

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/1353/P	G. Hawkins	48 Parliament Hill Mansions Lissenden Gardens NW5 1NA NW5 1NA	25/05/2017 23:05:06	INT	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Location is in a conservation area. 2. Health implications of telecom signals- close to primary and secondary schools 3. Impact on property prices on the area
2017/1353/P	G. Hawkins	48 Parliament Hill Mansions Lissenden Gardens NW5 1NA NW5 1NA	25/05/2017 23:04:51	INT	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Location is in a conservation area. 2. Health implications of telecom signals- close to primary and secondary schools 3. Impact on property prices on the area
2017/1353/P	G. Hawkins	48 Parliament Hill Mansions Lissenden Gardens NW5 1NA NW5 1NA	25/05/2017 23:04:33	INT	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Location is in a conservation area. 2. Health implications of telecom signals- close to primary and secondary schools 3. Impact on property prices on the area
2017/1353/P	Jeffrey Morris	75B Lissenden Mansions Lissenden Gardens Parliament Hill Fields London NW5 1PR	25/05/2017 18:10:06	COMMNT	<p>I object to the installation of these mobile phone masts on Chester Court, Lissenden Gardens.</p> <p>My home on the 4th floor of Lissenden Mansions is in direct sight, and on the same level as the proposed site of these telecommunications installations. The masts would be 100 metres from my home.</p> <p>I object to these masts, because there is no conclusive empirical evidence that they are safe. There are numerous cluster incidents within the UK, that reveal harmful outcomes for residents living within the proximity that I and other residents in Lissenden Gardens indeed reside. I am not convinced that this application can pass a public interest and health and safety scrutiny, that I and other residents will seek to initiate via the appropriate agencies, should planning permission be granted. As a journalist, there are specialists in the investigation of these technology platforms who will offer coverage.</p> <p>These proposed mobile masts at Chester Court, would be positioned within the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area. Where is the justification to transgress the conservation codes?</p>
2017/1353/P	Williams family	29 Salcombe Lodge Lissenden Gardens NW5 1LZ	25/05/2017 10:18:54	COMMNT	<p>Complete eyesore to our flat.5th floor connected to Chester Court.</p> <p>Still no guarantee that emissions from these installations do not cause health complications to health of nearby residents.</p> <p>Mobile signals in this area are very strong, so basicallythis unsightly structure is not needed. There is already one nearby on a Camden Council block in Lismore Circus.As a very near neighbour, in fact next door adjoining roof we strongly object</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/1353/P	Williams family	29 Salcombe Lodge Lissenden Gardens NW5 1LZ	25/05/2017 10:18:45	COMMNT	Complete eyesore to our flat.5th floor connected to Chester Court. Still no guarantee that emissions from these installations do not cause health complications to health of nearby residents. Mobile signals in this area are very strong, so basicallythis unsightly structure is not needed. There is already one nearby on a Camden Council block in Lismore Circus.As a very near neighbour, in fact next door adjoining roof we strongly object
2017/1353/P	Ms I Nash	14 Lissenden Gardens	25/05/2017 13:43:17	OBJ	I wish to object as a tenant of Lissenden Gardens to this proposal on the following points : Lissenden Gardens, which includes Chester Court, is part of a Conservation Area. These plans show that the antennas are huge and unsightly; this is out of keeping with the style and character of the surrounding buildings. I am also very concerned by the proximity of the phone masts to residents' homes. It is widely accepted that biological effects may occur below guidelines, as concluded in the Stewart Report (May 2000), " 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." There are numerous published accounts of health issues having resulted after telephone masts have been erected. I strongly believe telephone masts should not be placed near or on top of residential dwellings. I would have attended a consultation meeting had I been aware of one. I understand that Camden Council were to have sent letters or organised a meeting for residents. This did not happen.
2017/1353/P	Elizabeth Block	42 Clevedon Mansions Lissenden Gardens NW5 1QP	25/05/2017 09:44:06	COMMNT	I am concerned about the health issues raised by phone masts. I wonder why these masts are being proposed for residential buildings in a residential area. Thank you.
2017/1353/P	Scott winter	8 salcombe lodge 1 Lissenden gardens Nw5 1lz	25/05/2017 09:35:16	OBJ	if the masts are installed I will have to seriously consider whether I am happy to continue living next to Chester court. The health issues are of a huge concern to me.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/1353/P	John Wilkinson	95 Parliament Hill Mansions Lissenden Gardens London NW5 1NB	25/05/2017 09:20:27	OBJ	I consider this proposed installation to be inappropriate at this location, which is a Conservation area. These masts would disfigure the skyline of Chester Court and the nearby mansion block. Additionally, research indicates there are possible long-term health risks for residents from exposure to electro-magnetic radiation from such masts.
2017/1353/P	Dr Eliane Glaser	66 Parliament Hill Mansions Lissenden Gardens London NW5 1NB	25/05/2017 14:50:11	OBJ	I am not happy with this application. There has been inadequate consultation with local residents about the various potential impacts of this, and the impact on the important view from the Heath is not sufficiently mitigated.
2017/1353/P	Rebecca Nicholson	8 Chester Court Lissenden Gardens NW5 1LY NW5 1LY	25/05/2017 17:17:56	OBJ	As a tenant of this building, the work to install these masts on the building will be loud and disruptive. I am also concerned that there has been no definitive research into the long-term health effects of living underneath the masts (and not one, but three). Finally this is a beautiful street and the masts are out of keeping with the appearance of the skyline here. I strongly object to their installation.
2017/1353/P	Elizabeth Lawrence	flat 8 chester court lissenden gardens london nw5 1ly	25/05/2017 17:17:55	OBJ	objection on the grounds of unknown health risks. The disruption of the works, as a tenant who works from home. The damage to the appearance of a beautiful building and skyline.
2017/1353/P	Patricia FitzGerald	23 Salcombe Lodge 1 Lissenden Gardens London NW5 1LZ	25/05/2017 11:01:41	OBJEMPER	I object to the erection of towers in a residential area, as it will detract from the residential character of the apartments, and will constitute an eyesore. I am also not convinced that they are safe, and there are children in our building, including my grandchildren, who visit most days after school.
2017/1353/P	Chris Dickens	40 Glenhurst Avenue NW5 1PS	25/05/2017 10:47:19	OBJCOMP AP	I object to this installation and do not want the antennas to be installed on the grounds of firstly, Health. the possible side effects of these being so close to a lot of homes is not fully known so I think it's not appropriate in this case. Also on Aesthetic grounds - this will look ugly and affect the value of homes in the immediate area.
2017/1353/P	Shaheenara Chowdhury	16 Salcombe Lodge Lissenden Gardens London NW51LZ	25/05/2017 12:24:59	OBJLETTE R	Just simply this should not happen in an conservation area/residential neighborhood and most importantly the affect on our health, especially for children. Please do not do it, think for long time affect on our children/on us. NHS already suffering, please do not put more burden. Please see BBC inside out report: http://www.bbc.co.uk/insideout/westmidlands/series6/phone_masts.shtml Thanks

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/1353/P	Imogen West	67 Parliament Hill Mansions Lissenden Gardens London NW5 1NB	25/05/2017 22:36:51	OBJ	<p>I found out about the installation of these masts because of a small flyer posted on a tree. I saw it today, the last possible day to register an objection. I cannot believe that all surrounding properties have not been notified of these plans well in advance and given the opportunity to comment. Is that legal?</p> <p>I am a mother of three and strongly oppose these plans due to ASSOCIATED HEALTH RISKS.</p>
2017/1353/P	Pascale Lamche	43 Lissenden Mansion Lissenden Gardens NW5 1PR NW5 1PR	25/05/2017 14:27:57	OBJ	<p>I am very concerned by this and deeply opposed to it - it has just come to my attention, hence last minute attempt to halt proceedings.</p> <p>1) on health grounds [http://www.mast-victims.org/index.php?content=news&action=view&type=newsitem&id=3754] 2) conservation area! this is unsightly, unsuitable and runs counter to the values and legal protection we have been afforded as a conservation area. 3) it will degrade the value of my property!</p> <p>This is a very serious matter! And required proper consultation- surely.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/1353/P	Mike Barson	Flat 11 Chester Court Lissenden Gardens NW5 1LY	25/05/2017 14:48:48	OBJ	<p>Dear sir I wanted to object most strongly to the plan to place mobile phone masts upon the roof of Chester court for the following reasons.</p> <p>1 Conservation area, These masts are most inappropriate for a conservation area, they will be tall ugly very visible tower like structures which will spoil the present residential skyline.</p> <p>2 Health Issue - It seems that there is no universal scientific agreement on the possible harm caused by mobile phones/masts and what is safe emission levels. Obviously there is great pressure from such a vast industry as the mobile phone industry so that concern may be greater than it seems. there have been many studies done that raise concern for health issues and as is often pointed out the fact that the industry is relatively new and such health concerns may take many many years to develop before they become apparent raises valid reason for concern. I understand there are guidelines not to place masts on schools for concern that the emissions may harm children? What about children living in Chester Court and surrounding areas?</p> <p>In the letter from the council we received on the issue you state the following.. "The WHO and 'most' scientists agree there is no 'conclusive' evidence to suggest a link between mobile phones/masts and illnesses including cancer at exposure levels below the international guidelines". If this statement is supposed to reassure residents I can tell you it does the exact opposite... "no conclusive proof" that it doesn't harm - 'most' scientists agree... what about the ones that don't? Not harmful but only at low levels? Who would want such a questionable health hazard above their heads 24/7???</p> <p>I include a letter written to Richard Bond that includes various scientific research undertaken that raises questions as to health issues related to phones/masts. I find it very reckless/careless to place such apparatus above peoples homes such that they will be constantly exposed day and night to emissions.</p> <p>3 Loss of value - saleability of property I am very concerned regardless of whether such health issues are proven or not that there is doubt and suspicion in the minds of the general public on the subject and that this will affect the value of our properties. Personally I would never buy a property which has a mobile phone mast on the roof, without any doubt this will result in a substantial loss of value to the properties in close proximity particularly of course the flats in Chester Court. We are being offered no financial benefit we are taking all the risks and on top of that it will effect the value of our properties and make them more difficult to sell.</p> <p>For the above reasons I totally object to the placing of masts on the roof of Chester Court.</p>

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**

kind regards

Mike Barson

Objection Camden Council

Dear Richard Bond,

Concerning your recent letter regarding your wish to place a mobile mast on the roof of our building I wish to inform you I am totally opposed to this idea.

I cannot say I am in the slightest reassured by the claim in the "frequently asked questions" section of your letter that "most" scientists agree that there is no "conclusive" evidence to suggest that mobile phones/masts can be linked to ill health. What a strangely worded sentence... "most" scientists.... no "conclusive" evidence?

Regarding this question of scientists concerns are you aware of the the Naila Study, Germany (November 2004)

- This study, conducted over 10 years was released by The Federal Agency for Radiation Protection, Germany. Medical doctors compiled case histories since 1994 - 2004, looking at heightened risk of taking ill with malignant tumours. They discovered a threefold increase after five years exposure to microwave radiation from a mobile phone mast transmitter for up to 400 metres distance, compared to those patients living further away.

or

A study carried out by Ronni Wolf MD and Danny Wolf MD, Kaplan Medical Centre, Israel (April 2004) discovered a fourfold increase in cancer within 350 metres after long-term exposure to microwave radiation from a mobile phone mast and a tenfold increase specifically among women, compared to patients living away from the mast.

Are you aware of the Helsinki Appeal of 2005 in particular this statement concerning the

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**

ICNIRP?

"The present safety standards of ICNIRP (International Commission of Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection) do not recognize the biological effects caused by non-ionizing radiation except those induced by the thermal effect. In the light of recent scientific information, the standards recommended by ICNIRP have become obsolete and should be rejected. Especially children and other persons at risk should be taken into account when re-evaluating the limits. This was also suggested in the Freiburg Appeal of 2002, which was signed by more than 3000 European colleagues"

Or this appeal to the UN from 190 scientists expressing there grave concerns regarding electromagnetic fields and wireless technology in the face of increasing evidence of risk! They also mention that the ICNIRP are a self-selected group of industry insiders, who have long been criticized as non-protective.

International Scientists Appeal to U.N. to Protect Humans and Wildlife from Electromagnetic Fields and Wireless Technology

WHO's conflicting stance on risk needs strengthening, says 190 scientists
May 11, 2015 10:00 AM Eastern Daylight Time

NEW YORK --(BUSINESS WIRE)--Today 190 scientists from 39 nations submitted an appeal to the United Nations, UN member states and the World Health Organization (WHO) requesting they adopt more protective exposure guidelines for electromagnetic fields (EMF) and wireless technology in the face of increasing evidence of risk. These exposures are a rapidly growing form of environmental pollution worldwide.

The "International EMF Scientist Appeal" asks the Secretary General and UN affiliated bodies to encourage precautionary measures, to limit EMF exposures, and to educate the public about health risks, particularly to children and pregnant women.

The Appeal highlights WHO's conflicting positions about EMF risk. WHO's International Agency for Research on Cancer classified Radiofrequency radiation as a Group 2B "Possible Carcinogen" in 2011, and Extremely Low Frequency fields in 2001. Nonetheless, WHO continues to ignore its own agency's recommendations and favors guidelines recommended by the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP). These guidelines, developed by a self-selected group of industry insiders, have long been criticized as non-protective.

Or this...?

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**

BioInitiative 2012 Report Issues New Warnings on Wireless and EMF

University at Albany, Rensselaer, New York / Embargoed until January 7, 2013

A new report by the BioInitiative Working Group 2012 says that evidence for risks to health has substantially increased since 2007 from electromagnetic fields and wireless technologies (radiofrequency radiation). The Report reviews over 1800 new scientific studies. Cell phone users, parents-to-be, young children and pregnant women are at particular risk.

“There is a consistent pattern of increased risk for glioma (a malignant brain tumor) and acoustic neuroma with use of mobile and cordless phones” says Lennart Hardell, MD at Orebro University, Sweden. “Epidemiological evidence shows that radiofrequency should be classified as a human carcinogen. The existing FCC/IEE and ICNIRP public safety limits and reference levels are not adequate to protect public health.”

BioInitiative 2012 Report Issues New Warnings on Wireless and EMF

University at Albany, Rensselaer, New York / Embargoed until January 7, 2013

A new report by the BioInitiative Working Group 2012 says that evidence for risks to health has substantially increased since 2007 from electromagnetic fields and wireless technologies (radiofrequency radiation). The Report reviews over 1800 new scientific studies. Cell phone users, parents-to-be, young children and pregnant women are at particular risk.

“There is a consistent pattern of increased risk for glioma (a malignant brain tumor) and acoustic neuroma with use of mobile and cordless phones” says Lennart Hardell, MD at Orebro University, Sweden. “Epidemiological evidence shows that radiofrequency should be classified as a human carcinogen. The existing FCC/IEE and ICNIRP public safety limits and reference levels are not adequate to protect public health.”

A dozen new studies link cell phone radiation to sperm damage. Even a cell phone in the pocket or on a belt may harm sperm DNA, result in misshapen sperm, and impair fertility in men. Laptop computers with wireless internet connections can damage DNA in sperm.

Based on strong evidence for vulnerable biology in autism, EMF/RFR can plausibly increase autism risk and symptoms. “ While we aggressively investigate the links between autism disorders and wireless technologies, we should minimize wireless and EMF exposures for people with autism disorders, children of all ages, people planning a baby, and during pregnancy,” says Martha Herbert, MD, PhD.

Wireless devices such as phones and laptops used by pregnant women may alter brain development of the fetus. This has been linked in both animal and human studies to

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**

hyperactivity, learning and behavior problems.

According to David O. Carpenter, MD, and co-editor of the 2012 Report:

There is now much more evidence of risks to health affecting billions of people world-wide. The status quo is not acceptable in light of the evidence for harm.”

This study covers EMF from powerlines, electrical wiring, appliances and hand-held devices; and from wireless technologies (cell and cordless phones, cell towers, ‘smart meters’, WI-FI, wireless laptops, wireless routers, baby monitors, and other electronic devices). Health topics include damage to DNA and genes, effects on memory, learning, behavior, attention, sleep disruption, cancer and neurological diseases like Alzheimer’s disease. New safety standards are urgently needed for protection against EMF and wireless exposures that now appear everywhere in daily life.

The BioInitiative 2012 Report is available at: www.bioinitiative.org.

CONTACT: info@bioinitiative.org

also recent article in Guardian "Italian court rules mobile phone use caused brain tumour"
<https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2017/apr/21/italian-court-rules-mobile-phone-use-caused-brain-tumour>

I am sorry but your vague claims may be of little consolation when receiving a diagnosis of cancer for oneself or ones child in the Royal Free Hospital at some later date.

I would ask you most strongly NOT to be so callous regarding our health by attempting to place any masts above our heads on top of the building where we live for some paltry sum.

Please place them elsewhere where people do not reside and where there are less risks to peoples health.

How much are Camden council receiving for so callously putting our health at risk?

kind regards

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/1353/P	Jeffrey Morris	75B Lissenden Mansions Lissenden Gardens Parliament Hill Fields London NW5 1PR	25/05/2017 18:09:49	COMMNT	<p>Mike Barson (Flat 11)</p> <p>I object to the installation of these mobile phone masts on Chester Court, Lissenden Gardens.</p> <p>My home on the 4th floor of Lissenden Mansions is in direct sight, and on the same level as the proposed site of these telecommunications installations. The masts would be 100 metres from my home.</p> <p>I object to these masts, because there is no conclusive empirical evidence that they are safe. There are numerous cluster incidents within the UK, that reveal harmful outcomes for residents living within the proximity that I and other residents in Lissenden Gardens indeed reside. I am not convinced that this application can pass a public interest and health and safety scrutiny, that I and other residents will seek to initiate via the appropriate agencies, should planning permission be granted. As a journalist, there are specialists in the investigation of these technology platforms who will offer coverage.</p> <p>These proposed mobile masts at Chester Court, would be positioned within the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area. Where is the justification to transgress the conservation codes?</p>