

Printed on: 17/08/2023 09:10:08

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/2480/P	Zillah Rauter	16/08/2023 12:07:12	OBJ	<p>To Camden Council,</p> <p>I stand with John Adams and Amalia Adams in the objection of the proposed planning permission.</p> <p>I agree on the grounds that are presented in their objection letters and the change.org petition.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Zillah Rauter</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:	Printed on: 17/08/2023 09:10:08
2023/2480/P	amalia adams	16/08/2023 11:55:35	OBJ	<p>To all the relevant parties,</p> <p>I would like to register an official complaint/objection to the proposed plans. I am severely disappointed with the way in which this whole process has occurred. I believe that there is intentional obscurity and lack of transparency for all the individuals who will be affected by the plans. As a [REDACTED] year old, I have found it difficult to navigate the planning proposal and I have also had no responses from the council despite several attempts at contact.</p> <p>My name is Amalia and my father is John Adams, one of the residents of Jacqueline House. He is extremely distressed by all of the recent occurrences. It has been painful to watch my [REDACTED] year old father go through this pain, fear and feeling of powerless-ness that has been caused by your actions. As everyone knows, with old age there is often increased anxiety and a lack of digital literacy that undoubtedly creates obstacles for those wishing to challenge relevant authorities. This has not been helped by the fact that there has been an absolute mess in the way that all of this has been communicated to the residents.</p> <p>My father is a very intelligent man who knows when he is being taken advantage of and when his health is being compromised for profit. The proposed plans have not only brought the potential of physical harm to him and his neighbours, but the psychological distress caused by feeling that you have no say over what is constructed directly on your roof, directly on top of where you spend the rest of your living life.</p> <p>The dismissal of potential health risks is sheer ignorance. I will attach a link and some extracts from the European Parliament on the health impact of 5G at the end of this letter. It is rational to protect citizens from unknown risks, the alternative is criminal. On what grounds can you justify building something that has POTENTIAL carcinogenic risk on the roofs of elderly and vulnerable people who are without a choice reliant on the government for safe housing conditions?</p> <p>Why is it always after the mistake that we learn not to do something again? Something isn't seen as unsafe until people have died and suffered. That is not fair, I urge you to do all that is in your power to protect the people that you are ultimately responsible for.</p> <p>We have fast internet. We are more connected than ever before, what kind of black mirror episode are we living in when I have to watch my father - who is living in council housing - try to fight for his right to determine safe living conditions - so that we have better internet connection! What are the priorities of Camden Council? What is the point of providing housing to vulnerable people if it comes with hidden threats and attacks on their dignity?</p> <p>You have succeeded in making a group of 'old' people feel irrelevant and not worthy of consultation. I thought that the point of a council was to serve citizens, and the point of virgin media is to serve customers. So what's more important? Is the citizen irrelevant if they are not a paying customer?</p> <p>I have also researched into some other local cases and you do not need to look far to find examples where Waldon Telecom are taking advantage of local communities. There needs to be an alternative to imposing dangerous and visually obstructive installations.</p> <p>Least but not least, if the Hill View plans did not go ahead partially due to having schools in its vicinity, then that</p>	

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment:

Response:

is the case for Jacqueline House. There is a nursery at the community centre on Fitzroy road.

I would suggest that the solution to all of this is dialogue, open and organised, thoughtful and intentional. There must be a way to find a compromise that doesn't lead to this kind of civilian outrage.

Thank you for taking the time to read this,

Amalia Adams

Below is some additional information:

I have so far garnered significant support:

<https://www.change.org/p/stop-the-construction-of-a-radio-base-on-our-roof>

European parliament report on "Health Impact of 5G":  
(see attached doc):

Link to report:

[Linkhttps://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2021/690012/EPRS\\_STU\(2021\)690012\\_EN.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2021/690012/EPRS_STU(2021)690012_EN.pdf)

Executive Summary. Results of the Present review (section 6):

"...Using PubMed and the EMF Portal database, and applying the scoping review methodology to our research, we found 950 papers on the carcinogenicity of RF-EMF in humans, and 911 papers on experimental rodent studies, totalling 1 861 studies. Regarding reproductive/developmental studies, we found 2 834 papers for epidemiology and 5 052 studies for experimental rodent studies, totalling 7 886 studies. From the present review of the literature and the considerations reported above, we come to the following conclusions..."

Executive Summary, 6 (Overall Evaluation):

"7.1 Cancer FR1 (450 to 6 000 MHz): these FR1 frequencies are probably carcinogenic to humans. FR2 (24 to 100 GHz): no adequate studies were performed on the higher frequencies. 7.2 Reproductive/developmental effects FR1 (450 to 6000 MHz): these frequencies clearly affect male fertility. They possibly affect female fertility. They possibly have adverse effects on the development of embryos, fetuses and newborns. FR2 (24 to 100 GHz): no adequate studies were performed on non-thermal effects of the higher frequencies."

1.5 Social conflict related to 5G (page 12 of main doc - interesting quote - clearly showing why precautionary approach is appropriate):

"The number of 32 119 publications (October 20, 2020) includes the studies of all types of biological and technical end points on all EMF originating from RF. However, the collection of 5G MMW frequencies-related studies is scanty (around 100) and, for the most part, regards technical/dosimetric studies. As a consequence, both claims, presence or lack of harms, about 5G MMW safety are based on assumption, not on scientific evidence."

Application No:      Consultees Name:      Received:

Comment:

Response:

So in summary, claims regarding presence or lack of harms are based more on assumption than scientific evidence. Furthermore, there is limited evidence for carcinogenicity of RF (radiofrequency) radiation in humans (450 to 6 000 MHz).

As a BSc scientist, it would seem a reasonable leap to assume that higher frequency, higher energy EMF (electromagnetic frequency) radiation in greater densities would carry at least the same if not greater risks. There is a lack of evidence here. 100 papers does not constitute a wide body of evidence. There may have been some more studies done in the last two years granted but it won't be enough yet or over a long enough time frame to require a significant shift in attitude. The amount of studies is not adequate to justify these policies.

---