

**Electricity Act 1989-Section 37
Inquiries Procedure (Scotland) Rules 1997, as amended
Proposed Beauly to Denny 400kV transmission line.**

PRECOGNITION

on behalf of

STIRLING BEFORE PYLONS

**By Ian Paterson MRCVS
with regard to**

LOCAL HEALTH CONCERNS

**To be presented at the Stirling area Session of the
Public Inquiry due to commence on 21st November 2007.**

**Ian Paterson is a Veterinary Surgeon who lives and works in Stirling.
He has 26 years experience of mixed and small animal practice. He is
chairman of the community group Stirling Before Pylons.**

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 I believe it is important to clarify who Stirling Before Pylons was representing at the Strategy Session and who we are now representing.

1.2 Following the first pre-inquiry meeting on 31st October 2006 it was agreed that Stirling Before Pylons would lead evidence at the Strategic Session of the Inquiry on EMF and potential health impacts. It was agreed we would lead this evidence on behalf of Scotland Before Pylons to avoid unnecessary repetition in the other local sessions.

1.3 Two expert witnesses, Professors Henshaw and O'Carroll presented evidence on the science. Ian Paterson presented a critique of the Environmental Statement and Caroline Paterson's precognition was about public and parliamentary concern.

1.4 Chapter 32 of the ES was written by Dr John Swanson of the National Grid, but the applicants employed Dr Bailey of Exponent Health Sciences, New York to present their evidence at the Public Inquiry.

1.5 Stirling Before Pylons is now presenting evidence on behalf of people in the Stirling area. The evidence given in this precognition is based partly on communications that I and my colleagues have had, with hundreds, if not thousands of Stirling residents over the last three years. These people wish their views to be presented to the Inquiry. We understand and agree with the Reporters wish not to explore further the scientific evidence dealt with at the Strategic session. Only brief reference will be made to the science in a local context.

1.6 Contrary to assertions made by counsel in her closing submissions, Stirling Before Pylons has had very little influence in areas outside Stirling in raising awareness of potential health impacts. We understand that at nearly every meeting arranged by SSE during the public consultation phase health concerns were always one of the major issues raised by the public, and before we in Stirling knew any

details of the proposed power line. As confirmed in APL 2 B/2 paragraph 17.17 and APL 2B/1 paragraph 4.34 major public concern about potential health impacts, from HVOTL is nothing new.

2.0 REASONS FOR LOCAL HEALTH CONCERNS

2.1 StBP has held regular meetings since it was constituted in December 2004. These have been attended by representatives from Braco, Kinbuck, Dunblane, Sherriffmuir, Logie, Powis, Fallin, Cowie, Plean, Throsk and Denny. Since August 2005 these people have been joined by Community Council committee members from the following ten Community Councils who support StBP.

- Dunblane Community Council
- Bridge of Allan Community Council
- Causewayhead Community Council
- Cambuskenneth Community Council
- Logie Community Council
- Cowie Community Council
- Plean Community Council
- Polmaise Community Council
- Bannockburn Community Council
- Mercat Cross & Central C. Council

2.2 At these meetings participants have relayed information from their communities and following meetings information is fed back to those communities. StBP has around one thousand paid up members and many more supporters.

We have learnt that many Stirling area citizens believe this overhead power line development poses a threat to the health and wellbeing of themselves, their families, their neighbours and the wider community. We have had strong support from all our constituency and list MSPs on this issue.

2.3 The Rt Hon George Reid had this to say in December 2005 in a letter to the Energy Consents unit;

“My constituents in Cowie, Fallin, Logie, Manor Powis, Plean, Sherrifmuir and Throsk form the largest population group living in close proximity to the preferred route.

Over the past 18 months, in consultation with community groups, I have attempted to address the serious issues arising from the line with senior representatives of both companies. I have done so in written submissions, in face to face meetings and through on site inspections. Over this period my staff and I have responded to over 2000 letters from local people who have contacted us about their concerns.

It is clear to me that their concerns have not been adequately answered and I therefore believe that the Scottish Executive must address the following issues through a Public Inquiry”:

The first issue he dealt with was Health. See StBP/2/16 for full details. He finished this section by saying:

“I am sure the Scottish Executive will wish to examine these issues and also to consider the possibilities of both future litigation and re-routing of lines.”

2.4 The Formal Submission of **Anne McGuire MP and Sylvia Jackson MSP** (Stirling Constituency) to the Energy Consents unit on 15/12/05 contained the following:

“This submission reflects not only the face to face discussions we have had with hundreds of people in the constituency, but also the thousands of written submissions we have received.

The health effects from electro-magnetic fields (EMF) associated with high voltage power lines have become one of the principle concerns amongst our constituents.”

See Also StBP/7/21 showing the high level local public and political interest.

2.5 Some of the reasons given by Stirling citizens for serious health concerns:-

- People living close to the existing 132 kV power lines firmly believe their health has been adversely affected, some very seriously by this proximity.
- Animals, especially horses, becoming sick when kept near power lines, recovering when moved away and becoming sick again when moved back near the lines.

- Computers and pacemakers are adversely affected by magnetic field levels that would be encountered by people in the proximity of the proposed new power line. (Environmental Statement Chap 32)
- Human brains and bodies governed by vastly more sensitive bioelectrical systems than computers are bound also to be adversely affected.
- A wide range of medical conditions are successfully treated using low level magnetic fields. Effective treatments are always harmful in certain circumstances. No one would recommend that drugs used in medical treatments be randomly given to the public, especially to children. (StBP/7/14)
- Massive, recent increase in RF-EMF from mobile phone and other wireless technologies combines with power line EMF to potentially further increase risk. (StBP/7/14)
- Insurers are worried about health risks from power lines. The Norwich Union, one of the UK's biggest insurance companies, acknowledges that it regards "living close to high-voltage overhead power lines as a future risk to the insurance industry."
- Inaccurate and misleading information given to the public by the applicants regarding health risks. (See StBP/2/6 and Ian Paterson strategy session precognition.)
- Sir William Stewart, head of the RPD-HPA has misgivings regarding decision makers ICNIRP who set guidelines on EMF. (StBP/7/13) (see also StBP/7/11 extract in Appendix)
- Stress is a health hazard in itself. One serious stroke and one heart attack death among objectors partly attributed to the power line already.
- The noise from the proposed OHL will be an additional stressor. (StBP/4/25)
- There are Scottish Government policies that make it clear preventing ill-health, especially in children, is a top priority. This proposed new power line could undermine those policies in the Stirling area. (StBP/1/3, StBP/1/4, StBP/1/6, StBP/1/13, StBP/1/31. see appendix.)
- One Scottish Government policy tool for improving health and preventing ill-health, is to improve the physical environment, particularly for disadvantaged communities. This power line development would degrade the environment and conflict with this Scottish Government policy tool. (StBP/1/13 see appendix)

2.6 Some of public concern comes from science based evidence; some is based on common sense and anecdotal evidence. Common sense appreciation of what is likely to be dangerous partly based on anecdotal evidence must not be dismissed. History has shown many times that the informed public has often been well ahead of the “experts” in knowing when a serious public health problem exists.

3.0 PSYCHOLOGICAL IMPACT

3.1 Missing from the Environmental Statement is any acknowledgment of the long term consequences of altering the environment of those communities affected by the proposed pylons. There is no health without mental health. Factors which considerably alter our quality of life, and fall outside our ability to control, will invariably impact on our mental wellbeing; this in turn has major social and financial costs.

3.2 We know that a large number of people living in the villages and settlements along the route of the line around Stirling have serious concerns about the risk this proposed power line poses to their health and that this is a source of anxiety for them. Many other people in the Stirling area, not immediately affected, are still concerned that the lives of children and adults are being threatened.

3.3 Some peoples’ anxiety arises from the effect the proposed development will have on their business or livelihood. Some fear losing their businesses or being forced to leave their home. Many also feel significantly stressed at the thought of our magnificent cultural and natural heritage being degraded so badly.

3.4 Many in the Eastern Villages feel depressed and angry at the thought of their environment being degraded yet further. Even more galling for them, as the proposed route was moved much closer to them after the first “consultation” exercise, to avoid houses that might be built in the future.

3.5 The seven thousand or so people in the eastern village area who would have been very little affected by the applicants’ first, “indicative proposed route” suddenly became very seriously affected by the applicants revised, “preferred”, route. By the

applicants own admission the chances of altering the “preferred route” were much less (possibly nil chance) than for the “indicative proposed route”. This despite the fact that thousands more people would be affected, and indeed thousands more people objected to the applicants’ second choice of route.

(StBP/1/3, StBP/1/13, StBP/1/17, StBP/1/20, StBP/1/21, StBP/1/31.see appendix for extracts)

3.6 Keith Brown (Ochil) MSP at a Scottish Parliamentary debate on 19/09/07:

“The eastern villages of Stirling are often forgotten about in this context but have regularly been seen as a dumping ground for pylons and various other public utilities, to the detriment of the people. I hope that their interests will also be taken into account”. (StBP/2/24)

3.7 Dr Richard Simpson (Mid Scotland and Fife) MSP at the Scottish Parliamentary debate on 10/09/07.

“My final point is that after the loss of the mining industry in the eastern villages and given all the health inequalities and the major economic and employment problems in the area, I think it a total disgrace that pylons should be dumped on these people as well.” (StBP/2/24)

3.8 The proposed power line would have a major impact on the wellbeing of many hundreds of people in the Stirling area; this in turn has major social and financial costs for the region.

3.9 These costs might be very difficult to calculate but very definitely need to be considered.

3.10 Counsel for the applicants has claimed that StBP has “amplified fears”. This is not true. We have alerted some people in the community to the potential dangers, and rightly so. The term “amplification of risk”, in the reference quoted by counsel, is described as a phenomenon that some risks are seen as more hazardous by the general population than they are by experts.

3.11 History has shown many times that when there has been long term public concern over a health issue that it is very often the public who were right and the “experts” with the vested interests who were wrong. For example decades of

evidence were successfully suppressed on the dangers of smoking and asbestos by these powerful industries at huge cost to public health, and still, the tobacco industry denies there is an absolute proven link between its product and disease. (for many more examples see StBP 5. European Environment Agency, Late Lessons from Early Warnings) (see also StBP/2/6 extract in appendix)

3.12 The BioInitiative Report (published Aug 07) has this to say on the subject:

“The electric power and communication industries have enormous political clout and even provide support for a significant fraction of what research is done on EMF. This results in legislation that protects the status quo and scientific publications whose conclusions are not always based on only the observations of the research.”

(The UKCCS study and to a lesser extent the “Draper Report” may well be good examples of this)

“It hinders wise public health policy actions and implementation of prevention strategies because of the huge financial investments already made in these technologies.” (StBP/7/14)

3.13 Far from “amplifying fears” StBP has still not even had time to communicate with everyone closely affected by the proposal and we are still meeting local people who know very little if anything about the proposal. The reference Ms Wilson refers to regarding “amplification of risk” comes from the Health Council of the Netherlands (HCN) from 2003. She fails to explain that in October 2005 the HCN adopted precautionary guidelines for EMF exposure with which the proposed Beauuly to Denny power line would not comply. (See StBP 26 Recommendations with regard to overhead high-voltage power lines) Nor would it comply with guidelines in a number of other countries.

4.0 REASONING FOR CONCLUSIONS

4.1 A number of people from the Stirling area followed the evidence given by Stirling Before Pylons and the applicants, and have formed opinions on the witnesses, evidence presented and the conclusions drawn from that evidence.

4.2 We wish to make to it absolutely clear what precautions StBP is urging on the Reporters for the Stirling area and why. In order to do this it is necessary to make

comments on the witnesses who provided evidence on the health issue and the conclusions drawn from their evidence.

4.3 The author of Chapter 32 was Dr John Swanson of National Grid. As the foremost industry expert in the UK on these matters Stirling observers understand why the applicants chose him for this task. People also understand that as an industry employee he is bound to support the long established and dogmatic position of industry that there is nothing for the public to worry about.

4.4 It is still not clear to people in Stirling, who, if anyone, the applicants sought advice from before and during the public consultation period. It certainly was not the NRPB who confirmed that they had had no communication from the applicants. Stirling residents find this, and the fact that Dr John Swanson did not appear at the Inquiry to defend his written evidence, disturbing. Especially so as he has admitted “that no one in their right mind would want to live near a high voltage power line”. Stirling residents are also aware that Dr Swanson, one of the authors of the “Draper Report”, is lead author of the paper *Power-Frequency Electric and Magnetic Fields in the Light of Draper et al 2005, (2006)*. At the end of this paper (which was not published in time to be included in the Strategy Session) he concludes,

“What is clear is that the evidence associating childhood leukaemia with magnetic fields and power lines is substantial and deserves further research until an explanation is found”.

4.5 Stirling observers find it interesting that the applicants could find no one in the UK to fill Dr Swanson’s shoes, but instead employed Dr Bailey from the USA. It is claimed that Dr Bailey is an independent witness. Clearly the applicants would not have engaged Dr Bailey unless they knew he would support their position and Dr Bailey has given evidence on behalf of the power industry at public inquiries many times before. That is not to say we question the integrity of Dr Bailey but we do disagree with major parts of what he said, and certainly the conclusions drawn by counsel from his evidence.

4.6 We know that there is hardly ever such a thing as a fully independent witness. Professor Henshaw was honest enough to admit this when he said “are we not all, in a sense, (inadvertent) members of pressure groups advocating particular positions?” It

is interesting that counsel claims to have found this obvious and honest remark “astonishing”. Stirling observers are inclined to believe that Dr Bailey, is of course, in a sense, a member of the largest most powerful pressure group of all; the power industry.

4.7 The StBP witnesses were not in attendance for the money. Prof O’Carroll’s fee for his time was very modest and Professor Henshaw would accept no payment whatsoever for his appearance. They were there on principle. They believe, along with many other experts that measures to protect lives from ELF-EMF are needed NOW. People in Stirling are outraged that the applicants are seeking to have their £7 million costs paid by the consumer.

4.8 Stirling citizens in the audience were astonished by the rude and aggressive manner in which counsel for the applicants addressed and questioned the StBP witnesses. It seemed to many in attendance that counsel was finding it very hard to attack the substance of what the witnesses were saying so she had to resort to attacking the person. Observers from Stirling did not hear her successfully refute any of the science put forward by the StBP witnesses.

4.9 SHETL/SPT wish the reporters to believe that because the applicants have the resources to copy no fewer than 129 documents to all the main parties this is evidence that their witness is providing a balanced overview of the evidence. The people of Stirling do not buy this. There are many hundreds of scientific papers and had we had the resources we too could have produced a huge file for little purpose. The applicants seem to have misunderstood and confused the citation of papers for the purpose of illustration or example with drawing conclusions exclusively from them. As directed by the Reporters, it would not be appropriate for witnesses to give an entire overview and cite all the evidence on which conclusions are based for this subject; that would require a scientific dialogue beyond the scope of the inquiry. Rather witnesses may give their professional opinion together with an outline of their reasons and some of the key evidence.

4.10 The recently published **BioInitiative Report** truly does contain a very wide, expert, and up-to-date review of the evidence and it is commended to the Reporters.

(StBP/7/14) The BioInitiative Report discusses the Weight of Evidence approach of which the applicants appear to claim a monopoly. They are incorrect. StBP will officially comment on the BioInitiative Report by 30th October.

4.11 When the applicants' witness, Dr Bailey was asked in cross examination if he felt the three homes said to be within 100 metres of the whole line were worthy of investigation by the reporters he replied "**absolutely**".

A number of important observations are made by observers from Stirling on this very clear reply from Dr Bailey.

- Two of the supposedly three homes are in the Stirling area.
- In fact not 2 but 19 or even more homes in the Stirling area alone could be within 100 meters of the new line depending on the where the line was built within the deviation corridor applied for in this application.
- Dr Bailey has considerably softened his position since his last appearance at a UK power line public inquiry.
- People in Stirling want to know why homes within 200 or even 600 metres of the proposed power line should not also be "*absolutely worthy of investigation by the reporters?*" After all, the recent and emerging evidence suggests a problem extending beyond 200 metres. e.g. Draper 2005 (StBP 4) , Lowenthal 2007 (StBP/7/16)

4.12 Lowenthal et al (2007) reported that children raised for the first 5 years of life in home environments exposed to EMF within 300 metres of a high voltage power line have a five-fold (a 500%) increased risk of developing some types of cancer.

4.13 Draper et al (2005) found an increased risk of childhood leukaemia extending to 600 metres from high voltage power lines.

4.14 The Draper report also confirmed that the UKCCS study had found a relative risk of 1.42 (0.85 to 2.37) for acute lymphocytic leukaemia within 400 m for 275 and 400 kV lines. The applicants have tried to gloss over this finding. We understand that applicants contributed to the funding of the **UKCCS study**. (APL- 11/3/80)

4.15 The StBP presentation was strictly limited by our resources, but we believe that enough evidence was presented at the strategic session of the Inquiry to show that the applicants have not taken adequate precautionary measures with regard to potentially very serious health impacts which can now be reasonably foreseen to affect people in the Stirling area. Further important evidence has appeared since the Strategy session which has been accepted by the Inquiry and this adds even more weight to the case.

4.16 The applicants say they made consideration for visual impact and amenity, but it seems in some instances plant and bird life was prioritised over these human impacts. And the applicants admit potential health impacts, per se, were not a consideration in the routing of the line. Possibly considering visual impact and amenity is not the same as making consideration for acute lymphoblastic leukaemia in children or myeloproliferative cancers in adults for example. The line is too close to too many people in the Stirling area.

4.17 Contrary to claims by the applicants a great deal has changed since the 275kV Scotland to N. Ireland power line Public Inquiry thirteen years ago. Counsel quoted selectively from APL 2/B/1.

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

5.1 If the proposed new power line was invisible and the only effect to consider was ELF-EMF effect on health, StBP believes the following precautions would be realistic.

5.2 In line with recommendations from Professor Henshaw, The Westminster Cross Party Inquiry into Childhood Leukaemia (which only considered C.L. and not the adult conditions) and The BioInitiative Report, StBP believes there should be a minimum avoidance distance from dwellings of 200 metres and strenuous efforts should be made to extend this to 600 metres if at all possible and especially from schools, nurseries, other learning institutions or where many people would be affected.

5.3 If the effort can be made to protect birds and plants it can surely be made to protect humans. The applicants' assertion that they have considered visual impact and amenity and by extension, potential health impacts, is refuted in the Stirling area.

5.4 Due to the corona ion effect it is likely that a truly safe distance from the proposed new line could be 1 km or more, but to quote from the BioInitiative Report,

“As with many other standards for environmental exposures, our proposed limits may not be totally protective, but more stringent standards are not realistic at the present time.”

5.5 The Westminster Cross-Party Inquiry into Childhood Leukaemia and ELF-EMF ; “The inquiry recommends that the Government recognise the potential risks to children's health caused by exposure to EMF and introduce a moratorium on the building of new HVOTL within 60 metres of existing homes and schools. The inquiry also recommends that the Government consider the case for extending this distance to 200 metres for the highest voltage lines.”

5.6 George Wimpey, one of the UK's biggest house builders has an internal policy that restricts building within 200 metres of existing HVOTL. They describe the reasoning for their policy as a combination of commercial factors and corporate social responsibility.

5.7 Michael Connarty (Linlithgow and East Falkirk) Lab MSP: House of Commons Oral Answers.

“Will the leader of the house ensure that there is a dialogue with the Scottish Executive, which is considering the proposal for the Beaully to Denny supergrid? It will be a 400 kV grid and we are calling for a zone around it of 200 metres in which schools and houses should not be built. (nor the line built within 200m of schools and houses) That is a pressing matter. Many children have died from childhood leukaemia that is clearly linked to the proximity of their homes to pylons” (StBP/7/19)

5.8 From the conclusions from the BioInitiative Report (August 2007); “it is no longer acceptable to build new power lines and electrical facilities that place people in ELF environments that have been determined to be risky. While new limits are being developed and implemented, a reasonable approach would be 0.1 microtesla planning limit for habitable space adjacent to all new or upgraded power lines.” This equates to an avoidance distance of at least 200 metres. (StBP/7/14)

5.9 The proposed overhead power line will, of course, be far from invisible and in addition to the potential health impacts from ELF-EMF there will be huge visual impacts affecting tourism, recreation, amenity, local economy, and wellbeing. As

discussed earlier, in addition to the potential EMF impact on physical (including psychiatric) health, the psychological effect is likely also to result in physical health impacts.

5.10 In practice we are not asking the Reporters ultimately to decide on a precautionary distance for the proposed line in the Stirling area. StBP has made it clear since the first pre-inquiry meeting that we are respectfully urging the reporters to recommend undergrounding the whole Stirling section, or to recommend consideration of an alternative transmission route such as sub-sea.

5.11 Many people believe health impacts alone, or tourism impacts alone, for example, are serious enough to warrant refusal of this overhead line application in the Stirling area, but when all the impacts are added together StBP respectfully submits that the case for undergrounding or seeking an alternative transmission route for the Stirling area section is overwhelming.

5.12 Government has yet to respond to SAGE, the Cross Party Inquiry into Childhood Leukaemia and the BioInitiative Report. These and other developments are being watched closely by politicians and the public. StBP has already commented or soon will be commenting to the Inquiry on all these reports.

5.13 The Inquiry has heard acknowledged experts disagree on appropriate levels of precaution but agree that precaution to some degree is appropriate.

5.14 We submit that the Reporters should err on the side of caution when the consequences of not doing so can now be foreseen and could, quite literally, be fatal. Even a small increased risk for cancer and neurodegenerative diseases translates into an enormous public health consequence.

5.15 These precautions are reasoned and reasonable and are not, as counsel says she would like the reporters to accept, in any way extreme.

[END]

APPENDIX

1. StBP/1/3 First Minister's Environmental Justice speech 18/02/02

"Health – A healthy environment contributes to our well being, and we are committed to improving our national health: Scotland's record and the inequalities that still exist in health are intolerable. We must direct our resources to treating (preventing) preventable illnesses. If we improve life circumstances, improve our air quality and water quality, if we reduce noise pollution and ensure healthy living, then our health service itself becomes more sustainable."

"Finally, new environmental rights from the Freedom of Information Act, will ensure people can learn about the environment in which they live. Information is empowering and can help local people take control of their own circumstances"

2. StBP/1/4 A Partnership for a better Scotland

"Improving Scotland's health is central to the welfare of society. Our poor health record is well known. New initiatives are required to create a step change in improving health."

"We want a Scotland where everyone can enjoy a decent quality of life."

3. StBP/1/6 Scotland's Sustainable Development Strategy

Key Outcomes;

- *An environment that provides the conditions for health and well-being.*
- *A focus on the promotion of good mental health and well-being.*
- *The regeneration of local environments.*
- *People at the heart of change*

4. StBP/1/13 Scottish Executive Improving Health in Scotland.

The next challenge.. "to narrow the opportunity gap and improve the health of our most disadvantaged communities at a faster rate, thereby narrowing the health gap."

"Mental ill-health is increasing and disproportionately affects the disadvantaged groups in our communities."

“The responsibility for achieving improved health cannot lie solely in the hands of any one agent – Government, professional groups, organisations or individuals. For example, we will have to improve the physical environment of our most deprived areas.”

*“The tools available to the Executive to improve health are as follows:
Improving the physical environment – using national and local interventions to safeguard and improve the physical environment.”*

5. StBP/1/17 Health in Scotland 2005

The Environment as a stressor

“A concern echoed throughout this report is the fact that Scots in socially disadvantaged areas live shorter less healthy lives and confront chronic disease much earlier than as a whole.”

“A contribution from physical environment to these stresses is certainly plausible, given the correlation between disadvantaged social circumstances and environments which are damaged, visually unappealing and threatening, yet residents are often largely unable to affect change.”

6. StBP/1/20 Social Focus on Deprived Areas

“Improvements are being made across the whole of Scotland on a number of health outcomes. However, for many health outcomes, the differences between the most deprived areas and the rest of Scotland are increasing because the improvements are being made at a faster rate in the least deprived areas.”

7. StBP/1/21 Scottish Executive Environment Group. Review of Progress on Environmental Justice. December 2005

12. Health. “Environmental justice is a high priority largely because of the impact that poor quality environments can have on peoples’ physical, mental and psychological well-being. The precise relationships between environment and health are often complex and work to improve our understanding of them is an essential part of addressing these issues appropriately.”

14. “Public participation of the planning system allows local communities’ views and priorities to be reflected in decisions affecting the quality of their local environment”

15. “Communities need access to good quality, comprehensible information on environmental matters if they are to participate in decisions affecting the quality of their local environments.”

19. “Corporate social responsibility. Focus on environmental justice has served to highlight a perspective where business may be seen as accountable not just to shareholders but also to stakeholders such as the communities in whose neighbourhoods they operate.”

8. StBP/1/29 Ten ways to attract more visitors from the US

5. Improve Healthy Living

Phil Hanlon, Prof of public health at Glasgow University said Scotland *“had to turn round its image as the sick man of Europe. I think there is an issue in what we present to Americans, in terms of an image of Scotland that is healthy and opportunities to be healthy.”*

9. StBP/1/31 Principles and Priorities: The Government’s Programme for Scotland

4. A Healthier Scotland.

“We believe that effective health policy is as much about preventing ill-health as treating it. That is why we will ensure a sharper focus on improving public health and reducing inequalities, as well as on ensuring good quality and timely treatment and care”.

Our approach to improving Scotland’s health involves:

- *Encouraging everybody to take responsibility for their own health and well-being;*
- *Focusing on early intervention to give children the best possible start in life and tackle early the risk factors that lead to ill-health in later life*

10. StBP/2/6 Note of Bannockburn public meeting 1st April 2004

During Discussion the following points were raised :-

Health Issues (the first issue in the notes)

“Reference was made to a recent newspaper publication that linked incidences of childhood leukaemia to overhead high voltage power lines. It was suggested (by Dr Keith Maclean of SSE) that this research was limited. He said employees in the electricity industry worked in the highest magnetic fields and there was not a higher incidence of leukaemia amongst them. Health issues about depression and sleep patterns were also raised as concerns.

In response to a question on the proposal to site overhead power lines in an urban area (West Plein) it was pointed out that underground lines do not preclude magnetic fields. Although it was a reasonable theory that magnetic fields ionise pollutants into the atmosphere there was no evidence to support this.”

STBP comment. This information provided by Dr Keith Maclean of SSE was grossly misleading and inaccurate, and the notes from the meeting although recording *health issues* as the first point raised, do not reflect the amount and degree of public concern that was expressed at the meeting regarding health issues.

This meeting occurred long before the existence of StBP.

Alternative Options

“However undergrounding was being considered for critical sections of the route.”

Quoted from Dr Keith Maclean of SSE.

11. StBP/7/11 Scottish Parliamentary Debate, 22 February 2006.

Mr Andrew Arbuckle (Mid Scotland and Fife MSP)

“As everyone knows Sir William Stewart was the man who headed up the UK Government committee that investigated the radiation effects of mobile phone use. His findings on that issue were strongly based on the assumption that precautions should be taken. He was of the same mind when I mentioned the proposal to run high-voltage power lines down the spine of Scotland.”

Mr Brian Monteith (Mid Scotland and Fife MSP)

“It is said no causal link exists between contracting lung cancer and second-hand smoke, but parliament decided that the statistical link was great enough for Parliament to act. It is said that no causal medical link exists between contracting leukaemia and living in proximity to high voltage power lines; but the statistical link is greater than that between second hand smoke and lung cancer. That fact should be acknowledged by members who voted for a total ban on smoking in public places. They should lobby the Executive to apply the precautionary principle, act consistently and help to save lives.”

StBP/4/25 Noise