

I am deeply concerned about the proliferation of mobile masts within the island. Through the research that I have done and through listening to various speakers at the scrutiny meeting of thurs 18 jan 07, I have come to the personal conclusion that these masts and their emissions are dangerous and that the proposed number of masts would put, due to density, everyone in the island at risk of declining health and possible environmental damage to the island.

I, therefore come to the scrutiny with the view that allowing such health risks within the island would be an unreasonable and alarming thing to do.

I would like to include one copy of a statement made by an expert about the possible outcome of erecting 300 masts within Jersey. (PLEASE NOTE I SHALL FORWARD THIS LATER TODAY)

This statement has really alarmed me and has with other gathered information, testimonies etc propelled me into a chain of reactions culminating in this application to scrutiny.

This part of my application is particularly about health issues and I shall now type from a handwritten copy I wrote on thurs.

I missed the application for a mast to be installed in field 101, (to my knowledge approx 40 metres from my house.) I therefore did not contest the application.

My first awareness of this application was when it had been approved along with 25 other applications and was reported in the JEP.

I felt horrified and almost physically sick, as I have always believed such masts to be dangerous.

The other mast applic. for St Lawrence was close to St Lawrence School, and more specifically to the Nursery Class that he attends in the afternoon.

It was a "double whammy" of shock. My son will have no respite from these waves as an initial reaction, we will all become ill, we must move house, our quiet country location - that we have lived in for approx one and a half years is to be destroyed.

I was on the phone to a contact for the Jersey mast concern group within minutes. My husband and I wrote to the paper that night.

I felt then that my worries were overwhelming and indeed still feel the same nearly two weeks later - despite the promise of further inquiry into circumstances regarding the mast close to our home - for which I thank scrutiny.

We feel that if we can afford to we will look to move properties (as has been pointed out to me there maybe nowhere to go to that [isnt](#) close to a mast now) or even leave the island - because my husband and I feel that if the introduction of such a high density mast structure throughout the island, were to go ahead, everyone would be under significant risk of health complications.

Possibly a couple of weeks prior to our becoming aware of the St Lawrence application approvals, I read in the JEP a letter from a lady, concerning mobile mast emissions and the possibility that cordless phones damage health through emissions in the same way as mobile mast emissions. I reacted to this immediately, buying a corded phone from JT. (This was the display phone as all other similar corded phones had been sold

that day - an unusually high level of sales. )

I feel happy to be able to react in this way to perceived health risks, I like to take responsibility for such issues, it puts my mind at rest.

My mind has now not been at rest for days, as I become more involved in the current debate - Who will take reasonable responsibility for all of our health now? I have not been sleeping well at nights - I feel that I my husband and I are suffering from stress, feelings of anger, frustration and resentment, confusion fear and distress.

I am spending as much time as I can on this issue - but as full - time carer of my child - am constantly vexed by my lack of time. Our family life is under stress - my son is aware that mum is preoccupied, distracted and removed from normal day to day existence - yet how do I explain everything to a three year old?

My mother has agreed that I may also submit her testimony to scrutiny on her behalf.

Like us, she replaced her cordless phone for a corded one. As she has only one room acting as both lounge and bedroom, her phone is situated near to the bed and is on at night times. She came to me a few days later to say that she had stopped having headaches in the morning, ever y

morning since the day that she replaced her cordless phone.

We do not have a microwave in the house, only use our mobiles occasionally - and are happy to pay the price for one island networks JT's in my opinion good provision to the island (refer to talk by JT rep. at scrutiny meeting (thurs))

We are energy aware - I turn off all electrical items in the bedroom before sleeping, as I feel that such energy affects sleep. I am affected by certain types of lighting and have had great difficulties in sitting in front of a computer - as I find the energy to be draining.

I believe myself to be energy sensitive. I have suffered from stress, - having in the past had a nervous breakdown.

Mental health issues are often hereditary. I fear for my son on this specifically and for him and all children in general - they are a vulnerable group within the society, as are the elderly, and mentally ill.

I should like to ask if any specific research has been made with regards to these groups. Have groups representing such people - with specific regard to epileptics - been asked to make representation to scrutiny?

This is all I have time for at present, but will continue this representation as soon as possible. I thank you for your time.

This is the testimony to be read as part of my scrutiny application of Friday 19th. sent at approx 2.40pm. I think my introduction to it was incorrect - ie he is talking about the possible effects of 200 not 300 masts. Source - [jerseymastconcern.co.uk](http://jerseymastconcern.co.uk) home page.

Thank you.

[Dr Blackwell](#) an expert in the field of mobile masts, when asked "What the health implications are likely to be to our Island from over 200 masts?" he advised. "I believe it's possible to say pretty definitively now that the potential health implications for Jersey are: Significantly increased incidence of cancer over the next few years (all types); significant

increase in incidence of brain degenerative disorders such as Alzheimers and (particularly) Motor Neurone Disease; widespread incidence of sleep disorders and disrupted diurnal (daily) rhythms, leading to a significant degradation of quality of life for substantial numbers of Jersey residents; increased incidence of epilepsy and increased incidence of fitting by known epileptics - both particularly in respect of children; significantly increased incidence of hyperactivity among children of all ages through to teenagers, and an increased level of non-specific distress (crying, obvious discomfort, sleep problems) for numbers of babies; significant incidence of hearing disorders - hearing hums, clicks, buzzes, that aren't actually there, tinnitus - all of these severe for some sufferers; low-level infections that go on for months and just won't clear up - throat infections, colds etc; very serious discomfort/pain for a small percentage of the population (typically 3% to 5%, rising over time) who are particularly electrosensitive, often totally debilitating; various other disorders caused by disruption of intercellular signaling in the **body; significant detrimental effects on wildlife, cattle, birds - I'd expect the bird population to drop significantly over a period. There may well be other effects, but this gives a pretty clear picture."**

Dear Mr Breckon, with relation to our conversation on the environmental aspect or the mobile debate, I send you a copy of this letter sent earlier today to Senator Cohen. I will forward any response to you. Also could you inform me of any info relative to this matter. Thank you

Original Message -----

**From:**

**To:** [f.cohen@gov.je](mailto:f.cohen@gov.je)

**Sent:** Friday, January 19, 2007 9:50 AM

**Subject:** the environment in relation to mobile mast proloiferation

Dear Sir, I am writing to you after some involvement in the phone mast debate - I have spoken to local politicians and attended the scrutiny meeting last night, thurs 18th Jan, 2007.

One of my major concerns is that I cannot seem to find any research or indeed any apparent interest in the possible affects that the proposed development of the mobile network will have on the environment.

The one thing I have heard is about blending the poles into the environment - this is a concern, yet not the major ones.

I wonder if research has covered such issues as-

\* physical impact on all flora and fauna within the island. Also all livestock and produce to be consumed by islanders.

\*Possible soil pollution,

\*particular effects on trees as sensitive living organisms in very close proximity to masts.

\*Possible influence on global warming

I wonder if information has been sought from experts in this field internationally eg Greenpeace

and also locally eg Men of the Trees, Soil Association, Genuine Jersey Group, Jersey Trust etc.

At a time when the ecology and its vulnerability are constantly in the news, I am eager

to receive your reply on these issues.