


Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/1456/P		07/05/2020 21:02:07	OBJ	This mast will be in close proximity to 4 schools and I strongly object due to the health concerns for our children. Please take the objections from the public seriously Many thanks
2020/1456/P		07/05/2020 11:44:34	OBJ	As a local resident I wish to object on this planning application. The controversy surrounding the safety of 5G masts should be taken into consideration as having 3 of them so close to residents is of great concern and although Waldon Telecoms Ltd submitted a report regarding safety the data is biased as there is no concrete evidence to suggest complete safety especially as other European countries have decided against using them. Haddo House is in a conservation area and is a very iconic building, which is of social and architectural importance, having 3 masts stuck on top of it will detract from its aesthetics, as it can be seen from different parts of London it will become a bit of an eyesore on the London Skyline. The top of the building can also be seen from street level where the masts, cabinets, conduit and wiring will also be highly visible.
2020/1456/P		07/05/2020 11:43:25	OBJ	I am against the 5G towers near school or any busy areas as it is a health risk. I have young children attending schools nearby and also am a local resident. I OBJECT TO THIS PROPOSAL.
2020/1456/P		07/05/2020 22:09:08	OBJ	I strongly disagree with the planning action regarding 5G masts being erected in a residential area and in close proximity to many schools. Effects of these masts have been said to include increased cancer risk, cellular stress, increase in harmful free radicals, genetic damages, structural and functional changes of the reproductive system, learning and memory deficits, neurological disorders, and negative impacts on general well-being in humans. If these masts are erected I will have no alternative than to remove my daughter from Parliament Hill School.

Printed on: 08/05/2020 09:10:07

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/1456/P		05/05/2020 22:45:41	OBJ	I strongly object to this application. Camden Council have a duty of care to protect the health and safety of residents. 80% of scientific evidence confirms that there are harmful effects on humans of electromagnetic radiation from 2G ~ 5G. 5G is now being rolled out and Cornerstone mention 5G on the page Radio Planning and Propagation (V.4 November 2019) So Cornerstone are planning to upgrade these antennae to 5G. Many of Camden residents such as myself suffer from electro-magnetic radiation sensitivity which is recognized by W.H.O. as a disability. The effects of this sort of radiation is extremely detrimental to my health. I do not give permission for these masts to be installed and consider it a breach of the Nuremberg Code if they are installed. ICNIRP 2002 in its General Statement accepted that some people need non-thermal guidelines and not its thermal ones. https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPphilosophy.pdf p.546: Different groups in a population may have differences in their ability to tolerate a particular NIR exposure. For example, children, the elderly, and some chronically ill people might have a lower tolerance for one or more forms of NIR exposure than the rest of the population. Under such circumstances, it may be useful or necessary to develop separate guidelines for the general population to include such people. The health document produced by Cornerstone is incorrect and Cornerstone must be aware that their equipment is detrimental the health of residents. Georgia Gould and Andrew Maughan of Camden Council have been sent documents by a lawyer asking them to safeguard the health and safety of residents and to stop the roll out of 5G. This application must be stopped. The current ICNIRP EMF radiation guidelines are not fit for purpose in that they only address EMF heating effects, and not many other physiological effects. There is already a huge body of work by specialist scientists and doctors citing adverse effects on health of prolonged exposure to high frequency EMF radiation at levels well below the ICNIRP-recommended guideline maxima. This situation should not be exacerbated by the introduction of widespread mm Wave EMF radiation into the public realm until it is proven that subjecting the public to potentially ubiquitous and enduring mm Wave EMF radiation will not result in any adverse health consequences. Moreover, many of those on the ICNIRP board have an unacceptable conflict of interest in that they are closely associated with, and/or funded by, the mobile telecommunications industry, and as such have an interest in declaring safe long-term EMF radiation at high frequencies. In addition, many of those on the ICNIRP board are not from a medical and medical science background and are therefore arguably not best suited to considering serious matters affecting public health in the face of long-term exposure to mm Wave radiation. Similar arguments can be made of those involved in the UN/WHO 'EMF Project' that to an extent has set the parameters for the work of ICNIRP and with which there is an excessively large overlap in membership. It is understood that a number of ICNIRP members are also playing a leading role in the production of the WHO monograph on Radio Frequency Fields Environmental Health Criteria. Cornerstone's and Public Health England's advice to the UK government and planners is unscientific and not protective since they have not developed 'separate guideline levels' or 'adjusted' ICNIRP's short-term guidelines for the part of the population which has lower tolerance levels than those suited to ICNIRP's short-term ones. Cornerstone's and PHE's advice to the UK government and planners is therefore defective, since they have failed to include this aspect of ICNIRP's advice, and this failure seems culpable and an area which should be challenged. Some 80% of relevant studies show adverse effects below ICNIRP's heating levels, indicating the extent to which Cornerstone, ICNIRP, PHE and WHO are adopting a fringe or minority viewpoint. I have written to Camden Council explaining my medical diagnosis of electrical-hypersensitivity and Camden Council have a duty of care to not install such devices which will harm me and others in a similar situation. 5G

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				will harm me and others. In Sweden electro-magnetic hypersensitivity is a recognized disability and the government accepts responsibility to help those individuals to screen their homes from E.M.Fs. Better still to not install them at all. Please watch this recording of a Panorama Documentary dated 2011 about how Wi-Fi and mobile masts effect sufferers of electrical hypersensitivity https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yQGo0hesqIg#action=share Frank de Vocht, a member of the governments pro-wireless ifronti committee Committee on Medical Aspects of Radiation in the Environment has recently admitted that a small percentage of the population is sensitive to RFR below ICNIRP's heating short-term guidelines. Bristol 24/7: https://www.bristol247.com/news-and-features/news/concerns-over-brisstols-5g-roll-out/ Cornerstone and PHE should, like ICNIRP in 2002, be advising the UK government and planners that such people with lower tolerance levels exist and need protection according to the majority-viewpoint scientific evidence, be developing relevant long-term and non-thermal guidelines, or adopting appropriate long-term and non-thermal guidelines such as IGNIR. https://ignir.org Please see the critique of ICNIRP guidelines, especially as regards radar-like beams, 5G etc - on the ES-UK website under Resources section 3: http://www.es-uk.info/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/03.11-ICNIRP-Guidelines-Unscientific-and-Not-Protective.p df This application of mobile masts to include 5G sets a dangerous precedent and I urge the council to refuse this application. This is because it will injure residents and cause pain and suffering to residents who have electrical hypersensitivity, like myself, who will suffer greatly from more electromagnetic radiation transmitted by the antennae proposed. Camden has a duty of care to protect people with disabilities under the Health and Social Care Act and the HSCA must prevail.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:	Printed on: 08/05/2020 09:10:07
2020/1456/P		06/05/2020 17:46:38	OBJ	Dartmouth Park Area Advisory Committee (DPCAAC) OBJECTION: Haddo House is a beautifully balanced, symmetrical and architecturally important building in our conservation area in a setting of listed buildings and the historic London Squares. Designed by architect Robert Baillie in 1965 it is described in detail in the DP Appraisal and Management Statement 7.11. Its roofscape forms a prominent feature in the area as due to our topography it can be viewed from many locations in the conservation area. The view west from our Hampstead and Highgate Ridge where the roofscape clips the horizon is particularly significant (DP Neighbourhood Plan [adopted 02/03/2020] Appendix 1 Protected Views, View 2 and DPAMS 4.6 Views). It also falls within the Designated Panorama View (lateral) from Kenwood to St Pauls Cathedral see London Plan 7.1 and London View Management Framework SPG and Camden Local Plan 7.29. Haddo House is listed as a Heritage Asset in DPNP Appendix 2 Part B; the proposed application does not comply with Policy DC2 Heritage assets (a), (c) and (d). The applicants Design and Access Statement and photomontage are misleading as only refer/show the near view and not the far views contrary to page 28 General Principles for Telecommunications Development, Code of Best Practice for Mobile Network Development in UK. The drawings do not include a north facing elevation, however the proposed north east elevation annotates a cable and tray rising up the full height of the north facing end wall, then ending in a cabinet over two metres high against the set back wall of the top floor. Together with three bulky roof masts and other roof additions the symmetry of the building will be destroyed. The proposed site plan shows a 300 mm wide cable tray raised to step over the domed skylights, these are not shown on either the existing or proposed elevations. The internal view looking up at this large cable tray running across the rooflights would be totally unacceptable. Camden's Local Plan states in Design, Policy D1 that the Council will require that development 'preserves strategic and local views'. This proposal does not comply and will not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area as required by the policy. The installation of this telecommunication equipment on the roof of Haddo House will introduce unacceptable clutter to its significant roofscape and together with the other additions, will materially alter the appearance of the building. The impact will be harmful to the building and its setting in the conservation area.	

Printed on: 08/05/2020 09:10:07

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/1456/P		06/05/2020 10:44:59	OBJ	We are strongly opposed to the installation of the masts. This is purely for Camden Council's financial gain and is of no benefit to residents. We are concerned about the negative effects of having masts on our roof. The roof can be clearly seen from street level and from protected views including that of Parliament Hill. There is no substantial evidence that confirms there will be no health risks to residents. We are on the top floor, metres from the roof. We have reservations on health grounds, we are also concerned about noise from the apparatus and we are worried it will affect the price of our property. There is also plans for a 5g mast to be installed. Multiple arson attacks have been carried out on 5G masts across the country. Our roof is easily accessible from the balconies and we are concerned about people climbing onto the roof and igniting the masts. We are also aware that insurance companies will not cover 5g masts as they are seen as a fire risk. We object to the underhand way this has been forced upon residents despite an estate wide objection to the plans. Nobody in the block is keen for this to go ahead. Please look for alternative places for this installation. Thank you for your time.


Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:	Printed on: 08/05/2020 09:10:07	
2020/1456/P			06/05/2020 21:27:40 OBJ	As a resident of Haddo House, my family and I object on the following grounds: 1. Our building forms part of the Dartmouth Park conservation area and is a point of interest to many locals and 'passers by'. I have many times observed our building being admired for its interesting architectural structure. It attracts much attention, even the local youths have managed to access the roof a number of times, graffitiing the roof turrets, (an accident waiting to happen). The graffiti has remained for the best part of a year, it is a complete and utter eye sore and I dread to imagine what more of a hideous sight it would be with a scattering of electrical apparatus. The apparatus will create visual clutter and diminish what is a beautiful skyline. It will be a constant reminder of how Camden holds the opinions and feelings of its residents in such disregard. Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Statement Adopted 22 January 2009 acknowledges our building as a place of interest and is visible from ground level, as well as the surrounding buildings, homes and roads. 7.46 Chetwynd Road (east): (edited) From York Rise the street is densely developed but as the slope of the hill lessens the scale changes to larger semi detached and some detached houses with wider plot widths. The impact of the steeply rising street makes the roofscape highly visible. Looking west from the top there are dear views of the road and roofscape of Chetwynd Road (West) stretching down the hill towards Haddo House, which forms an important architectural component of this view. 2. However much the telecoms company would try to persuade us of the safety of such technologies, their opinion is biased. They may say there is not enough evidence to show its harmful to health, but I would like to say there is not enough evidence to say that its safe. My neighbours and I do not wish to be guinea pigs. There is much evidence to show that it is particularly harmful to the developing brains of children (we are surrounded by 4 schools) not to mention the 20 children living in Haddo House. The WHO have deemed it as a known carcinogen. 3. I am shocked that we are being treated in such a Draconian way at a time where I thought democracy ruled, 60 residents signed a petition objecting to these masts. Since September, Camden and Waldons have imposed upon us much worry and anxiety, they have sneakily submitted their application whilst we are distracted with the current CoVid19 crisis, knowing too well that we cannot canvas our neighbours because we are adhering to the social distancing rules. Camdens own Planning Guidance: Planning for health and wellbeing March 2018 states that: 1.22 Health and wellbeing are, to a large extent, determined by the environment in which we live. Transport, housing, education, income, working conditions, unemployment, air quality, green space, climate change and social and community networks can have a greater influence on our healthcare provision or genetics. Many of these determinants of health can be shaped by the planning system. I ask you the representative of Camden, to stand by your words! Its our environment and our beliefs about it that influence our genetics and our genetic response. Stress has been proven to be a precursor to disease (please see: Dr Bruce H. Lipton - PhD - The biology of belief). Camden, why are you ignoring us and our wishes?		

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				4. We live on a very busy, noisy junction and the very possibility of anymore noise fills us with dread.
2020/1456/P		07/05/2020 14:55:15	COMMENT	I'm raising concern and urging you to desist in plans to install 5G tower There has not been adequate studies and research into long term harmful effects of 5g. It is now common knowledge that many people have adverse effects from 5g. This installation will have huge negative health impact on our children.
2020/1456/P		07/05/2020 19:19:51	OBJ	I object to the planning application to place a mast on the roof of Haddo House. I am a nearby householder on Highgate West Hill so would not be affected directly by the mast other than its possible ugly visibility. What I do object to is the ignoring of residents concerns that have not been addressed in any way. The residents do not want a mast imposed on them. The consultation process is deeply flawed given that it has come during lockdown with notices hidden behind bins. I am deeply disappointed that Camden, one of the best run councils, can behave in such an almost dishonest way.
2020/1456/P		07/05/2020 16:55:54	COMMENT	I I am a resident of Haddo House who is deeply worried about the plans for three G5 masts would be being planned for our roof. We don't want these places here at all. It will affect the look of the block. We are a listed building as far as I know. I am also worried about the effect on the effect it will have on the local wildlife including bees and even our pets. Many people don't have very good health either. Please think again before you go ahead with this plan.
2020/1456/P		07/05/2020 16:55:37	OBJ	Concerns over health, disruption to daily life, the view/eyesore element to this and expense that this can cause. As a resident of the block, I formally wish to object to the installation of all these elements as listed above in the description.
2020/1456/P		06/05/2020 22:03:02	OBJ	properties value are being affected negatively when near telecom/5g masts so having one above our block will devalue our flat and Camden reputations. My flat was recently valued at 550K by the mortgage lender so I would like to be entitle to compensation if buyers are then put off by the hideous and potential health hazards that will show up on the local search if I ever decide to sell my flat. will Camden or the telecoms company be responsible for the shortfall ?

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/1456/P		06/05/2020 20:09:41	OBJ	I object to the planning application to place a mast on Haddo House. As a resident, I am dismayed that both the applicants and Camden have ignored the concerns of the residents. In particular, the consultation process led by Camden has been most unsatisfactory & the preferred outcome (placing of the masts) has always been framed as a foregone conclusion. There has been universal concern about the proposal amongst residents and a petition against the mast, signed by representatives of all 40 households of Haddo House, was submitted to Camden in Autumn 2019. Residents wide-ranging concerns focus on: ⌘ Unknown health implications ⌘ Equity and transparency in the choice of location ⌘ Visual impact on an important local building ⌘ Poor consultation Camden has never acknowledged or responded to our concerns, and the application was submitted regardless. Finally, this round of ⌘consultation⌘ began after the lockdown, with notifications hidden behind recycling bins ⌘ as shown in other submissions to this application. I am aware of other installations in the area that have been declined due to similar concerns and firmly believe this planning application should also be rejected.
2020/1456/P		06/05/2020 14:01:40	OBJ	I completely oppose to this for health reasons for myself and for my fellow residents I do not want these masts until in depth further studies have been done into the effect the masts and exposure to 5g have on human bodies and brains Until I see proof that no effect is caused these masts should not be installed
2020/1456/P		07/05/2020 11:58:44	OBJ	I am strongly opposed to this application. I am very concerned that the wishes of the residents in the block have been ignored and that petition by 60 residents against the installation of masts was not taken into account. I don't think that it was a genuine consultation. I live in a nearby council block and I am very worried that the concerns of residents are not being listened to. I think more research into the long term health risks is required before 5g masts are put on residential blocks. And they certainly should not be installed in cases where the residents object.

Printed on: 08/05/2020 09:10:07

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/1456/P		07/05/2020 19:19:52	OBJ	I object to the planning application to place a mast on the roof of Haddo House. I am a nearby householder on Highgate West Hill so would not be affected directly by the mast other than it's possible ugly visibility. What I do object to is the ignoring of residents concerns that have not been addressed in any way. The residents do not want a mast imposed on them. The consultation process is deeply flawed given that it has come during lockdown with notices hidden behind bins. I am deeply disappointed that Camden, one of the best run councils, can behave in such an almost dishonest way.
2020/1456/P		06/05/2020 21:53:11	OBJ	residents of flat 21 are very sensitive to EMF and suffer badly with headaches and insomnia. We switch our electronics off every night to be able to sleep a bit better. The thought of having one massive mast above our heads is stressing me out and being very detrimental to my well being. a) it's unfair that the more vulnerable, lower wagers, council flat residents are being put under this stress and private tenants are not. Nobody can confirm that there is zero risk of negative health effects of long-term, close and constant exposure to the emissions, including 5G - research is not conclusive. Is it human to ask residents of council blocks to unfairly bear the risk in favour of more well off people? one does not see big masts above Hampstead mansions so where are our equality rights as citizens? b) other UK boroughs and many other countries have already declined the installation of 5G and the fact that the proposal already state that we have one nearby, it defeats the purpose of this installation. c) Due to our unique sensitivity to electronics/emf emission devices, I would like to have my flat painted with anti emf paint and fitted with anti emf equipment to protect me from excess exposure 24hrs a day, the telecom company and camden to be responsible/accountable for all the anti emf installation expenses and any health related issues that I or any of the residents might suffer as a consequence of this application. European laws already protect their citizen in that manner and our concerns should not be ignored. d) our block is located within a conservation area and the hideous masts goes against every visual pollution law there is in this country. our coverage is already good enough and should not pollute our environment e) we are already under such stress over this lockdown/pandemic situation and this is not essential works to be submitted or installed when our health and well being are already a lot of pressure.
2020/1456/P		07/05/2020 04:47:06	OBJ	Safety of our children has not been established

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:	Printed on: 08/05/2020 09:10:07	
2020/1456/P		07/05/2020 10:47:29	OBJ	Dear Camden Council, As a leaseholder I am objecting to the proposed planning of the 5G masts being installed at Haddo House due to the fact that Haddo House is in a conservation area and is a very iconic building and having three masts stuck on the top of it will massively detract from its aesthetics, especially as you can't even install your own satellite dishes for this very reason, so I find it ironic that this is even being proposed, Haddo House can be seen from different parts of London and having these masts will just be an eyesore. The top of Haddo House can be seen from street level and these masts, cabinets, conduit and wiring will also be highly visible on an iconic building in a conservation area that is also of social and architectural importance. The controversy surrounding the safety of 5G masts should also be taken into consideration as having three of them so close to residents is of great concern, although data showing the safety of these masts has been submitted by Waldon Telecom Limited this is a biased study and there is still no concrete evidence to suggest the absolute safety of these masts particularly as other European countries have decided against using them. By installing 5G at Haddo House you are potentially putting residents health and well being at risk. Other proposed sites to install these (I don't think they should be installed anywhere) could potentially be office blocks or commercial buildings where there is likely to be a slightly lower risk to residence. How this proposal had even got to this stage of the process is beyond me, how any planning officer or councillor can actually see this as a good idea and a great addition to a conservation area that is highly populated I will never know. In addition to this I have noted the notice of proposal was strapped to the railings behind the big communal bins where conveniently no one can see it.		

Printed on: 08/05/2020 09:10:07

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/1456/P		05/05/2020 12:19:00	OBJ	From the Officers of the Lissenden Gardens Tenants Association It has been brought to the LGTA Committee's attention that Waldon Telecom is seeking planning permission from Camden to install 3 5G masts on the roof of neighbouring Haddo House. In 2017, the LGTA objected to the proposal to put the masts on the roof of Chester Court, Lissenden Gardens. At its meeting on Wednesday 29th April, the Committee unanimously instructed me to contact you to express our objection in support of the residents of Haddo House, who objected in November 2019 when Waldon Telecoms consulted them about the proposal, and continue to object now: 1. Disrupted views. Haddo House is a local landmark, in a conservation area. It is visible from four intersecting roads at street level and from hundreds of windows in the surrounding area. The masts would clutter the skyline and be a permanent reminder of how a telecoms company disregarded the wishes of council tenants and leaseholders who made their objections clear. 2. The timing of the application. We are aware that health concerns are not considered a reason to object to telecom masts. However, there remains ambiguity around the possible health effects and this increases the concerns of residents at a time when elderly residents are already vulnerable. We, the entire committee of Lissenden Gardens Tenants Association, are signing our objection on behalf of the residents of Lissenden Gardens. Yours sincerely, St.John Wright Chair
2020/1456/P		07/05/2020 22:51:20	OBJ	I object to any 5g mast going up in the Gordon house road, Highgate road, habbo house are. I do not want my children and others children's health out at risk. There are 4 schools in this are and it's a very built up residential area with a large community. There is not enough known about the affects on people's health and I'm totally against 5g.
2020/1456/P		06/05/2020 21:40:53	SUPPRT	I am writing in favour of the application. 5G is an excellent improvement to our vital communications infrastructure. It will provide faster internet connections using less energy. It will improve the audio quality of phone calls and enhance the opportunity for video communications. All these services have been even more important to us during the lockdown and will continue to increase in importance beyond. 5G will also reduce the need for physical cabling for broadband connections at home and at work. The external appearance of the equipment is typical of that already distributed through our city. The technology is safe.
2020/1456/P		06/05/2020 13:52:47	COMMTNT	No ! No! No! Resident nearby seriously objects to any 5g masts !

Application No: 2020/1456/P
Consultees Name: [REDACTED]
Received: 07/05/2020 09:51:53
Comment: OBJ

Printed on: 08/05/2020 09:10:07

Response:

I am objecting to this application as a leaseholder of Haddo House.

The masts will be seen at street level and will detract from the aesthetics of the building. The wiring, conduit, cabinets and masts will all be seen at street level on a building which is in a conservation area. Conservation areas are there to protect the location from harmful changes that impact the appearance of the area. These masts will negatively impact the appearance of Haddo House which is in a prominent position within the conservation area.

I would also like to object to the positioning of the Planning Notice as it had been erected on the railings behind the large recycling bins where no one would see it. Previously, planning notices have always been put up in the stairwell in the entry of Haddo House so it is of concern that there appears to be a lack of transparency regarding this planning application.

The funding the council will receive by allowing these masts to be installed does not outweigh the harm to the character of the building. Haddo House is an iconic building which can be seen from various locations around London, particularly from the top of Dartmouth Park Hill. These masts will negatively impact that street view that includes Haddo House as they will also be seen from miles around. Even at street level in near proximity to the building, the masts will be seen.

There are grave concerns regarding the safety of the 5G masts and various countries, including countries within the EU have already decided to ban them due to safety concerns. I feel not enough is known about the strength and power of 5G to be sure the masts are safe enough to be placed right next to, or on top of a residents property.

Other tower blocks have successfully managed to reject planning applications of a similar nature and I strongly urge you to do the same for this application, particularly as the block is of architectural importance, and it is within a conservation area.

As a leaseholder, I am also concerned that the installation of the masts will reduce the value of the property and potentially make it much harder to sell on should I choose to move. The masts have a very negative reputation and people are fearful of them, no one is going to want to live in a block that has 3 of them attached to them.

I cant understand why the council is not identifying other high rise buildings for the location of these masts, such as office blocks, which would have far less of an impact than that of a residential block. It is unfair that residents have to 'put up' with these planning applications purely because they are council tenants.

Due to the above reasons, I strongly object to this planning application and urge you to do the same. In summary, Haddo House is an iconic building in a conservation area that can be seen from various viewpoints such as Dartmouth Park Hill and Parliament Hill. These masts will negatively impact the character and appearance of the building and will have a negative impact on the conservation area.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/1456/P		07/05/2020 07:42:26	INT	It is clear from all the scientific evidence cited in this petition - see eg the Observer article 'An Inconvenient Truth About Cancer and Mobile Phones' - that there is a serious risk of damage to health, particularly to children, from 4G and therefore inevitably 5G radiation. The proposed site of these masts is in close proximity to four large state schools. It is simply not a safe or wise decision to expose so many thousands of children, at a vulnerable stage of their development, to such greater radiation when a link between 3 and 4 G has already been found with a higher rate of brain tumours and other cancers as well as damage to DNA in adults.
2020/1456/P		07/05/2020 06:24:13	OBJ	I strongly object to these masts/antennas. Haddo House is a landmark and should not be used as a base for them. It is also too close to 3 schools to have masts like this.
2020/1456/P		06/05/2020 20:55:55	COMMENT	I am very concerned about these plans because of the proximity of these masts to Parliament Hill School which my daughter attends. There are serious health implications which need to be looked into further due to risk to our young children. I am not satisfied this has been investigated adequately. These masts should not be near any schools.
2020/1456/P		06/05/2020 11:16:06	COMMENT	The jury is still out on the health and safety of 5G. The frequency 5G operates on gives me cause for concern and research so far into the health impacts definitely warrants caution. My children go to the school on Gordon House Road. They are already exposed to severe pollution and an absurd amount of EMF traffic. We do not need 5G - we do not need faster internet. I wholeheartedly object to this. How often are the decisions over our health and the environment ongoing to be defined by corporate entities rather than the communities they effect?
2020/1456/P		05/05/2020 19:42:56	OBJ	I write to object to the proposed installation of masts at Haddo House on the following grounds: 1. Haddo House is part of the Dartmouth Park conservation area and the masts will detract visually from the aesthetics of the building - especially given the crowded nature of the junction where it sits. 2. Uncertainty around any long term health effects of 5G masts on residents. 3. Regardless of the long term health effects, the very real stress caused by the masts for residents about possible health effects for them and their children.
2020/1456/P		05/05/2020 18:44:30	OBJ	I walk past this building to get to work everyday and my daughter attends Parliament Hill School, which is a stones throw away from Haddo House. I feel that the Antennas will cause unwanted electromagnetic energy which will be directed into the homes of the tenants, locals and wildlife. This is Purley for financial gain and simply not acceptable.