



18 June 2020

Planning - Development Control
Camden Council
London

**Re: Planning Reference 2020/2015/P
Cornerstone, Telefonica UK Ltd and Vodafone Limited
Application For Planning Permission
Rooftop at 1 St Giles High Street, London, WC2H 8AG**

To Whom it May Concern

I am writing to object to proposed development. I believe, with the installation of proposed equipment, the visual impact to Matilda Apartments and the wider urban area would be irreparable. Matilda Apartments, integral to St Giles Complex is one of the most important examples of London contemporary architecture in the recent years, therefore proposed roof development should not be allowed. In addition, I don't see a valid reason to place the proposed equipment on top of apartments building when there are many commercial buildings around, which are not a primary residence to 100 or more people.

I have carefully analysed the included documentation and my comments are as follows:

- 1. Cornerstone Community Information Sheet**
- 2. Allaying Health Concerns Regarding 5G and Exposure to Radio Waves**

In these documents, Applicant is referring to a couple of Scandinavian assessments. In fact there are many more contradicting assessments, all over the internet, which puts me and I am sure all other Matilda Apartments residents at unease with living under the proposed masts.

As a supporting information, please see BBC article, *Does 5G Pose Health Risk*, found at <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-48616174>, which clearly indicates that there are still many unknowns regarding 5g and Exposure to Radio Waves

3. Application Plans March 2020 and Proposed Elevations:

- Site Name/Address is wrong. Correct site name is Matilda Apartments, 4 Earnshaw Street, London, WC2H 8AJ.
- All elevations are labelled wrongly, e.g. what is shown as East Elevation should be West Elevation, etc.
- For illustration, please see below the proposed East Elevation (should be West). One has to really struggle to see the proposed roof equipment, positioned at approx 3m height from roof level (+44.40m A.G.L) - **Image 01**.
- In fact, as shown in drawing 303, top of roof equipment is positioned at +52.10m A.G.L, which with my calculations brings the top of equipment at 7.7m height from roof level - **Image 02**.
- The visual impact would be much more severe than suggested in the planning application! This is not acceptable, considering that Matilda Apartments are integral to one of the most prominent London developments in recent years, designed by worlds leading architecture practice, RPBW. This Development is a real attractor, visited by hundreds of visitors on daily bases.

4. Castlewood House Replacement Site Map

Not sure why this document is here? It has identified two additional sites, 1) 55-59 New Oxford Street and 3) 100 New Oxford Street. I haven't been able to find supporting information for these two sites i.e. impact study, plans, elevations, etc, therefore I cannot comment. To me it is more than obvious that one and only earmarked site is the roof at the Matilda Apartments.

I sincerely hope that the Camden Council Department will reject this application, and possibly help the Applicant in identifying a site that is suitable. Definitely not on top of peoples homes!

Regards,



*Two images included in the following page.



(01)



(02)