




--

For the Attn: Brendan Versluys

Further to our recent discussion and your very kind assistance, attached to this email is my personal objection to the proposed mast, and also attached the wording of the Petition which has around 180 names etc

 But I am most grateful to you for agreeing to accept the Petition forms wording today and to register the completed petition forms with signatures on Monday as if received today, the closing date for the formal consultation.

I would be most grateful if you could kindly acknowledge safe receipt of both documents. And as arranged, either I or a colleague will bring the hard copy of the petition to Camden's St Pancras offices during Monday's office hours.

Thank you again for your help and understanding and please - if time permits, thank the switchboard operator Chizona Udenna for facilitating the phone call this afternoon.

Enjoy the weekend

Cheers

Jerry Lewis



9, Weech Hall, Fortune Green Road, Hampstead, London NW6 1DJ

28th July 2023

Re: Planning Application - 2023/2341/P Fortune Green Road Outside Hampstead Cemetery London NW6 1DT

To the Camden Council Planning Committee

I wish to register the strongest possible objections to the installation of the proposed 5G mast on Fortune Green Road by the historic Hampstead Cemetery.

Others in the area have already submitted detailed objections including references potentially to health and to the local wildlife and environment.

Without the detailed scientific knowledge I cannot match their researches but in principle I endorse their concerns and dismiss the feeble and clearly out of date counter arguments presented by the applicants.

I wish to concentrate on other aspects and cannot allow the lame excuse that Camden Council are bound by Government policy to fail to properly consult local residents on the proposed installation.

- 1) To the best of my knowledge there has been minimal – in fact I venture to suggest no – local consultations on this latest application. No notices have been placed on any of the local lampposts, trees or any other possible locations advising of the plans in recent weeks.
- 2) I have checked with numerous local residents, the local schools and retailers on Fortune Green Road and the Care Home opposite the proposed site. No-one had heard of the application, therefore this so called consultation appears to have been conducted in such a way that it made it very difficult if not impossible for those most affected to make their case.
- 3) On Camden's application form they have actually ticked the 'Yes' option about consulting "neighbours or the local community", and added they consulted Camden Council! That is just misleading.
- 4) On page 4 of your site details form, they list four educational establishments who they claim they sent details about their application by email. Three of the places I checked with had absolutely no knowledge of the proposals, small wonder the applicants state "there were no issues raised" in response to their email. It's a sham.
- 5) In their application, the company behind the mast claim to have looked at other sites in the area, see pages 8/9 of their documents. How ironic that there is not one word of their failed application from just a few months ago, outside my block of flats, Weech Hall. Camden will have details on file, but we local residents were pleased the Planning Committee decided to reject their last attempt. Thus their claim to have examined five other potential sites without a mention of their rejected Weech Hall application must tell Camden volumes about their truthfulness – they have clearly deliberately attempted to mislead Camden's committee on this key issue.

- 6) Their deception only increases when examining the photographic evidence of the proposed site attached to their application. The photograph shows very little of the surroundings, neither the Cemetery gates within feet of the place they plan to place the mast, nor of the views from the gates which will be completely ruined by the masts installation nor the Zebra crossing.
- 7) The positioning next to a much used Zebra crossing on a relatively narrow pavement is clearly a safety issue. The narrow pavement is used regularly by very young children taken on walks from the nearby schools, and amongst others, it used by the more mobile members of the care home opposite who wish to enjoy some fresh air in the cemetery.
- 8) The accompanying street furniture will considerably impede easy access along the narrow pavements and this will adversely affect those pushing prams, and wheelchairs etc.
- 9) The Zebra crossing is also quite close to the two bus stops, northbound and southbound which those alighting or trying to get access to the buses would use if they wish to safely cross the busy Fortune Green Road. Otherwise if they want a safe crossing they have a quite lengthy walk to the traffic lights at the junction of Fortune Green Road with Finchley Road.
- 10) The vista and views across this part of London, so far uncluttered by high rise buildings, will be badly compromised by the mast's positioning. It will be a massive eyesore and completely out of keeping with the height of the nearby buildings and the trees in the locality.
- 11) On Page 6 of the application reference is made to their belief that they comply with the requirement set out in the National Planning Policy Framework dated February 2019 guidelines and they state "the proposed streetworks design has been selected to minimise visual impact upon the street scene by integrating with existing street furniture". Precisely what do they mean? Minimise visual impact??? There is nothing along the street remotely as hideous as this planned mast. They must be strongly challenged on this total lie.
- 12) All their alleged justifications, complying with Government objectives, repeatedly stated throughout their application is also tempered with concerns about visual impact, and even unknown health issues. How can they just wave a policy recommendation as the all clear to set up masts wherever they wish?
- 13) Ask Mr Cameron Wilson of CK Hutchinson, (sadly no home address given, but the Company address is in Reading) whether he would be happy with such a mast installation outside his residence. Similarly Mr Tom Gallivan of Dot Surveying (again no home address but his outfit has a London address on its headed notepaper but appears to be Edinburgh based). He too needs to be questioned. And while Camden are about it, they could tell them their paperwork too is defective as Cameron Wilson's name appears both as the Applicant (based in Reading) and as the Agent (this time with an Edinburgh address). With such serious errors, couldn't Camden disqualify the application altogether?

- 14) Reference is made on the application form to Site Selection. The applicant was asked whether the Council's mast register was used to check whether this is a suitable site. Their answer was 'no' and they had elected to use an industry site database. It would be very helpful if Camden Council reveal what their information is on the suitability of the site and how up to date their information might be. Does it take into account the latest research on the safety of these newer 5G masts which were not even around when the government guidelines were compiled?
- 15) Assumptions about the safety of 5G masts by their very description must be out of date as the research quoted in the various pieces of submitted documentation is at least three and in some cases four years old. In the industry provided paper headed Mobile re 5G and health refers to guidelines written in 1998, Worse still in a reference to the effect on children in the same document, evidence from the UK Health Protection Agency is given dated April 2012.
- 16) Surely a competent applicant will have produced far more up to date evidence to support their claim. The wording in the paper such as "it is expected...." And "to date no adverse effects..." hardly give rise to confidence, and the industry paper admits the governing paper from 1988 is being 'revised' and is due to be 'replaced' possibly later this year. The paper goes on to state that it remains in their opinion there is "no convincing evidence of adverse effects at exposure below the guidelines levels". No sensible expert can make such an assertion based on research over 25 years old. And the reference to WHO's working group relating to cancers dated 2011, made very clear that "chance bias or confounding cannot be ruled out with reasonable confidence". That type of statement sets alarm bells ringing and should Camden be subsequently sued for allowing 5G masts to be set up causing illness and worse, the Council's reliance on such ancient documentation could well be laughed out of court with heavy financial penalties and heavy compensation potentially involved.
- 17) Under the policy analysis on page 5 referring to the design to be deployed for the proposed antenna and ground based cabinets, (note at no stage are the number or size of the cabinets given), the developers claim it is "the least visually intrusive option available". One is bound to ask, in whose opinion. The applicant adds that they accept there will be "a localised visual increase" through the installation, "it is considered that this will not overly detract from the character of the existing streetscape". Well, Hutchinsons ought to take due note, their masts campaign criteria and considerations are way off the mark and certainly not shared by any or very few of those resident in the locality. They must think again and look elsewhere.
- 18) Finally and a clinching argument. I have a long held mobile phone agreement with 3. I have often complained about their - at times - abysmal reception in this area, I would be one of the chief beneficiaries of a 5G mast were I to own a 5G phone. But for all these reasons coupled with the health concerns expressed by others, and in the absence of any up to date information about those risks, I strongly urge Camden Council's Planning Committee to firmly reject this application and tell the company concerned to think again and choose another area for their proposed mast.

Jerry Lewis

OBJECTION TO Proposed 5G Telecommunications Installation at Hampstead Cemetery

TO CAMDEN COUNCIL: Re Planning Application: 2023/2341/P

We, the undersigned, wish to register our objections to the proposed 5G Mast Installation at Hampstead Cemetery (Planning Application: 2023/2341/P) due to - amongst other reasons: - its impact on the visual appearance of the historic Hampstead Cemetery and its proximity to a care home, residences and school

[illegible]