

[REDACTED]

From: sarah nicholl [REDACTED]
Sent: 16 November 2017 13:27
To: Planning
Subject: Objection to Planning application: 2017/5172/P

Objection to Planning application: 2017/5172/P

Dear Camden Planning Team,

I am writing to strongly object to the proposal to erect mobile phone masts on the roof of Winifrede Paul House, Churchill Road, NW5.

I am objecting to this proposal for two main reasons. Firstly, that there has been no proper consultation with the residents of Winifrede Paul House. It seems that Camden are choosing to put profits above the decency of conducting fair and proper consultations regarding proposals which could have a significant impact on health and well-being to both residents of Winifrede Paul House and the wider community. (This lack of consultation regarding the proposal to install a mobile phone mast also happened at another residential block of flats in Camden - Troyes House, NW3, where again residents and leaseholders were not properly consulted, and subsequently successfully challenged Camden regarding this).

And secondly I am objecting to this proposal in the interests of the protection of public health and limiting the risks from the potential health hazards of radio frequency emissions from mobile phone masts and base stations. I therefore urge you to take the precautionary principle and not erect a mobile phone mast so close to residents, a school and the wider local community.

The following detail is taken from a paper published by Health Protection Scotland - link: <http://www.hps.scot.nhs.uk/resourcedocument.aspx?id=492>

"The case for adopting a "precautionary approach" is persuasive. The basic precautionary principle of maintaining radio frequency emissions (RF emissions) at the lowest possible levels, which are technically achievable and practicable, is entirely justifiable from a public health protection standpoint. Adoption of such an approach allows for flexibility in the future to raise thresholds when sufficiently robust scientific evidence of safe levels becomes available. A "precautionary approach" would ensure that in the meantime any risk of potential adverse health effects, no matter how small, is kept to the absolute minimum. This is a fundamentally different approach to using existing scientific knowledge as the basis for setting upper limits, which will only be revised downward on the basis of further conclusive scientific evidence of harmful effects".

In addition, The World Health Organisation officially classifies electromagnetic radiation as a possible 2B carcinogen, which is the same category as lead, DDT, and styrene.

Another link with valuable evidence in favour of protection against increased radiation levels via mobile phone masts etc. in sensitive, populated areas : <http://www.equilibrauk.com/emfnewinfo.shtml>

Yours sincerely,

Sarah Nicholl
45 Lady Somerset Road, NW5 1TY

[REDACTED]

From: Gill Jacobs [REDACTED]
Sent: 16 November 2017 20:00
To: Planning
Subject: Objection to Planning Application: 2017/5172/P

Objection to Planning application: 2017/5172/P

Dear Camden Planning Team,

I am writing to strongly object to the proposal to erect mobile phone masts on the roof of Winifrede Paul House, Churchill Road, NW5.

Many very eminent scientists across the world believe that there are biological effects, leading to adverse health effects on people, animals and plants at far lower levels of microwaves than the high ICNIRP limit. Khurana (2010) stated "We found that eight of the 10 studies reported increased prevalence of adverse neurobehavioral symptoms or cancer in populations living at distances of less than 500 metres from base stations. None of the studies reported exposure above accepted international guidelines, suggesting that current guidelines may be inadequate in protecting the health of human populations." People living near masts report disturbed sleep, headaches, blood pressure problems and heart arrythmias, skin problems, memory and concentration problems, mood disturbances, nosebleeds, increase in the number and / or severity of epileptic fits and other even more serious effects, including cancer. Very little research has been, or is being, done in this country, and internationally, on the sort of pulsing microwave emissions that people are exposed to from such masts. There is sufficient evidence to believe that they may affect health at least in a proportion of the population, and until research evidence is available, I feel that people may choose to take appropriate precautions, depending on how much belief they have in the risk of health problems.

In the light of the above, it is surprising that the residents of Winifrede Paul House have not been consulted. My concern is that this property is low rise, and therefore there is more risk from radiation than from higher buildings. As far as microwave radiation is concerned, low height high-power masts are responsible for higher levels of RF exposure to the general population than the ugly, but high ones. Slim monopole masts usually blend in better, looking not too unlike high lampposts, but these structures can't easily be shared. Some mobile phone antennas attached to the side of buildings are painted to look unobtrusive. Field levels inside buildings, on the other side of the wall to which the antenna is fixed, could be high. Across the road, the fields could be very high depending on the power of the transmitter.

The amount of radiation reaching any property depends on what is surrounding it. Most materials reduce microwaves, though not by very much. They can also be reflected by most materials. Microwaves travel through windows easily, but are reduced by other building materials. It is impossible to calculate exactly what the radiation at any place will be. The only

way to know for certain is to measure the field. May I suggest that before granting permission to install further mobile phone masts, Camden publishes microwave readings from a number of masts across the borough, from installations at a variety of different locations, and heights. This information is essential, and also alerts Camden to potential litigation when and if further research points to their liability for damaging health effects on those living in the range of microwave radiation from installations on Council property, or near any mast that has been given planning permission from Camden.

This lack of consultation regarding the proposal to install a mobile phone mast on Camden property, also happened at another residential block of flats which are let or leased by Camden - Troyes House, NW3, where again residents and leaseholders were not properly consulted, and subsequently successfully challenged Camden regarding this. This block is also low rise. My understanding that notwithstanding this outcome, the mobile phone mast companies are resubmitting their proposals, in the expectation that they will win the second time round. Their assumption is that residents' objections will fade away, and give up protesting, after the large amount of time need to challenge Camden's push to install phone masts on properties that they own or manage, without prior consultation with residents.

I feel strongly that Camden's policy of raising money this way, without proper consultation, is underhand and counter to our right to live safely in our neighbourhoods.

Yours sincerely

Gill Jacobs
10 Burghley Road
London NW5 1UE

[REDACTED]

From: alison huntington [REDACTED]
Sent: 16 November 2017 23:37
To: Planning
Subject: Objection to Planning Application 2017/5172/P

Objection to Planning application: 2017/5172/P

Dear Camden Planning Team,

I am writing to strongly object to the proposal to erect mobile phone masts on the roof of Winifrede Paul House, Churchill Road, NW5.

I have two children at Acland Burghley School, and live directly across the railway line from Winifrede Paul House.

Several things were of immediate concern to me when this planning application was brought to my attention this morning, and I've spent some time today trying to find out more from friends and neighbours.

Firstly, I understand that the residents were not consulted or asked for their views on having mobile comms masts on their building. This seems wrong, and an abuse of their situation as social housing residents. It seems this has happened before in other parts of Camden.

While I appreciate Camden urgently needs revenue, surely there are better ways of working with commercial organisations that don't run roughshod over residents.

Secondly, the threat to health. I'm concerned that Acland Burghley School already sits on a heavily polluted junction. Adding masts which my environmentally savvy friends and others advise can have an immediate impact unless installed at sufficient height is a serious worry to the safe development of our young people - to whom the council has a great responsibility.

We all use mobiles and benefit from mobile technology but this should not be to the detriment of public health or respect for fellow citizens.

The company involved and Camden need to come up with a more responsible way of doing this.

Yours sincerely,

Alison Huntington
86a Burghley Road
NW5 1UN