

Issue: Mobile Phone Masts and International Approaches

Key Words:

There is no verified governmental approach worldwide that has adopted exclusion zones from comparable installations to those in Jersey.

Current situation

- International approaches: The Jersey approach has gone beyond the standard approach of the UK, other EU countries, US and AUS/NZ. These countries only require self compliance with ICNIRP and this is where the criticism exists. Jersey requests companies go beyond that and provide exact levels of emissions and only give temporary permissions until those levels are measured by an engineer and verified by the Health Protection Department.
- Exclusion zones: The Department has had direct written confirmation from the French Agency for Environmental and Occupational Health Safety and the French Ministry for Health that France "has not adopted any specific regulations relating to exclusion zones between mobile phone base stations and schools/residences". The only standard is the maximum value for exposure to Electromagnetic Emission levels. The Department has also had direct written confirmation from the Australian Radiation Protection and Nuclear Safety Agency that Australia "do not have any distance requirements between facility and other land uses such as residences, schools or hospitals". New Zealand have a trans-Tasman agreement that adopts the standards of the ARPANSA.
- Practicality: It would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to find enough land parcels in Jersey to support a mobile network that was 300-500 metres from any home or school. Despite finding appropriate land parcels, there is the reality that the owner of that land may not consent to the installation. There have been several installations to date that have not been located in the optimum place in a certain area because the land owner has refused consent, and have had to be installed at the next best location. It is a requirement of the Planning Department that each application is submitted with supporting information that details other locations in the area that have had to be discounted and the reasons for those decisions.



Issue: Mast Sharing

Key words

All existing infrastructure that can support additional equipment *is* currently being shared by two or more companies. The only way more mast sharing is possible is by building additional lattice masts. This is considered to be more detrimental than allowing a number of wooden clad replica telegraph poles.

Current situation

- Of the existing telecommunication infrastructure:
 - 5 sites are existing large lattice masts where all three companies installed equipment:
 - Fremont, St John: 1 mast 136 metres
 - Les Platons, Trinity: 1 mast 52 metres
 - Five Oaks, St Saviours: 1 mast 57 metres
 - Airport Radar, St Peter: 1 mast 30 metres
 - La Chasse, St Ouen: 2 masts 37.5 m, 1 mast 20 m
 - 14 sites are on existing buildings, sites or masts where two or more companies share.
- The mobile phone companies have led the Planning Department to believe that they could all achieve island-wide coverage with approximately 20-30 large lattice masts, similar to those mentioned above. The alternative to this is with a mixture of smaller rooftop and telegraph pole designs and the 5 existing lattice masts. The construction of additional 20 large lattice masts on the Island would require large service areas, and finding a large enough space away from residential areas in the required areas for technical reasons would be very difficult, if not impossible. The equipment would also be required at a greater strength to cover further distances and thus would result in greater exposure to emissions.
- The decision was therefore made to allow smaller designs with less equipment that blend into the landscape better and thus are at significantly lower emissions. Where alternative rooftop site are not available, the telegraph pole design is considered the best design for this equipment in context of the rural character of Jersey.

Issue: Health Impacts, Precautionary Approach

Key words

The Planning Department has complied with the recommendations in the Health Protection report dated April 2006.

Current situation

- The Planning Department has gone beyond the health recommendations and beyond the best practice in the UK, and has required that all applications provide the exact levels of emissions and only give temporary permissions until those levels are measured by an engineer and verified by the Health Protection Department.
- The international guideline for emissions (ICNIRP) was set at a significantly lower level than those levels tested as having effects on human health. The ICNIRP reference level for maximum exposure for the public is a precautionary approach. The ICNIRP precautionary level is **4.5 W/m²**.
- The lowest 'alternative' level for a precautionary approach, from all the web sites, news articles and scientific reports (valid or not) provided to the Department during the moratorium, is suggested at **1 W/m²**.
- The maximum levels proposed in **Jersey** is below **0.3 W/m²** (watt per metre squared).
- At individual sites the emissions level is well within the maximum ICNIRP level. They are also within the levels recommended by Salzburg, Dr Cherry and Dr Hyland, who's research questions the ICNIRP levels.
- Estimated levels of emissions are a theoretical maximum based on ideal circumstances and are worst-case levels. The actual emissions from a base station are absorbed and reflected by buildings or vegetation and can be expected to be 100 to 10,000 times less than the estimates.

Background:

- It is not the role of the planning system to determine health safeguards. However in assessing these applications my officers and I have recognised public concern over the potential health impacts of the telecommunication base stations and requested an informed opinion from Health and Social Services as to their likely health impacts on the basis of sound scientific evidence. This was received in April this year, prior to any approvals being granted.

The levels involved in Jersey are thousands of times less than the level of emissions recommended as safe by Lord Stewart's Independent Expert Group on Mobile Phones (2000). Adoption of these safe levels was an integral part of the precautionary approach recommended in Lord Stewart's report.