

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/2480/P	Harry Adams	20/08/2023 20:30:27	OBJ	To Camden Council,

I object to planning application 2023/2480/P on the following grounds (in order of importance as I see it):

1. Residents have not been given the right to reject this. This is unethical.
2. I believe it constitutes a potential risk to the health of residents and nearby community members. A significant number of scientists have urged greater caution wrt the 5G rollout.

"Bioeffects are clearly established and occur at very low levels of exposure to electromagnetic fields and radiofrequency radiation. Bioeffects can occur in the first few minutes at levels associated with cell and cordless phone use. Bioeffects can also occur from just minutes of exposure to mobile phone masts (cell towers), WI-FI, and wireless utility 'smart' meters that produce whole-body exposure. Chronic base station level exposures can result in illness."

"Existing FCC and ICNIRP public safety limits seem to be not sufficiently protective of public health, in particular for the young (embryo, fetus, neonate, very young child)."

<https://bioinitiative.org/conclusions/>

It is my understanding that the detriment caused by 5G radiation cannot be dismissed without a thorough evaluation of the tissue at risk as well as the energy absorption. This is not an adequately researched area and whilst it remains as such, these policies do not follow the precautionary principle.

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7753259/>

Until we better understand the effects of these frequencies/this technology on humans, it is unethical to roll out 5G infrastructure such as this. Consequently, I believe proceeding with this installation could amount to a violation of article 8 of the 1998 Human Rights Act: the Right to privacy. Citing certain reports whilst ignoring others and also dismissing a lack of critical evidence is not a rigorous or careful enough way to go about this. People have a right to not be interfered with by external parties whilst in the safety of their homes unless there is very good grounds for doing so and said interference is within reason. This installation to my mind fails on both counts.

3. Planning for the same installation was previously rejected in a nearby location and I understand on the grounds it was too close to children. This new location is right by a nursery. Why has it been considered in that case and in what way is this situation different?
4. This will be unsightly and an eyesore right next to one of inner London's green spaces - an area we cherish and of natural beauty that will be spoilt to some extent.
5. Construction will be noisy and disruptive to residents and the nearby community.
6. We do not need faster internet in my opinion. Furthermore, the IoT to my mind represents a further risk to personal privacy and an opportunity for more invasive data collection. We ought to be working against such practices, not enabling them. It has been shown time and again that personal data is sold to 3rd parties unlawfully. These companies cannot be trusted in my view. The price of convenience is not worth paying here.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>7. We already spend far too much time wrapped up in internet connected devices. This is undermining the fabric of society and our very relationships. More enabling technology is not in our collective interests.</p> <p>8. I believe there is inherent bias in our systems of government towards corporate interests and to the detriment of common citizens. Policy surrounding 5G to me is yet another demonstration of that and therefore something that needs questioning/opposition.</p> <p>I hope you will take my objections seriously and reconsider your position.</p> <p>Best regards,</p> <p>Harry Adams</p>
2023/2480/P	A Leventon	20/08/2023 17:40:03	COMMNT	I wish to object. The jury is still out on the danger to residents in the proximity of the masts. These are extremely vulnerable elderly people who need your protection.
2023/2480/P	A Leventon	20/08/2023 17:40:06	COMMNT	I wish to object. The jury is still out on the danger to residents in the proximity of the masts. These are extremely vulnerable elderly people who need your protection.