

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3674/P	Jonathan Digby	Flat 5 9 Gloucester Avenue NW1 7AU	14/09/2017 16:45:00	COMMNT	<p>I would like to register a strong objection to this proposal.</p> <p>This appears to be a completely inappropriate planning proposal on a number of grounds, seeing as it is placed on a low lying residential block, is surrounded by other residential properties and is extremely close to a school.</p> <p>The government sponsored Stewart report acknowledged the potential health risks of mobile antennae and (para 6.68) clearly states that a precautionary approach should be taken when siting this type of equipment and that it should not be near schools, near the homes of children or other vulnerable people. Parkside Court has children living in it, as do both of the properties on either side as well as other homes in the street. The school classrooms are only a few meters from the proposed site. There is at least one vulnerable individual living in Parkside Court itself and there are also people who work from home, including myself, in the close vicinity who will be subjected to radiation on a 24 hour basis.</p> <p>This is an area where people are already massively impacted by pollution, and are subject to the construction and traffic problems that will be the legacy of HS2. To subject them to further health risks is inconceivable.</p> <p>It is a needless proposal - coverage is very good in this area and there are seven other mobile antennae sites nearby. Therefore it appears that it is simply a question of more cash for the council - but people should be put before profits and I hope that the council will show no bias in judging this proposal.</p>
2017/3674/P	kelvin	25 Gloucester avenue	14/09/2017 22:53:44	OBJ	<p>We object this proyect, the installation of this antennas so near to the school and residential houses could be very dangerous for the children's and residents because, radiaron and levels of electromagnetic fields</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3674/P	Neil Macdonald on behalf of North Bridge House School	6 Sandmartin grove Lenzie Glasgow	14/09/2017 15:30:06	OBJLETT ER	Planning and Public Protection Culture and Environment Camden Council 6th Floor, Town Hall Extension Argyle Street Camden London WC1H 8EQ

14th September 2017

Ref: NM / 00001 / Camd 1

Dear Sirs,

Objection By Cognita Schools Ltd, Owners of North Bridge House School, 1 Gloucester Avenue, London NW1 7AT

Regarding: Application 2017/3674/P

For: Installation of 6 antennas and 6 cabinets on roof located behind GRP screens and 1 cabinet and associated works at ground floor level

Location: Parkside Court, Gloucester Avenue, London NW1 7AT

On behalf of Cognita Schools Ltd, the owners of North Bridge House School, which is a neighbouring use located at 1 Gloucester Avenue, 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 rationale 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 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.

Application No: Consultees Name: Consultees Addr: Received:

Comment: Response:

The level and scale of the GRP surrounding the masts effectively adds another storey to the building and detracts from the appearance of the building.

The proposal 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 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 this area can best be safeguarded if the existing residential use is maintained.

The introduction of new masts, cabinets and GRP screens 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 GRP screen will have a physical and adverse impact on the existing building and residential amenity. It is considered that the development would be highly visible not just from the surrounding properties, but also the street scene. This would adversely impact both on the existing residential block, the street scene and the wider 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 area. The cumulative effect of this development with others would be materially detrimental to 'preserving or enhancing' the character and appearance of the area and near a Conservation Area and would be contrary to Camden Council planning policies.

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

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>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.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above we respectfully request that planning permission is refused for the above development.</p>

Kind regards

Yours faithfully

Neil Macdonald

2017/3674/P	Joanne Lim Fat	4 Dudley Road	14/09/2017 09:30:56	INT	<p>I am a parent of two children who attend North Bridge House Prep School which is at 1 Gloucester Avenue. I highly object to this proposal due to health concerns for my children. I quote here the government-sponsored Stewart Report, which advises that telecoms antennas should not be placed near schools due to the possible harmful effects of exposure to low level electromagnetic fields. As Camden Council own the property I am also appalled by this conflict of interest. You clearly have a lot to gain financially from this proposal and have chosen to ignore it despite scientific research saying clearly that they should not be located near schools.</p>
-------------	----------------	---------------	---------------------	-----	--

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3674/P	Olga Selivanova	14 Holyrood Court 3-5 Gloucester Avenue NW1 7AE	14/09/2017 10:55:55	COMMNT	<p>I am a resident at 14 Holyrood Court, 3-5 Gloucester Avenue, NW1 7AE. I have attentively looked into all the supporting documentation regarding this planning application on Camden Council website and I would like to share with you my view on this.</p> <p>It is commonly known that telecommunication antennas of the radio base stations have certain pattern of directivity with a very clear main ray, that carries most of the energy.</p> <p>If your home, place of work or study are located far from the main ray of the antenna or quite far from the antenna, then in opinion of many experts, there is no reason for concern. But if a person is in the area of the main ray and very near it, then it can become very dangerous for health and even for life.</p> <p>After looking at the supporting documents regarding the planning application, I have come to below conclusions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed height of antennas on the roof of Parkside Court, based on the site location plan, is extremely low relative to the heights of the surrounding residential buildings. 2. Nearby residential blocks and schools (3-5 Gloucester Avenue, North Bridge House School, 9 Gloucester Avenue, 11 Gloucester Avenue, 1 Price Albert Road, 2 Price Albert Road, 3 Price Albert Road, 3 Regal Lane, 5 Regal Lane among others) located in the area of the main rays of the 6 antennas are in the distance of 4 to 30 meters from Parkside Court. 3. 4 out of the 6 antennas are directed almost point blank to the nearby residential buildings: 3-5 Gloucester Avenue and 9 Gloucester Avenue with a distance of 4 metres. 4. North Bridge House School is also located in the area of the rays. 5. In the supporting documents there is a reference to WHO stance on telecom antennas. However, in the case of this planning application, given the height and proximity of nearby residential buildings and school, electromagnetic power and energy of the high-frequency signal directly affect the people living in the area and the children studying in the area. In this case the allowed requirements of the radio frequency and non-ionizing radiation could be exceeded many times over. 6. I would also like to mention 4G. This is a new complex technology and it's impact on human body has not been studied yet. Evaluation of the harmlessness of such signals is given without any supporting facts. Installation of antennas transmitting 4G in the direction of nearby residential building and schools can be dangerous. 7. The area surrounding Parkside court has already good coverage and there are already 7 antenna sites in close proximity. 8. In the supporting documentation there are a lot of references to commercial benefits of this project. I understand this and support technological development and economic development of the area, however, it should not come as a risk and harm to people's health. 9. Unfortunately the recent heart-breaking events at Grenfell Tower show us that concern about health and life of people should be the first priority of councils.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3674/P	Lawrence Salem	9 Holyrood Court 3-5 Gloucester Avenue	13/09/2017 11:17:27	OBJ	<p>Overall, in my opinion, this project can be dangerous for health. Another more convenient and safe place should be found for installation of the telecom antennas.</p> <p>In the supporting documentation there are a lot of references to commercial benefits of this project. I understand this and support technological development and economic development of the area, however, it should not come as a risk and harm to people's health.</p> <p>This project can be dangerous for health. Another more convenient and safe place should be found for installation of the telecom antennas.</p>
2017/3674/P	Maximo Riera	3-5 Gloucester Avenue Holyrood Court NW1 7AE	13/09/2017 11:24:09	OBJ	<p>To whom it might concern, I have 2 small children (3 and 4 months old) I am really concern about the impact that these antennas might cause to their health and safety. I do not understand how they even consider this area particular area as an option, having a school next door. I beg you to reconsider this option and deny this application. Thanks for your help. Kind regards, Maximo Riera</p>
2017/3674/P	Marilyn and Ian Schroder	11 Gloucester Avenue	14/09/2017 17:16:38	COMMNT	<p>Dear Camden Council</p> <p>We wish to object to the proposal to site 6 Telecoms Antennas on Parkside court.</p> <p>As a telecom customer I am bound to say that the strength of service offered would be the envy of many rural areas in the country.</p> <p>More importantly we refer to the health issues raised by the 'Stewart Report'</p> <p>As these objections are so serious, we wonder what the BENEFITS could possibly be.</p> <p>yours faithfully</p> <p>Marilyn and Ian Schroder 11 Gloucester Avenue</p>