



For the attention of Raymond Yeung,

I am registering my objection to the construction of a telecommunications signal tower on the top of Winifred House . I live yards away from Winifred House in Churchill Road .This area is densely populated ,there are several housing estates close by and a large secondary school plus several streets of housing. I am objecting because of the health risks plus the impact on the environmental aesthetic. The company involved did not initially inform anyone , even Camden Planning , of their intentions to erect said tower , leading me to believe that they thought there would be objections. The company have tried to erect the tower at several locations in the area and planning has been rejected by the council and the local population. I have been in touch with my local MP Keir Starmer concerning this.

Yours sincerely Rosalie Keegan

22A Churchill Road NW5 1AN

Mr and Mrs Baker
23c Churchill Road
London, NW5 1AN

Wednesday 22nd Nov 2017

RE: Planning Application 2017/5172/P
Mobile Phone Masts 1 Winifrede Paul House York Rise LONDON NW5 1DX

Dear Camden Council Planning,

As you are aware the applicants for the Mobile Phone masts is CITL and Galliford Try on behalf of Vodaphone and o2 they approached other sites in the area Troyes House which was turned down by Camden Council. The companies were fully aware of the planning process and rules but tried to Install the mobile phone masts on the roof of Winifrede Paul House without any permission from the Council. In the hope that they could get away with this without any public consultation. This is a totally underhanded way, when they are fully aware of the rules and they have been turned down on previous sites so they were trying their luck.

The entire Winifrede Paul House sent letters to Galliford Try before they were to consult Camden Council Planning for the full planning application after they were caught doing this with no permission, Galliford Try saw all the objection letters 16 from Winifrede Paul House residents but they still pushed for their outcome of installing the Phone Masts so that's zero respect for the views of Winifrede Paul House. These Phone Masts will emit 24/7 365 days a year it's radiation signal into neighbouring homes meters away and also to note that 300 meters away from a secondary school Acland Burghley.

The skyline and aesthetics will change the area dramatically with this installation no matter how hard they might try to camouflage the masts. it's hiding the the effects will not be hiding but taking full force of radiation. Additionally it will be an eye sore, a stark brutal, commercialised outlook which will over shadowed the residents This would change the view from the street and other streets which is inconsistent with the Conservation Area, and fails to preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area (contrary to policy CS14 of the Camden Core Strategy, policies DP24 and DP25 of the Camden Development Policies, policies D1 and D2 of the Camden Drat Local Plan, The London Plan and NPPF).

We are supposed to be living on a residential road and not a commercial industrial estate. As a Council tax payer we the residents should be put before the commercial business interests of others. Not enough residents have been made aware in the area about this installation of Phone Masts, when you speak to anyone they are horrified. Having 1 sign on a lamp post which vanished after 5 days, is not an adequate out reach. It should be a social responsibility that the companies in question send letters to do a full consultation on something so controversial in to trying to silently apply their will. The radiation will literally

be raining into our bedrooms and living room, 20 meters away. We live here 24 hours a day 7 days a week 365 days a year. Our lives will be ruined if this is allowed to happen. We do not want to look at the Mobile Phone Masts, we don't want to think about it anymore and we don't want to worry what it might do to our health in the future. We reject this 100%.

To make you aware of our current health situation in our house hold, Autism affects one of my sons, my husband who has under active Thyroid, Tinnitus, Diabetes and growths in his shoulders.

The health impact of the masts over long term has not been fully studied with the way it can change the DNA of the body and eat into the body tissue changing atoms structure.

Here is a Daily Mail article about 14 deaths over 6 years to cancer where Masts have been installed. I am sure you will agree this is horrific.

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/health/article-1027699/14-die-cancer-seven-years-living-phone-mast-highest-radiation-levels-UK.html>

Cell Phone Radiation Boosts Cancer Rates in Animals; \$25 Million NTP Study Finds Brain Tumors

<http://microwavenews.com/news-center/ntp-cancer-results>

The leaflets that the phone company provides say it's within the World Health Organization, EU and supported by the UK Government guide lines for phone mast equipment radiation levels. If we look historically on Government decisions, always the public found out about ill effects and the same could be here in 25-30 years time and all the people making these decisions have moved on in the world and working somewhere else who made these life changing decisions. Do we really want to look back on this event and say what did we do and how could we of let this happen?

Microwave links which BBC News camera men used to use, they all thought were safe and now all of the cameramen how cancer now. So years later these things come out with devastating effects. The phone mast technology is recent technology and the long term effects have not been fully researched yet, think of all the things that the public were told is totally safe in the past then 20 years or more later evidence and symptoms rear it's ugly head. Such as The Formaldehyde birth defects. It's to late to turn back the clock as countless lives would have been destroyed.

As after all this is a money making scheme for the mobile phone operators whose only concern is getting customers at all costs! Even if that means harming the public as they would come back with "I was only doing my job". We have a duty of care and safety of our citizens the voice of the people have spoken who will be most affected in our community is is not wanted.

I hope that Camden Council take on boards the feelings and views of the residents who this is directly affecting and thus turn down the planning application. As after all Camden are working for the people of the borough and

business interests should not over ride the care commitment and safety of it's citizens.

Yours Sincerley,

Mr and Mrs Baker