Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/2015/P	AJ	21/05/2020 18:12:47	OBJ	I object to the antennas on Matilda Apartments due to the impact this would have on the architecture of this development. Matilda apartments was designed by world renowned architect Renzo piano and forms part of his important global work - this development will be of significant future importance.
				I also object to the antennas which are huge and an eye sore to be on the cusp of a conservation area and seen from many aspects below. These antennas do not need to be placed on top of a residential building when there is many commercial options around.
				The initial planning application for Matilda apartments was withdrawn/ rejected and had many objections from residents, resident committee and from the central St Giles limited freeholder.
				The applicant has made many confusing applications with different addresses and mentioned sites for antennas and ultimately is disguising the applications for the Matilda apartments Site which I strongly object to.
2020/2015/P	Tim Baros	21/05/2020 09:07:21	OBJNOT	Antennas should not be placed on top of residential buildings, including Matilda Apartments. I object to this.
2020/2015/P	Victoria Llewellyn	26/05/2020 08:58:07	OBJ	I am a resident within the St Giles complex and object to these being installed on our building. There are a large number of office buildings that they can be installed upon, why do they want to instal on our building. I also thought for anything like this, we should have received formal notification, we did not. We live here day and night I do not feel comfortable then being erected above us. Renzo Piano, the architect, I feel sure would not like to see these on our building either!
2020/2015/P	Azeem Ahmad	26/05/2020 20:19:32	COMMNT	I object to this application as the installation is on a residential building which is part of a large development. This will make Matilda apartments stand out in a way that will not be in line with the rest of the development. I know that the health concerns of 5G have been addressed however why would you subject residents on the top floor to 24/7 exposure to 5G radiation when you could quite simply place this on an office building such as Albion House (see separate application) and decrease human exposure massively. Also I object that no consideration has been given to the design of the antennas which will be viewable from several different conservation areas despite the preplanning advice that is recorded as part of this application.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/2015/P	T Felix	26/05/2020 15:54:42	OBJ	<ul> <li>THERESA Felix of 13 Matilda apartments, object to part of this application. Specifically the part where it placing 5G masts on top of 1 St. GILES HIGH STREET.</li> <li>The application is firstly wrong in that the masts are not being placed on 1 St. GILES HIGH Street which is an office building. But they are being placed on Matilda Apartments,</li> <li>4 Earnshaw St. London</li> <li>WC2H 8AJ</li> <li>1 St. Giles High Street and Matilda apartments is part of the Central St. Giles building complex however they are separate buildings are on different Streets and have different post codes.</li> <li>The application therefore is confusing as local residence will not realise that the masts are to be placed on their building, and should be refused simply on this ground alone.</li> <li>Furthermore I wish to point out that Matilda Apartments is an residential building consisting of 53 apartments. It isn't called Matilda House as the planning application refers to it perhaps replacing the part of the name from Apartments to House is a way to remove the fact it is a residential Apartment Building in the application. It has never been called Matilda House.</li> <li>I further wish to assert that while there are so many options in the area to place these masts on top of office buildings where people spend significantly less time than a residential one.</li> <li>Placing the masts will not only cause disruptions to a Residential building in the instillation and maintenance of the building where having the option to reduce the possible risk and place them on office buildings where people spend significantly less time than a residential one.</li> <li>Irfer to a BBC article on this link:</li> <li>https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-48616174</li> <li>Lastly I wish to state having reviewed the supplementary information for this application, and more importantly being a stakeholder on the pinamy proposed site, no resident of Matilda apartments has to date been comultary organisation guard partment have been consulted and</li></ul>
				Matilda Apartments

				Printed on: 28/05/2020
Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/2015/P	Max Robinson	26/05/2020 08:58:44	OBJ	I would like to object to part of this application. Specifically the part where it placing 5G masts on top of 1 St. GLES HIGH STREET. The application is firstly wrong in that the masts are not being placed on 1 St. GLES HIGH Street which is an office building. But they are being placed on Matilda Apartments, 4 Earnshaw St. London WC2H 8AJ 1 St. Gles High Street and Matilda apartments is part of the Central St. Giles building complex however they are separate buildings are on different Streets and have different post codes. The application therefore is confusing as local residence will not realise that the masts are to be placed on their building, and should be refused simply on this ground alone. Furthermore I would also like to point out that Matilda Apartments is an residential building consisting of 53 apartments. It isn't called Matilda House as the planning application refers to it perhaps replacing the part of the name from Apartments to House is a way to remove the fact it is a residential building in the application. It has never been called Matilda House and I can see no documentation to it ever being referred to in that name. I do not understand while there are so many options in the area to place these masts on top of office buildings that instead they suggest they are placed on top of a residential building in the instillation and maintenance of therefore wouldn't it be better when having the option to reduce the possibly increase the chance of cancer and therefore wouldn't it be better when having the option to reduce the possible risk and place them on office buildings where people spend significantly less time than a residential one. One of the masts is preposed to be placed directly over my bedroom within 5 meters of where I sleep, and within 10 meters of my entire apartment. I refer to a BBC article on this link; https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-48616174 Regards Max Robinson