Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/0969/P	Fitore	9b Ainsworth way	03/08/2017 20:53:40	OBJ	These should not be put where there are so many schools that's going to be radiation for the kids we want our children to be healthy this should have never been considered in the first place. No no no
2017/0969/P	Christina Economakis	25 Lyndale Avenue NW22QB	03/08/2017 14:01:06	OBJ	I am very concerned about the potential risk to my children's health should the proposal go ahead. They both attend Devonshire House Prep School which is in close proximity to the proposed site. Studies have yet to conclude that radiation from such equipment is safe and to put the health of so many small children at risk is unacceptable.
2017/0969/P	Mrs Karen Page	29 Heath Drive London NW3 7SB	03/08/2017 10:39:01	OBJ	As a Hampstead resident and mother of two young children I would like to strongly object to this planning application on the grounds of health and safety and suitability for the area. Hampstead has an abundance of primary schools, many of which would be in close proximity to these proposed masts. They would be both unhealthy and unsightly and in my opinion unjustified.
2017/0969/P	Lesley Stevas	Flat 7 57 Christchurch Hill	03/08/2017 10:37:42	COMMNT	Hampstead is a conservation area. The height and bulk of this equipment detracts from the character and heritage of the area. The streets are characterised by buildings which are devoid of visual clutter. The height and size of the masts and their equipment, together with the railing will irreversibly damage the street scene. As the equipment and masts are on the roof, there is no scope for landscaping or screening to hide the impact of this bulk on the surrounding area. No consultation with St Anthony's, Devonshire House, Northbridge House and Fitzjohns Primary which are in close proximity to this development has taken place pre-application. This is contrary to the Code of Best Practice on Mobile Network Development in England. The application should therefore be refused on the grounds of its adverse impact on a conservation area and on the grounds of its failure to comply with the Code of Best Practice.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/0969/P	MACDONALD Planning Consultancy on behalf of Cognita Schools Ltd	6 Sandmartin Grove Lenzie Glasgow G66 3WF	03/08/2017 14:52:12	OBJLETTER	Planning and Public Protection Culture and Environment Camden Council 6th Floor, Town Hall Extension Argyle Street Camden London WC1H 8EQ 3rd August 2017 Ref: NM / 00001 / Camd 1 Dear Sirs, Objection By Cognita Schools Ltd, Owners of North Bridge House Senior School, 65 Rosslyn Hill, Hampstead NW3 5UD Regarding: Application 2017/0969/P For: Installation of 4 antennas and 6 cabinets on faces of chimney on eastern corner, 2 antennas and 3 cabinets on faces of plant room on western corner, 4 equipment cabinets on roof of northeast side plus associated 1.1m high handrail walkway across roof, and one meter cabinet on ground at southwest elevation Location: Henderson Court, 102 Fitzjohns Avenue, London NW3 6NR On behalf of Cognita Schools Ltd, the owners of North Bridge House Senior School, which is a neighbouring use located at 65 Rosslyn Hill, we would like to submit a formal objection to planning application 2017/0969/P. To assist I have broken down the objection into a number of matters/considerations in the determination process. National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012) (NPPF) The NPPF sets out clearly the rational and aim of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan making and decision taking. Through paragraph 43 it states: “in preparing Local Plans, local planning authorities should support the expansion of electronic communications networks, including telecommunication and high speed broadband. They should however aim to keep the numbers of radio and telecommunications masts and sites for such installations to a minimum consistent with the efficient operation of the network. Existing masts, buildings and other structures should be used, unless a new

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

site has been justified”

it goes on to make it very clear that where new sites are proposed, as is the case here, they should be sympathetically designed and camouflaged and be of a scale commensurate. The level and scale of masts proposed fails to meet in any way this objective and would be extremely detrimental to not just the school, its pupils but the surrounding neighbourhood and environment. This objection sets out the case in more detail below:

The Requirement For Telecommunications In the Area

Maintaining both the historic and residential character of the site, the area and the Fitzjohns Conservation Area character depends greatly not on the uses buildings are put, but also how they are used, maintained and serviced. The character of a residential or other building in a Conservation Area can best be safeguarded if the existing residential use is maintained.

The introduction of new masts, cabinets and railings should be located as per NPPF and Circular advice and concentrated on existing building where these features are already prevalent. The proposed location, height and setting would introduce an entirely new and major set of communications equipment on this flat roofed residential block, contrary to this guidance.

Alternative Locations to Site Telecommunications Masts and Equipment

It is considered that there are other more suitable locations, including existing mast sites within the area, which would be more appropriate for siting of this level of equipment.

Visual Impact of Proposal

The installation of the antennas, cabinets and hand railing will have a physical and adverse impact on residential amenity. It is considered that the development would be highly visible not just from the surrounding properties, but also the street scene and the Fitzjohns Conservation Area. This would adversely impact both on the existing residential block, the street scene and the Conservation Area.

Precedent

The approval of the proposed development would set a major and unwelcome precedent making it difficult to resist similarly inappropriately sited telecommunications development in residential properties in the Conservation Area. The cumulative effect of this development with others would be materially detrimental to ‘preserving or enhancing’ the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and would be contrary to Camden Council planning policies, in particular Policy D2 Heritage of the Camden Local Plan July 2017.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					Policy D2 Heritage advises: The Council will preserve and, where appropriate, enhance Camden's rich and diverse heritage assets and their settings, including conservation areas, listed buildings, archaeological remains, scheduled ancient monuments and historic parks and gardens and locally listed heritage assets. Designated heritage assets Designed heritage assets include conservation areas and listed buildings. The Council will not permit the loss of or substantial harm to a designated heritage asset, including conservation areas and Listed Buildings, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss. The current proposal before the Council is contrary to Policy D2 Heritage. Health Issues It remains Central Government's responsibility to set out the framework and responsibility to decide on measures to protect public health. However, there are both actual and perceived health effects from masts, which is emerging and has been assessed and set out through different forms of guidance. The Stewart Report 2001, through paragraph 6.68 recommends a precautionary approach and states clearly that masts should not be near schools, near the homes of children or other vulnerable people. Equally, Southampton City Council v Hutchinson 3G Orange in 2003 (R.V.Stockport MBC exparte Smith CO/159/2001 confirmed this approach). Given the surrounding uses Policy C1 Health and Wellbeing of the Camden Local Plan through paragraph 4.6 sets out to 'The creation of healthy environments for people of all ages across the borough will be a key consideration when the Council assesses planning applications' should be considered. The proposal is poorly sited in relation to both residential and school use and is considered to be contrary to Policy C1 Health and Wellbeing of the Local Plan July 2017. For the reasons stated above we respectfully request that planning permission is refused for the above development. Kind regards Yours faithfully Neil Macdonald
2017/0969/P	Jonathan Elstein	15a Fitzjohns Avenue NW3 5JY	03/08/2017 10:07:06	OBJ	These masts are wholly unsuitable for a conservation area and will spoil the visual landscape.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/0969/P	Anna Strillacci	NW3 2PA	03/08/2017 09:36:12	OBJ	I am writing as the mother of a pupil who attends St Anthony's School. No one has been consulted about this work and parents/teachers have not had the time to assess what this means for our local area and our health. The timing of this application and the deadline for comments is not only too short but also at a terrible time, while all the local schools are on holiday. Considering this is an area with one of the highest concentration of schools in London, I would have thought that considering the local schools' opinions would be your FIRST priority. This is not only unfair but almost sneaky. As a parent, I would like for the council and the school to expose all the relevant reasons why these antennas and masts must be put right at that location, what the real benefits are vs putting them somewhere else (ie an area with less schools) and what the EXACT impact on health would be for my child and local residents. This is our children we are talking about. More information is needed. Not to mention the fact that Hampstead is a conservation area. This is unacceptable.
2017/0969/P	Mrs Ruth Schocken Katz	Flat 3 60 Greencroft Gardens NW6 3LU NW6 3LU	03/08/2017 20:14:12	OBJ	I am writing to express my serious concern over this plan. I am concerned of the effect it would have on Hampstead, as a neighbourhood. But more than that, I find it shocking that this is even considered in an area with so many schools, and with so many very young children. The area is already heavily polluted as we have recently seen in the press, and to think of adding yet another mast, for which i cannot imagine a need for, when it is put there at the expense of young people's (and other people's) health. This is shameful. Also, releasing this up for discussion when most schools are already out on their summer break seems dodgy. I would seriously urge you to reconsider this poor plan and not give it a green light. It's time to prioritise local people and their needs and concerns, over those of huge telecommunications companies who are driven by profit.
2017/0969/P	Nicola Sinclair	36 Downshire Hill NW3 1NU	03/08/2017 17:28:09	OBJNOT	Hampstead is a conservation area. The height and bulk of this equipment detracts from the character and heritage of the area. The streets are characterised by buildings which are devoid of visual clutter and the Hamsptead Neighbourhood Plan, BID and Hamsptead Ward are all against pavement clutter and in favour of protecting the street scene. The height and size of the masts and their equipment, together with the railing will irreversibly damage the street scene. There has been no consultation with any of the local schools many of which are in close proximity to this development and all of which have strong school policies to walk to the schools ie past these antennas. This is contrary to the Code of Best Practice on Mobile Network Development in England.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/0969/P	Emma Graham	29 Downshire Hill London NW3 1NT	03/08/2017 19:31:17	OBJ	As a local resident and parent of a child at Fitzjohn"s Primary School which is in the immediate vicinity of this application I would like to object on the following grounds: 1) Hampstead is a conservation area and such structures are not in strict compliance with the l guidelines as adapted by the local authority. This is specifically as regards design. A telecom mast will violate the guideline of 'inappropriate bulk, massing and / or height (page 60 Hampstead Conservation Area Statement of the London Borough of Camden https://www.camden.gov.uk/ccm/content/environment/planning-and-built-environment/two/planning-policy/supplementary-planning-documents/conservation-area-appraisal-and-management-strategies/hampstead/) . 2) The proposed mast is very close to 4 different primary schools 3) Research on the impact of radiation from such equipment on small developing children and the implications for their future health is insufficiently comforting. Studies to date have not had the benefit of longevity. Therefore, long term health consequences are not known. 4) Sample sizes in studies to date have been regarded as too small to be conclusive 5) There is some evidence that people with neurological problems suffer side effects from extended exposure to electromagnetic fields. As a school with several autistic children we find this implication concerning. 6) There are appropriate spots locally that provide sufficient height but will not impact a large group of small school children. It is also of note that the application has been logged just as most of the other local schools closed for the summer. Having a deadline of 28/7/17 for objections to the application is inappropriate as it deprives these affected parties form having their say. It is quite a coincidence that the original application and notification form Waldon Communications was sent just as the schools closed for Christmas break. One might think that this is a purposeful strategy to avoid proper consultation with affected neighbours of the proposed project. Many thanks Best regards Emma

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/0969/P	Lesley Stevas	Flat 7 57 Christchurch Hill London NW3 1JJ	03/08/2017 11:09:07	COMMNT	I object strongly to this project. Hampstead is a conservation area. The height and bulk of this equipment detracts from the character and heritage of the area. The streets are characterised by buildings which are devoid of visual clutter. The height and size of the masts and their equipment, together with the railing will irreversibly damage the street scene. As the equipment and masts are on the roof, there is no scope for landscaping or screening to hide the impact of this bulk on the surrounding area. No consultation with St Anthony's, Devonshire House, Northbridge House and Fitzjohns Primary which are in close proximity to this development has taken place pre-application. This is contrary to the Code of Best Practice on Mobile Network Development in England. The application should therefore be refused on the grounds of its adverse impact on a conservation area and on the grounds of its failure to comply with the Code of Best Practice. According to Alasdair and Jean Philips in their book, 'Mobile Phone Masts and Wireless Computing' Para 5. Page 11 'Dr Sam Milham and E.M. Ossiander, in a scientific paper published in 2001, linked the increase in childhood Leukaemia with the arrival of electrification throughout the U.S. We do not know what might be the result of increased population exposure to microwaves, but adult leukaemias have been linked to occupational exposure and many people living near mobile masts are reporting adverse symptoms related to stress, so some adverse effects on well being seem likely'
2017/0969/P	a belilty	24a netherhall gardens	03/08/2017 18:03:32	COMMNT	shocked that this has been applied no pre consultation with local schools community application should be refused on these grounds health risk to all the children residents in condensed housing area dirty tactics applying when local community on holiday and many residents away i hope the council will be sensible to see thru this transparent plan and refuse thank you
2017/0969/P	Sandie and mike Rawlings	7 Frognal gardens Hampstead London nw36uy	03/08/2017 13:24:33	OBJEMPER	As nearby residents we would like to object to this planning application. WE have many unsightly phone masts in Hampstead. THey are a blight to a conservation area and should not be allowed. WHitestone Pond has many such masts and they spoil this beauty spot. PLease refuse this application on the grounds that FItzjohns Avenue is in a conservation area and should be protected.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/0969/P	Elaine Wright	14 Prince Arthur Road Hampstead London	03/08/2017 13:01:15	OBJ	I strongly object to this planning application and believe that it is more than 'a minor commercial alteration". I own 14 Prince Arthur Road and the cabinets and antennae and unsightly handrail would face directly into our bedrooms. Henderson Court may not be the most attractive building in Hampstead, but is at the heart of the conservation area and on a residential street with a high footfall particularly at school times. I wholeheartedly agree with the objections made elsewhere that the numerous additional antennae and long hand rail will have a negative effect on the streetscape. Henderson Court is not a tall building and its limited height and internal courtyard mean that the antennae and handrail would therefore be visible from street level as well as our house, giving a heavily populated and used residential street an inappropriate commercial look. Henderson Court is not a suitable location for this equipment despite the revenue such leases may bring to the Council. I urge Camden to carry out their duty of enhancing and protecting our conservation area and turn down this bulky, cumbersome and inappropriate proposal.
2017/0969/P	a belilty	24a netherhall gardens	03/08/2017 18:03:16	COMMNT	shocked that this has been applied no pre consultation with local schools community application should be refused on these grounds health risk to all the children residents in condensed housing area dirty tactics applying when local community on holiday and many residents away i hope the council will be sensible to see thru this transparent plan and refuse thank you
2017/0969/P	Moira	Flat 5 42 Redington Road	03/08/2017 18:02:17	INT	It is insane to place such a thing near a high density school area thus affecting hundreds of children! I don't even know how the councing can allow this!! I am against this.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/0969/P	Elaine Lee	12 Church Row Basement Hampstead London NW3 6UT	03/08/2017 17:42:56	OBJ	Dear Sir or Madam, Re: Planning Application - 2017/0969/P Site Address: Henderson Court , 102 Fitzjohn"s Avenue, London, NW3 6NS Proposal: Installation of 4 antennas and 6 cabinets on faces of chimney on eastern corner, 2 antennas and 3 cabinets on faces of plant room on western corner, 4 equipment cabinets on roof of northeast side plus associated 1.1m high handrail walkway across roof, and one meter cabinet on ground at southwest elevation. I write to strongly object against the installation of antennas at Henderson Court, Hampstead, NW3 6NS. I have lived and worked in Hampstead for over 13 years and know the community well. Hampstead is a neighbourhood filled with business workers, large family residential population and a dense concentration of schools. I am deeply concerned about the long term effects of radiation emanating from telecom antennas into our community on a daily basis. CONSTANT BODY RADIATION EXPOSURE The telecom antennas not only spoil the aesthetic attractiveness of historic Hampstead Village, these antennas also emit microwave radiation. The current proposed antennae location is situated within metres of private homes, businesses and schools, as well as being within close proximity of my home and workplace. This radiation is capable of travelling from the antennae mast to and through the structure of our houses, penetrating our homes and workplaces, constantly exposing our bodies with microwave radiation and putting the hundreds of people living and working within the radius of this proposed antennae at risk of very serious health dangers. POSSIBLE CARCINOGEN & UNKNOWN HEALTH EFFECTS OF NEW TECHNOLOGY According to the World Health Organisation’s website: http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs193/en/ , it is directly cited: “IARC has classified radiofrequency electromagnetic fields as possibly carcinogenic to humans (Group 2B), a category used when a causal association is considered credible, but when chance, bias or confounding cannot be ruled out with reasonable confidence.” The Stewart Report provides information on the interaction of radiofrequency fields with

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

tissues. It examines epidemiological (human health) studies, research on cells in culture, experimental animals as well as on volunteers, and concerns about the use of mobile phones. It also describes the operation of mobile phones and reviews recommendations on exposure standards for RF radiation.

A precautionary approach has been recommended by Sir William Stewart of the UK"s own Health Protection Agency. As cited from The Stewart Report:

6.39 There are additional factors that need to be taken into account in assessing any possible health effects. Populations as a whole are not genetically homogeneous and people can vary in their susceptibility to environmental hazards. There are well-established examples in the literature of the genetic predisposition of some groups, which could influence sensitivity to disease. There could also be a dependence on age. We conclude therefore that it is not possible at present to say that exposure to RF radiation, even at levels below national guidelines, is to-tally without potential adverse health effects, and that the gaps in knowledge are sufficient to justify a precautionary approach.

6.40 In the light of the above considerations we recommend that a precautionary approach to the use of mobile phone technologies be adopted until much more detailed and scientifically robust information on any health effects becomes available. We further recommend that national and local government, industry and the consumer should all become actively involved in addressing concerns about possible health effects of mobile phones.

Allowing yet another antennae to be erected within the Camden Borough and within close proximity to hundreds of homes, schools and businesses is not a precautionary approach.

VULNERABLE GROUPS

The Stewart Report also discusses ‘sensitive’ groups that may be more susceptible to radiation absorption. These groups include schoolchildren who are more vulnerable to potential health effects due to longer cumulative radiation exposure and thinner skulls and the elderly. As cited from The Stewart Report:

“1.53…children may be more vulnerable because of their developing nervous system, the greater absorption of energy in the tissues of the head and a longer lifetime of exposure”

Hampstead Village has a large concentration of primary and secondary schools with some schools located within minutes of Henderson Court. With the World Health Organisation stating mobile radiation as a possible carcinogen, telecom antennas cannot be guaranteed to be safe over long periods of time.

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

POTENTIAL FUTURE COMPENSATION & INSURANCE

Does the provider installation company have sufficient insurance to cover any ill effects from the microwave emissions from their antenna? Has Camden Borough Council sufficiently investigated this? Surely, the council have a duty of care to their residents to safeguard against any future negative financial consequences and any potential compensation claims due to ill health or suffering because of the microwave emissions from the antenna.

There is no guarantee there will be insurance compensation should long term radiation exposure begin to affect the health of Hampstead residents. In 2015, it was evidenced that Lloyd's of London underwriters, CFC Underwriting Ltd, declined to underwrite insurance coverage for claims associated with illnesses caused by continuous long term non-ionising radiation exposure and this was considered standard market practise. If radiation from antennas truly posed no threat to human health, insurance companies would not need to protect their business from this potential future issue.

Although there has been some research relating to the heating mechanism of radiation, the understanding of microwave radiation on a human biological level is still in its infancy. The incoming scientific data regarding the hazards of radiation is slowly stacking up, however, we need to minimise the growing number of antennas erected in our neighbourhood to reduce the constant daily radiation exposure in our environment, the same way society has learned to reduce exposure to second hand tobacco smoke.

PROFITS OVER PUBLIC HEALTH CONCERNS

There are historical lessons to be learnt from the long term exposure of asbestos and tobacco smoking. The first medical report to link negative health to smoking occurred in the early 1900's, but it took over 90 years for irrefutable scientific evidence and a change in mainstream public opinion to influence government legislation and public policies. Unfortunately, thousands of lives and families have been devastated by poor health and death due to tobacco smoke, whilst companies raked in the financial benefits of commercial profits at the expense of human health. It is crucial to avoid repeating the mistakes of public health officials slow to recognise the dangers of asbestos, tobacco smoking and possible carcinogens from new technology.

Our human bodies are resilient and capable of repairing itself from external damage, such as medical x-ray exposure, however, our bodies are NOT designed to handle constant, cumulative radiation exposure on a daily basis, with ever increasing radiation from various sources.

SUMMARY

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					It is unfair for the community of Hampstead to be exposed to potentially carcinogenic radiation whilst companies stand to benefit from financial profits. I have the right not to be exposed to radiation against my will. Using the precautionary principle, I respectfully ask you to turn down this application and to consider the unknown long term radiation exposure of young school children, the vulnerable bodies of the elderly, workers and residents living and working in Hampstead within meters of the proposed Henderson Court mobile antennae. Yours sincerely, Elaine Lee

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/0969/P	Maria Teterina	46a Frognal NW3 6AG NW3 6AG	03/08/2017 20:15:44	OBJ	I would like to support the comment made by Robert Earrey, the Headteacher of Fitzjohn''s Primary school where three of my children go. Objection from Fitzjohns Primary I am writing to you in my capacity as Headteacher of Fitzjohns Primary School regarding the proposed base station installation at Henderson Court in Hampstead NW3 as outlined in the planning application dated 7 July 2017. My objections remain the same as when we were first alerted of the proposed project by Waldon Communications in December of 2016. I am afraid that as Headmaster of a primary school located very close to the proposed base station, I must object to the project going ahead for the following reasons: 1) Hampstead is a conservation area and such structures are not in strict compliance with the l guidelines as adapted by the local authority. This is specifically as regards design. A telecom mast will violate the guideline of 'inappropriate bulk, massing and / or height (page 60 Hampstead Conservation Area Statement of the London Borough of Camden https://www.camden.gov.uk/ccm/content/environment/planning-and-built-environment/two/planning-policy/supplementary-planning-documents/conservation-area-appraisal-and-management-strategies/hampstead/) . 2) The proposed mast is very close to 4 different primary schools 3) Research on the impact of radiation from such equipment on small developing children and the implications for their future health is insufficiently comforting. Studies to date have not had the benefit of longevity. Therefore, long term health consequences are not known. 4) Sample sizes in studies to date have been regarded as too small to be conclusive 5) There is some evidence that people with neurological problems suffer side effects from extended exposure to electromagnetic fields. As a school with several autistic children we find this implication concerning. 6) There are appropriate spots locally that provide sufficient height but will not impact a large group of small school children. It is also of note that the application has been logged just as most of the other local schools closed for the summer. Having a deadline of 28/7/17 for objections to the application is inappropriate as it deprives these affected parties form having their say. It is quite a coincidence that the original application and notification form Waldon Communications was sent just as the schools closed for Christmas break. One might think that this is a purposeful strategy to avoid proper consultation with affected neighbours of the proposed project. Thank you for your consideration.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/0969/P	Emna Peacock	2 Heat Hurst Road NW32RX NW32RX	03/08/2017 21:28:59	COMMNT	I wish to abject to the above application on the following grounds:- The construction of the masts will be an unsightly addition to Henderson Court which lies in a prominent position and is in a conservation area. Installation of the masts in close proximity to many local schools, could put children at an unnecessary health risk, in an area which already suffers from very high levels of pollution. My three children all attend schools in the area. It is unfair to allow this application during school holidays when many who might have objected will be on holiday and unaware of the proposal. A fair discussion needs to take place, and the application must not be allowed to be sneaked in while people are away as seems to be the case.
2017/0969/P	Francesca Agostini	18c Arkwright Road	03/08/2017 21:45:53	OBJ	I object to the proposed installation. 1) Hampstead is a conservation area and such structures are not in strict compliance with the l guidelines as adapted by the local authority. This is specifically as regards design. A telecom mast will violate the guideline of 'inappropriate bulk, massing and / or height (page 60 Hampstead Conservation Area Statement of the London Borough of Camden https://www.camden.gov.uk/…/planning-and-built-env…/two/plan ning-policy/supplementary-planning-documents/conservation-area-appraisal-and-management -strategies/hampstead/) . 2) The proposed mast is very close to 4 different primary schools 3) Research on the impact of radiation from such equipment on small developing children and the implications for their future health is insufficiently comforting. Studies to date have not had the benefit of longevity. Therefore, long term health consequences are not known. 4) Sample sizes in studies to date have been regarded as too small to be conclusive 5) There is some evidence that people with neurological problems suffer side effects from extended exposure to electromagnetic fields. As a school with several autistic children we find this implication concerning. 6) There are appropriate spots locally that provide sufficient height but will not impact a large group of small school children.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/0969/P	Mrs Catrien Harris	24 Netherhall Gardens NW3 5TH NW3 5TH	03/08/2017 23:06:32	OBJLETTER	As a local resident, I strongly object to the construction of the masts, antennas, cabinets and equipment proposed in this application. First of all, it is unthinkable that of all the green and unpopulated acres that exist and are available in Hampstead, Camden agrees to the construction of the antennas, cabinets and equipment in this particular place. This is a much loved and respected conservation area and its presence would be a true 'eyesore' to the whole community, visible from miles away. A telecom mast/antennas violates the guidelines of 'inappropriate bulk, massing and/or height' (see page 60 of the Hampstead Conservation Area Statement of the London Borough of Camden - https://www.camden.gov.uk/ccm/content/environment/planning-and-built-environment/two/planning-policy/supplementary-planning-documents/conservation-area-appraisal-and-management-strategies/hampstead/)' in the most flagrant way. The height and mass of the antennas and equipment will damage the street sight/look irreversibly. No landscaping or screening will hide the impact of this most ugly 'mass'. Secondly, no consultation with the local community was done, no consultation with any of the 3 primary schools which are in very close proximity of this development has taken place. It is cynical that the application was logged on 7 July 2017 when most schools were closed for the summer and most residents had left for holidays. With a deadline of 28/7/2017 for any objections to be filed is totally inappropriate as it deprives all mentioned affected parties from communicating their grave concerns. This seems to be a repeat as the original application of the former Waldon Communications was also sent to schools when they were closed, that time for Christmas break. This is contrary to the Code of Best Practice on Mobile Network Development in England, and just in general Code of Best Practice for Camden. Thirdly, I find it thoughtless, careless and reckless that as long as there remains great doubt and uncertainty about the safety to health of installations of this kind, Camden allows such installation to go ahead in a place which is surrounded by three primary schools. These are young children under the age of 12, who are still developing massively both physically and mentally, and thus very susceptible and vulnerable to environmental pollutants, such as radiation and radiofrequency electromagnetic fields. Camden's pretence to care for young children seems very shallow if it agrees such development to go ahead and forces these young children to grow up and spend 7 hours – or 1/3 – of their day near radiation and radiofrequency electromagnetic fields. Equally, to allow the construction of these masts, antenna and equipment near another vulnerable group of the old people at Henderson Court, shows Camden's total indifference to this group's health and well-being. This goes against Camden's policy to represent its and follow a Code of Best Practice and Conduct. Please reject this application.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/0969/P	Konstanze Rietsch	Flat 16 Gardnor Mansions Church Row London NW3 6UR	03/08/2017 07:46:10	COMMNT	As local resident (one of my children attending the almost adjacent Fitzjohn's primary school) I am writing to strongly object to this proposal. We walk down Fitzjohn's Avenue every day, and this would extremely unsightly and mar the street scene in the local area.
2017/0969/P	Sandie and mike Rawlings	7 Frognal gardens Hampstead London nw36uy	03/08/2017 13:24:31	OBJEMPER	As nearby residents we would like to object to this planning application. WE have many unsightly phone masts in Hampstead. THey are a blight to a conservation area and should not be allowed. WHitestone Pond has many such masts and they spoil this beauty spot. PLease refuse this application on the grounds that FItzjohns Avenue is in a conservation area and should be protected.
2017/0969/P	Emna Peacock	2 Heat Hurst Road NW32RX NW32RX	03/08/2017 21:29:15	COMMNT	I wish to abject to the above application on the following grounds:- The construction of the masts will be an unsightly addition to Henderson Court which lies in a prominent position and is in a conservation area. Installation of the masts in close proximity to many local schools, could put children at an unnecessary health risk, in an area which already suffers from very high levels of pollution. My three children all attend schools in the area. It is unfair to allow this application during school holidays when many who might have objected will be on holiday and unaware of the proposal. A fair discussion needs to take place, and the application must not be allowed to be sneaked in while people are away as seems to be the case.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/0969/P	Kate Perrins	flat 1 7 ellerdale road nw3 6ba	03/08/2017 18:49:03	OBJ	I am writing to you regarding the proposed base station installation at Henderson Court in Hampstead NW3 as outlined in the planning application dated 7 July 2017. I must object to the project going ahead for the following reasons: 1) Hampstead is a conservation area and such structures are not in strict compliance with the l guidelines as adapted by the local authority. This is specifically as regards design. A telecom mast will violate the guideline of 'inappropriate bulk, massing and / or height (page 60 Hampstead Conservation Area Statement of the London Borough of Camden https://www.camden.gov.uk/ccm/content/environment/planning-and-built-environment/two/planning-policy/supplementary-planning-documents/conservation-area-appraisal-and-management-strategies/hampstead/) . 2) The proposed mast is very close to 4 different primary schools 3) My interest here is for our own children who attend Fitzjohn"s and for all the other children there and from the surrounding schools. Research on the impact of radiation from such equipment on small developing children and the implications for their future health is insufficiently comforting. Studies to date have not had the benefit of longevity. Therefore, long term health consequences are not known. 4) Sample sizes in studies to date have been regarded as too small to be conclusive 5) There is some evidence that people with neurological problems suffer side effects from extended exposure to electromagnetic fields. As a school with several autistic children we find this implication concerning. 6) There are appropriate spots locally that provide sufficient height but will not impact a large group of small school children. It is also of note that the application has been logged just as most of the other local schools closed for the summer. This deadline for objections to the application is inappropriate as it deprives these affected parties form having their say. It is quite a coincidence that the original application and notification form Waldon Communications was sent just as the schools closed for Christmas break. One might think that this is a purposeful strategy to avoid proper consultation with affected neighbours of the proposed project. Best wishes Kate

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/0969/P	Dana Sharma	antrim mansions	03/08/2017 14:15:59	APP	I object to this application for a number of reasons: 1) Hampstead is a conservation area. To begin with, the appearance of such masts does not adhere to the area's character or heritage 2) More importantly, the placement beside Henderson Court is quite unbelievable on many grounds 3) There are four primary schools nearby and this application was not made in consultation with any of them. This decision will affect hundreds of young children and the staff/caretakers. 4) The date of filing is so devious - to put in an application in the second week of July is NOT coincidental. In fact, it's in really poor taste as the person(s) filing the application surely knows school holidays have begun and the one month filing due date is perfect for relevant parties to miss it Sorry, but this is absolutely disgusting. The decision for this application should be delayed and put forth when representatives from each of the schools including staff and parents as well as locals and those affected at Henderson Court can all object to this in person. Thank you.