

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/1353/P	Mandy Hill	Highgate Road	19/05/2017 13:52:48	COMMNT	<p>I would just like to point out that :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The visual appearance is not in keeping with the skyline of buildings. 2. Is not in keeping with the Style of the building. 3. The building is located in a conservation area. 4. Threat of health risks - there are academic studies exploring the issue. <p>Surely this would be better placed further down the railway line towards Camden, where there are wide open spaces next to more industrial sites, which do not have domestic housing near by.</p>
2017/1353/P	A irving	1 Chester court Iissenden gardens	19/05/2017 19:43:26	OBJ	<p>As a resident of this block I oppose the erection of said communications equipment on our roof.</p> <p>The plans show that the antennas are huge and unsightly, this is very out of keeping with the style and character of the surrounding buildings. Chester Court is in a conservation area and I feel that this will greatly compromise the character and the appearance of the conservation area.</p> <p>I am also concerned of the associated health risks.</p> <p>Installation and maintenance of such equipment will result in damages and additional wear and tear to the building. This will impact the service charges and charges for additional works which the leaseholders pay.</p> <p>I was advised by Walden Telecom on 19th January that there would be a consultation process, however I have not received any correspondence in relation to a consultation. I quote... "Camden Council as your landlord has advised Waldon Telecom they will consult with you on this matter. The consultation will take the form either of a letter or a meeting."</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/1353/P	Josephine O'Keeffe	Flat 27 Parliament Hill Mansions Lissenden Gardens London NW5 1NA	19/05/2017 09:21:49	INT	<p>As a resident of Lissenden Gardens, I strong object to the erection of the antenna. The visual aspect on the photomontages look very out of keeping with the style and skyline of the buildings around and underneath the ariels and I would think that this is unsuitable for our conservation area.</p> <p>I understand the proposals conform to current international guidelines on radio frequency emission. However, being underneath the antennas, I would still have concerns over any potentially subtle and unaccountable effects from emissions, as mentioned in your supporting document, "Health and Mobile Phone Base Stations". The document specifies: "Published in May 2000, the Stewart Report concluded that the balance of evidence did not suggest that exposures to radio frequency fields below international guidelines could cause adverse health effects, although it is acknowledged that biological effects might occur below these values."</p> <p>The installation and maintenance of the antennas will involve engineers and other work people using the area for parking and access in what is already a busy enclave with limited space. I believe this will cause disruption to what is a quiet, family community of residents which will have a detrimental effect of our home environment.</p> <p>I strongly oppose the installation of the equipment.</p>
2017/1353/P	Sarah Kiernan	23 LAURIER ROAD CAMDEN NW5 1SH NW5 1SH	19/05/2017 17:13:21	COMMNT	<p>1) As a leaseholder of flat 8, chester court I object to the development on behalf of my tenants as it could constitute a health hazard. Research into the health effects from masts of this type have not been conclusive but they have NOT been pronounced risk free. THis mast will therefor devalue my flat.</p> <p>2) I object on the grounds of aesthetics. how ugly to have a mast where one was not designed to be. Again this will devalue my flat.</p> <p>3) I object that Camden will be making money from renting out the top of the property, whilst charging us ridiculously high maintainence and renovation fees. None of the financial benefits of this mast would be passed on to the residents / leaseholders.</p>
2017/1353/P	Sarah Kiernan	23 LAURIER ROAD CAMDEN NW5 1SH NW5 1SH	19/05/2017 17:13:27	COMMNT	<p>1) As a leaseholder of flat 8, chester court I object to the development on behalf of my tenants as it could constitute a health hazard. Research into the health effects from masts of this type have not been conclusive but they have NOT been pronounced risk free. THis mast will therefor devalue my flat.</p> <p>2) I object on the grounds of aesthetics. how ugly to have a mast where one was not designed to be. Again this will devalue my flat.</p> <p>3) I object that Camden will be making money from renting out the top of the property, whilst charging us ridiculously high maintainence and renovation fees. None of the financial benefits of this mast would be passed on to the residents / leaseholders.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/1353/P	Simon Balch	Flat 10 Chester Court Lissenden Gardens NW5 1LY	19/05/2017 17:53:24	OBJ	<p>I have been diagnosed by the neurology department at Queens Hospital with migraine associated vertigo. This condition has various triggers, and from my experience, one of the triggers could well be electro magnetic radiation. Therefore from a health point of view I am extremely concerned as to the effect on my future health from these antenna.</p> <p>The plans show that the antennas are completely huge and unsightly and completely out of character for the area, the roofline, and the fact that it is a conservation area. The photomontage shows a new structure which is significantly and materially detrimental to the block at Chester Court as well as the surrounding buildings.</p> <p>We were advised by Walden Telecom on 19th January that there would be a consultation process, however I have not received any correspondence in relation to a consultation. "Camden Council as your landlord has advised Waldon Telecom they will consult with you on this matter. The consultation will take the form either of a letter or a meeting."</p>
2017/1353/P	Mandy Hill	Highgate Road	19/05/2017 13:53:04	COMMNT	<p>I would just like to point out that :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The visual appearance is not in keeping with the skyline of buildings. 2. Is not in keeping with the Style of the building. 3. The building is located in a conservation area. 4. Threat of health risks - there are academic studies exploring the issue. <p>Surely this would be better placed further down the railway line towards Camden, where there are wide open spaces next to more industrial sites, which do not have domestic housing near by.</p>