

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3674/P	Richard Cottton	Town Hall Judd Street London WC1H 9JE	19/09/2017 16:01:01	COMM	The antennae are low relative to the height of neighbouring residential buildings and four of the six antennae are within 4 metres of 3-5 Gloucester Avenue and 9 Gloucester Avenue. Northbridge House School is also located in the area. There is insufficient evaluation of the impact of 4G antennae and a fear that there is an over concentration of antennae in this area.
2017/3674/P	Richard Cottton	Town Hall Judd Street London WC1H 9JE	19/09/2017 16:00:53	COMM	The antennae are low relative to the height of neighbouring residential buildings and four of the six antennae are within 4 metres of 3-5 Gloucester Avenue and 9 Gloucester Avenue. Northbridge House School is also located in the area. There is insufficient evaluation of the impact of 4G antennae and a fear that there is an over concentration of antennae in this area.
2017/3674/P	Naci Uydac	11 Adamson Rd London NW3 3HX	19/09/2017 22:03:00	OBJEMAI L	<p>I wish to object to this application.</p> <p>My children attend North Bridge House School and The Cavendish School and I am very concerned about the negative impacts this will have on their health.</p> <p>The government sponsored Stewart report clearly states that telecoms antennae should not be placed in such a location and highlights concerns about the possible harmful effects of exposure to low level electromagnetic fields. Specifically paragraph 6.68 recommends that a precautionary approach be taken when siting such equipment and clearly states that it shouldn't be near schools.</p> <p>The proposed location is already heavily strained by the increases in traffic, pollution and construction due to HS2. Even without HS2 it is a very polluted area and my son has developed asthma since being at the school.</p> <p>The antennae are unnecessary as there is already good coverage in the area (see mast data.com)</p> <p>The council has already rejected several more suitable applications in the local area.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3674/P	JiangYin Qu	1 Holyrood Court 3-5 Gloucester Avenue London NW1 7AE	19/09/2017 17:45:16	OBJLETT ER	To whom this may concern.  We live adjacent to the proposed building site and are writing to ask that as residents from Holyrood Court, we strongly object to this 6 Telecoms Antennas on Parkside Court planning application from CTiL

Herein are our comments and objections relating to this planning application:

#### 1. Health and safety issue:

The proposed location for 6 telecom antennas is in a residential area. It is right above a residential building and surrounded by other highly occupied residential buildings. The nearest school is North Bridge House School, which is only 40 meters away. Therefore the location may cause a health and safety concern, because all the residents and students will be exposed to the radio waves directly and constantly.

According to Stewart Report, there are 'possible harmful effects of exposure to low level electromagnetic field' and in the report it also recommends 'a precautionary approach when siting this type of equipment and clearly states that it should not be near schools, near the homes of children or other vulnerable people'.

On EMFcomp's website, it also mentioned 'For high frequency radio waves (radio-frequency or RF) - produced by, for example antennas, this type of radiation can cause heatstroke and burns.'

Another study from Safespace suggested that 'The microwaves from cell phone towers can interfere with your body's own EMFs, causing a variety of potential health problems, including: Headaches, Memory loss, Cardiovascular stress, Low sperm count, Birth defects, Cancer'

It is very clear that telecom antenna can potentially cause great damages to human body, and it should not be placed very close to residential area and school.

Another problem I would like to raise is how did the company measure the current radiation level. As the ICNIRP public exposure guidelines involved all the radio wave in the environment, which include all kinds of wireless signal and all the electric equipment. The company declare the radiation from their equipment were within the safe level, however, they never mentioned the current radiation level in the proposed location, and the current radiation level in the resident's homes around the proposed location. If they can't provide a comprehensive safety report of the surrounding area, then their safety statement can't be trusted.

What's more, there are studies showed the telecom antennas should affect the surrounding properties price.

#### 2. Inappropriate Location

According to Vodafone, O2, EE and 3 network mobile coverage checker, the whole area around the proposed location is well covered by 2G, 3G and 4G signal. And there are already 7 antenna sites closed by. There is no point for CTiL propose to install another telecom antennas site in this area.

What's more, In CTiL's statement, it mentioned:

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>'71954 is required to provide coverage and capacity in the area North of Regents Park in and around London Zoo.'</p> <p>'The site will also help along the A4201 a main commuter route into Camden.'</p> <p>According to supporting signal coverage information from CTIL, the proposed telecom antenna can hardly improve the signal strength in the targeted area. What's more, 4 out of the 6 proposed telecom antennas are facing the opposite direction of the targeted area, which make no sense.</p> <p>Clearly Parkside Court is not an appropriate location to install the telecom antenna.</p> <p>From the above, I cannot see any reason for the company to install telecom antennas on top of Parkside Court building. Thus, I object the proposal and I hope Camden Council can value the opinions from local residents, and make the safety of local residents a high priority.</p> <p>Kind regards, JiangYin Qu Jia Cai XiYi Wang</p>

2017/3674/P	S flexer	9 Gloucester ave	19/09/2017 10:13:09	OBJ	<p>I'm writing to register my concerns regarding the proposed plans to to erect several antennas and equipment on parkside court block of flats on Gloucester Avenue, London.</p> <p>I recently moved into the property beside parkside court with my two young children (aged 6 and 3) and am now extremely anxious about them living in such close proximity to this telephonic equipment given the potential harmful effects of regular exposure to such low level electromagnetic fields: essentially, radiation. To my knowledge it is advised in the Stewart Report of 2001 that one should take a precautionary approach when sitting this type of equipment and clearly states that it should NOT be near schools or near the homes of children or other vulnerable people.</p> <p>Given that it is such a heavily populated area and particularly that there is a school also right beside park side court (on the other side to me) It does seem like an extremely unsuitable location to place the equipment. Furthermore there doesn't appear to be any issues with coverage in this area and a number of masts are already sufficiently closely located.</p> <p>I do hope you will take these concerns seriously</p>
2017/3674/P	Mr Geary-Jones	6 Regents Park Terrace NW1 7EE	19/09/2017 21:51:44	OBJ	<p>As a local resident in the area, I object to the plans to put up 6 antennas at 7 Gloucester Avenue. The additional masts in the area are unnecessary, will be unsightly and tests show there are negative health implications to antennas.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3674/P	Sarah Walford	11 Adamson Rd London NW3 3HX	19/09/2017 22:01:38	OBJEMAI L	<p>I wish to object to this application.</p> <p>My children attend North Bridge House School and The Cavendish School and I am very concerned about the negative impacts this will have on their health.</p> <p>The government sponsored Stewart report clearly states that telecoms antennae should not be placed in such a location and highlights concerns about the possible harmful effects of exposure to low level electromagnetic fields. Specifically paragraph 6.68 recommends that a precautionary approach be taken when siting such equipment and clearly states that it shouldn't be near schools.</p> <p>The proposed location is already heavily strained by the increases in traffic, pollution and construction due to HS2. Even without HS2 it is a very polluted area and my son has developed asthma since being at the school.</p> <p>The antennae are unnecessary as there is already good coverage in the area (see mast data.com)</p> <p>The council has already rejected several more suitable applications in the local area.</p>

---