

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/0461/P	EM	28/03/2020 00:23:33	OBJ	<p>It is difficult to know whether this process of application is a process of consideration by those in power or merely a formality in the current climate as permission will no doubt be granted. Nevertheless, the timing of the application is interesting, to put it politely. The Council will be familiar with the arguments and questions regarding the possible side effects on human health posed by such structures but these will be of no concern to those not living in their immediate orbit. The processes by which the telecoms companies decide on the location for masts is always opaque and their documents are filled with the word 'technical' as a means to hide the fact that there is little national or international agreement on whether not this already outdated technology is dangerous to human health at close proximity. What is sure is that we are living in an experiment.</p> <p>The decision some time ago to allow the company in question to site the current mast(s) on top of a hotel in Russell Square was a gamble - no doubt it was and still is a lucrative proposal for the hotel group, the thinking being that if people suffer detrimental, life-changing effects to their health so be it as they will never be able as individuals to prove the reason for their condition and as we know, the pursuit of money trumps most considerations in London plc. The main reason given in the application, that a sister-hotel would be the most suitable alternative site for a set of replacement 5G masts is weak and in combination with extreme levels of pollution adds to the sense of a city in the which collective health and wellbeing of most of its residents play second fiddle to the opportunism of corporate 'values'.</p> <p>It is proposed the masts be situated next door to a block of flats, where I, my family and neighbours live, and within metres of the homes of other (young) residents. Not within a few metres of hotel guests or workers or Councillors who will come and go but within a few metres of people living 24/7 within the short range of frequencies emanating from the masts whose long-term effects on the human body are not yet proven to be safe within such parameters. As we know, their 'safety' is based on short-terms studies and short-term exposure and the committee will be aware that is not the case with arrangement proposed here with the sitings of these masts.</p> <p>The application states that the suitable height for the masts is determined by a 'specialist radio engineer' taking into consideration the height nearby buildings and trees which will not obstruct the signal but again, no mention is given to the effect such signals have on those living within such close range - the often-cited excuse for this lack of proof of harm being, to put it very simply, that the waves radiate forward rather than outwards in a more 'open' configuration and if not in the direct path, it is within current guidelines.</p> <p>Although, these masts have a substantial range, the application dismisses various other local and nearer commercial alternative locations including much taller buildings such as Senate House and Victoria House, neither of which is adjacent to or directly in front of a residential building and both with uninterrupted high pathways. It would seem that the true reasons that the hotel in question is the preferred site is the ongoing, unquestioned convenience for the telecoms group and an ongoing financial gain for the hotel's parent group as a refurbishment takes place. The given 'reasons' that alternative sites - which stand many metres above any neighbouring residential buildings nearby and in front of which are no impediments to a signal - are too far from the current site of the existing masts are, to put it bluntly, spurious.</p> <p>Much space is given in the application and accompanying documents to tired and empty PR statements about building vibrant, healthy (!) connected communities. As if. Assurances of no interference to wildlife, such as it is (mostly pigeons and rats) and an assurance to protect conservation area(s) with barely a mention of any rights residents may have to health and safety in their own homes.</p>

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

There is a serious lack of transparency with regards to the financial incentives offered by telecoms companies to both councils and private and public landlords with regards to the roll out of this already outdated 5G tech.
