
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 22 April 2020 10:45
To: Planning
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Objection to Planning Application | Ref: 2020/1456/P

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc. Please note there have been reports of emails purporting to be about Covid 19 being used as cover for scams so extra vigilance is required.

The residents, both tenants and leaseholders, strongly oppose the plans to install telecom masts on the roof of Haddo House on the following grounds:

Health Implications

Residents are primarily concerned with the health implications. Having read every one of the websites referenced, the message seems to be that there are unlikely to be adverse health effects but that research is still needed into the long-term effects of exposure. Camden councillors have made the judgement that, for the financial reward offered, the chances are worth taking but for our families living in Haddo, including small children, these question marks are too significant to be completely comfortable with a mast 3 metres above our beds.

There were 60 signatures collected on the petition written by our colleague Foulla Pashkaj and previously sent to Camden; each one of those residents feels the same.

Matter of Choice?

The wording of the consultation letter, and subsequent planning application, gives the impression that the installation is going ahead and so residents have been left with the unpleasant feeling that, as local authority tenants or leaseholders in a local authority owned building, they are expected to just put up with it. Here a question of equity is obvious.

Size of Masts

Neighbours in Dartmouth Park often comment on the graffiti that has remained on our roof for nearly a year they are sure to notice, and have an opinion on, any additions to the rooftop apparatus. The masts will change the fabric of the area.

Sound

The FAQs tell us we are unlikely to hear noise from the masts but we could not tolerate hearing any at all given the level of noise pollution we are already suffer due to our position on a busy junction. Given the concrete construction of the building, some sounds travel extremely well up and down the height of the building.

Location of Masts

We believe that the proposed location was not chosen by the network operator because 'it works best in terms of network coverage' but because the building is owned by a local authority whose budget in previous years has been reduced by hundreds of million. Charity, church and NHS buildings become targets for the acquisition agents for the same reason. There are alternative locations for the apparatus.

Consultation

We find the consultation lacking in range. Residents of Clanfield and Wheatley Houses would have liked to be included. Additionally, many of our residents are elderly or, for some other reason, do not have access to the internet so will not easily be able to respond to a consultation where the only return method is an email address, neither will they be able to access any referenced articles.

A TRA is an organisation accredited by Camden Council, involvement in one is entry level participation in local government. It is particularly important that our opinion is heard and responded appropriately to at a time when people across the country are ready to give up on democracy. Failing this, residents of this estate are ready to continue their efforts to stop a mast coming to this rooftop.

In addition to this, we have heard that 2 other local resident associations have been successful in getting the plans refused on similar grounds. Please can Camden Council confirm this?

Please confirm receipt of this email.

Thank you,

