

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/4252/P	Angela Cooke	09/01/2021 16:20:27	COMMNT	<p>Re: 25 Gresse Street London W1T 1QW/Planning application number 2020/4252/P Installation of 12 antennas on six masks, 2 GPS modules, 3 dishes, 15 ERSs, 15 RRUs, 6 equipment cabinets with ancillary equipment thereto.</p> <p>I would like to lodge an objection regarding the above proposed application for the development of 5G technologies ON THE ROOF OF 25 Gresse Street which consists of 92 residential flats and houses a lot of vulnerable people.</p> <p>The owner of the complex granted Camden Council a long lease on 25 Gresse Street who have a duty of care to its residents.</p> <p>25 Gresse Street has 92 residential Flats which is part of the same complex called CENTRAL CROSS to which Camden refused planning for 5G technologies in 2019. A further application has been proposed 2020/2469/P EE/H3G CENTRAL CROSS, TOTTENHAM COURT ROAD which I have been told a decision is still awaited.</p> <p>Reason for refusal</p> <p>The proposed antennas and associated fixtures, by reason of their scale, height, design, and siting, would result in incongruous additions to the building resulting in visually intrusive rooftop clutter, causing harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding Gresse Street, Stephen Street, and Bloomsbury Conservation Area contrary to policy is D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) of the London borough of Camden local planning 2017, and sections 10 and 16 of the NPPF 2019. A roof garden/solar panels have been discussed in our tenant meetings in the past so it would be nice for the residence to have this option left open to them as non of us know how this pandemic or future ones will pan out.</p> <p>Aside from visual concerns, I, along with a considerable amount of people living within the country have apprehensions about the potential ICNIRP exclusion zones and the effect that these will have given the development of 5G technology onsite. Whilst the long-term effects of this technology is largely untested, we are aware that the current exclusion zones from these technologies can scan up to 50m+ away from the source. This again will potentially create issues with the people living in the flat below the proposed 5G technology and neighbouring residential buildings or any proposed development of these as no structure could then be built in these areas. Although the planning application drawings for the proposed Installation of 5G masts, antennas, and equipment on the roof of 25 Gresse Street block of flats claim it complies with the ICNIRP guidelines, the actual guidelines do not confirm or guarantee it is 100% safe for the residents' well-being. The same ICNIRP site also mentions (see below) dangers of long-term and short-term exposures to 5G signals, RF EMF effects on the body and health implications on human health, and that there is no enough credible evidence on how it affects human health and that it is completely safe.</p> <p>"Personal exposure to RF EMF fields from base stations is different to that from mobile phones. RF EMF exposure from mobile phones is mostly limited in time and is largest in the head or in those parts of the body close to where the phone is held. By contrast, base stations are a source of continuous whole-body exposure. This exposure is less intense than from a mobile phone, but occurs whether a mobile phone is being used or</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

not.

Assessments of personal exposure levels are most accurately achieved through onsite field measurements. Theoretical calculations are also common but are complicated by the many factors that influence the actual exposure such as the height, tilt and direction of antenna, absorption from trees and plants or reflections from buildings, as well as distance. Distance alone is not a reliable proxy for exposure from a base station.

RF effects on the body and health implications

Radio frequency fields have the ability to penetrate the human body (though the higher the frequency, the lower the depth of penetration), with the main effect of this being a rise in temperature in the exposed tissue. The human body can adjust to small temperature increases in the same way as it does when undertaking exercise and performing sporting activities. This is because the body can regulate its internal temperature. However, above a certain level (referred to as the threshold) depending on the duration, HF exposure and the accompanying temperature rise, can provoke serious health effects, such as heatstroke and tissue damage (burns).

A large number of studies have been undertaken on both acute and long-term effects from RF EMF exposure typical of base stations. Research at these levels of exposure has provided no conclusive evidence of any related adverse health effects.

Protection

The ICNIRP guidelines give general recommendations regarding RF EMF exposure. These provide limitations, expressed in terms of the Specific Absorption Rate (SAR), for the absorption of energy from RF EMF fields. Distinct SAR values apply to whole-body exposure, which is typical from base stations, and for the head, which is relevant for exposures from mobile phones. (Source: ICNIRP | Base Stations)"

I do feel the proposed sitting on the rooftop of 25 Gresse St is most unsuitable given the concerns raised and the fact that it is a large block that houses vulnerable residents.
Thank you for your attention.

A Cooke
25 Gresse StW1T 1QW

The notice is not clear that it is to do with 5G. The phone number on the notice has an answering machine but no one gets back to you.

In normal times I find most people miss the planning notices that are placed on street posts. With the seriousness of this application and because of the pandemic where people are diving in and out as quickly as possible and Christmas and New Year I do feel each Flat at Gresse Street should have had a letter drop as well as neighbouring properties.