

Carol Le Quesne

From: Jersey Community Relations Trust [communityrelations@jerseymail.co.uk]
Sent: 21 December 2006 12:36
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: re mobile mast report by Steve Smith in April 2006

This e-mail has been received directly from the Internet: you should exercise a degree of caution since there can be no guarantee that the source or content of the message is authentic.

If you receive inappropriate e-mail from an external source it is your responsibility to notify Computer Services Helpdesk (telephone 440440).

The Full States e-mail Usage Policy can be found here:
http://intranet1/aware/internet_email_issues.htm

Dear [REDACTED],

As far as I am aware Alan Breckon is still unable to make a public announcement on the Scrutiny panel and I have enclosed a letter from Freddie Cohen to one concerned resident that confirms that as of 8th January all pending applications will go ahead. Because of this I am emailing yourself as I believe you will know the best people to forward it to.

The lifting of the moratorium does not surprise me, licences were issued without thought being given to consequences and as such it is difficult to penalise the telecommunications companies. But it raises immediate concern for me as although Steve Smith quotes from the Stewart report he is very selective in his approach. A precautionary principle according to this report is 300 metres from schools, residential areas and other sensitive areas. Many of the proposed masts currently pending, do not adhere to this principle.

There are some recommendations in Mr Smith's report that I agree with and that should also be expanded upon for instance, a database of all masts and base stations **but this must include the number of antennae and overall emission levels and also type of mast ie G2, G3 or tetra**. People will use this when looking to purchase or rent property and on choosing which schools to send their children to. Some schools such as St Martin's primary will end up with a cluster of masts surrounding them, **emissions must be measured where they overlap**.

We are a small Island, UK mast average is 1 for every two squares miles, here with 300 masts (Telecoms have over 100) it would be 6 for every square mile. London has approx 10 per square mile but London is not regarded as a particularly safe place to live, unlike Jersey. We are trying to determine difference in residential to work areas for London. Surely though these figures alone raise enough cause for concern for the **fourth licence to be retracted, so basically no more masts**.

We have a petition of approximately 1,000 signatures from residents Island wide and we will be presenting this to planning on 2nd or 3rd of January. There are not a few concerned citizens out there, there are loads of them.

Finally I personally believe that everything will go ahead despite growing evidence of risk. Therefore I would ask that health is monitored and GP's are also consulted and trained. I believe that electromagnetic sensitivity and related health risks from impaired immune systems will greatly increase over the next 5-20 years. Jersey can at least be prepared.

Please can you pass this email onto Scrutiny, Patrick Ryan and anyone else you feel will influence the outcome of scrutiny as **we feel further recommendations are required**.

Many thanks and best wishes for the festive season
[REDACTED] on behalf of jmmcg@hotmail.co.uk

14/01/2007