Health and Social Services. I am not familiar with these particulars and thus cannot advise.

Secondly, when a planning application is submitted, an ICNIRP certificate (which details the levels of emissions for each installation) is provided, which is then sent to the Health Protection Department of Health and Social Services for consultation. The Health Protection Department will send us a letter commenting on the proposed limits. In determining an application, the Planning Department will consider the objections raised on health grounds but also will consider the comments received from the Health Department. With the applications that have been approved thus far, they all are conditioned in the following way: The development hereby permitted is temporary and shall cease on or before the (12 months from approval date) 2007 and the land restored to its former condition unless the post commissioning test is completed and the relevant measurements are in accordance with the ICNIRP certificate submitted, to the satisfaction of the Minister for Planning and Environment. When the post-commissioning certificate is submitted, the Planning Department send it back to the Health Protection Department to ensure that the levels are satisfactory. Thus the Planning Department is ensuring that the levels stated in the applications are in fact the actual levels.

Therefore I would state that the responsibility for ensuring that the public is protected from a health point of view clearly rests with the Health Protection Department and subsequently the Health Minister, Senator Syvret.

*2. Sitefinder is a UK website managed by Ofcom which enables individuals to search for masts near them.*

*Please can you advise if we can have this information locally. In particular have mobile operators disclosed where all mast sites are? We understand Jersey Telecom put some masts up before planning was a requirement. Is this true? Do you have a log of all Masts in Jersey?*

Sitefinder is an operator incentive, and thus the operators must make the decision to list themselves on that site. I suggest you contact each company with regard to this.

The Planning Department has a list of applications approved and pending on our web site under Planning Applications/ 07 Communication Antennae/ Mobile Phone Masts and Base Stations. Please note this list is regularly updated as new applications come in. This is NOT is list of where installations are, but a list of the possible locations of installations. As with any planning permission, an applicant can choose whether to develop what has been approved. There are some sites that have been approved that will not be developed, for various reasons. There are also some installations that are inside buildings, but that is not within the Planning Law for the Department to control. You will need to approach the operators for that information.

Over the last year, we have been working with Jersey Telecom on their network, and they have applied for all their sites that were erected pre-2002. Therefore, Jersey Telecom have declared to us that there are no installations erected that has not been applied for within the last year and thus that are not on our web list. However, as with installations inside buildings, Jersey Telecom also have installations inside telephone kiosks, but again it is outside what planning can control.

If you know of any installations that are not on the list, please contact me and I will investigate the situation.

3. Senator Cohen, commented today on CTV that mobile operators were looking for 30 to 40 masts each. It was understood at the Grouville meeting, Jersey Telecoms has over 50 masts, Cable and Wireless have requested 48 sites (in various stages of planning, some being erected) and Airtel required 57 masts at the moment, with possibly more in the future.

We understand mast sharing might reduce the amount of masts, but this will not impact on the amount of emissions if each operator has their own antenna on masts? Those situated close to masts will be submitted to even higher levels of EMR. Can you confirm this?

There is a little confusion with the terminology and what each person understands the networks are made up of. Let me explain the terminology used by the Department and in this email. Each company applies for 'installations' of telecommunication equipment. Some of these installations are placing new antennae and dishes on existing lattice towers (eg Five Oaks and Les Platons). Some installations are placing new antennae and dishes on the roofs of buildings (Sand Street and Minden Place Car Park). In areas where there are no existing lattice towers or appropriate roof top sites, the companies have applied to erect a wooden clad replica telegraph pole with antennae hidden inside and a dish on top. The wooden clad poles are being referred to as a 'mast'.

In terms of numbers, each operator has applied for approx 30 wooden clad replica telegraph poles. The exact number may change from just below 30 to just above 30, thus Senator Cohen, by stating 30-40, was covering all eventualities. He was also asked by CTV what the total numbers will be. Obviously the Department can state the exact number that has been applied for and the exact number approved, but not how many will be applied for in the future. We do have network plans from each company so we know how many each company are planning to apply for, but this can change and is not something the Planning Department can control. Thus the need for a rounded figure of 30-40 'masts' or wooden clad poles.

In terms of total 'installations', each company's network plan has approx 50 installations. The exact number again changes from just below 50 to just above 50. The numbers are not static.

In terms of mast sharing, every existing lattice structure on the Island that has the load bearing capacity to be shared, is being shared. Those shared sites are included in the total approx number of 50 installations. In terms of emissions, no, mast sharing does not reduce emissions, it only reduces the overall visual impact of 3 companies on the Island by locating similar infrastructure together. This we have achieved as much as possible with what existing lattice towers the Island has.