

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/4214/P	Geraldine Moloney	30/10/2020 14:42:26	OBJ	I am emailing to object to this planning application on the grounds that the proposed antennae and satellite dishes will have an adverse impact on the skyline which is observable from the top of the Primrose Hill and a number of buildings surrounding the park. As an important area which has managed to retain its individual despite being so close to central London, this should continue to be preserved. The area's uniqueness is due in large part to the quality of the local architecture which will not be improved by the proposed installations.
2020/4214/P	Mrs Lesley Stevas	30/10/2020 22:46:02	OBJ	<p>I strongly object to this proposal, as I did to the prior application. This application was rightly refused in April of this year by Camden.</p> <p>These masts would be an eyesore and would spoil the skyline in this conservation site. They would be seen from prominent places such as Primrose Hill a registered park and garden.</p> <p>The plans do not respect the distant vistas.</p> <p>St Paul's Primary School is in close proximity to the proposed site for the masts. See this article on the Clear Evidence of Harm to Children from radiofrequency radiation which is produced by the type of antennae to be erected in this application: by Professor Tom Butler of the University of Cork</p> <p>https://e9a5d5c6.stackpathcdn.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/On-the-Clear-Evidence-of-the-Risks-to-Child-ren-from-Smartphone-and-WiFi-Radio-Frequency-Radiation_Final.pdf</p> <p>According to The Stewart Report (March 2001) It has been suggested that children might be especially vulnerable to any adverse health effects of RF radiation. There is evidence that, at the frequencies used in mobile phone technology, children will absorb more energy per kilogram of body weight from an external electromagnetic field than adults (Stewart Report, 2000). Additionally, since children are being exposed to RF radiation from base stations from a younger age than adults, they will have a longer time in which to accumulate exposure over the course of their lives and a longer time for any delayed effects of exposure to develop.</p> <p>This application does not comply with the Mobile operator's code of best practice.</p> <p>Finally, who will be liable for damages should low-level electromagnetic proved to be dangerous to health. Has Camden Council made suitable arrangements to deal with such claims? We would like the legal position on this issue clarified? Who is liable? It is a fact that many insurance companies are now excluding Public liability covers in respect of Telecommunications mast.</p>