Printed on: 02/04/2021 09:10:04

Application No:Consultees Name:Received:Comment:2021/1219/PLesley Stevas01/04/2021 15:01:59 OBJ

Response:

I strongly object to this application. Rightly so, it was refused before.

I object to yet another application to put this monopole on the pavement in a busy area. It just wouldn't look right from a conservation area and it won't be good for the health of local children. Many children visit this popular area.

This monopole will set a dangerous precedent if it the application is granted, they are popping up like mushrooms in Camden. This application if it is accepted with cause far more harm and outweigh any positive effects.

This application to be placed on a public right of way is tantamount to a landgrab by a private company. Even though it has been reduced in height from the previous refused application. The proposed mast will be an eyesore and have a detrimental effect on the locality generally, and on amenities that ought, in the public interest, to be protected. This is a conservation area. No consideration, or insufficient consideration has been given to the adverse effect the proposal will have on the amenity of the area, or indeed this particular site. From the far view of the massive mast is conspicuous and tasteless in its placing and effect.

The Cabinets will cause more street clutter, a visually impaired person will have difficulty negotiating the footway here, likewise a person with mobility difficulties. This is a health and safety matter. It is a very busy area with many people using the station exit and the nearby market so will cause many extra difficulties for those with visual impairments and mobility impairments.

There are residents in Camden who are electro hypersensitive ("EHS"). Camden has an obligation to safeguard their health.

Health:

The NPPF states the following:

1. 116. Local planning authorities must determine applications on planning grounds only. They should not seek to prevent competition between different operators, question the need for an electronic communications system, or set health safeguards different from the International Commission guidelines for public exposure. This states that local planning authorities should not "set health safeguards different from the International Commission guidelines for public exposure".

We appreciate that the council cannot do that. But the council has an obligation to safeguard the health of its constituents by virtue of s. 2B of the National Health Service Act 2006

- 2B Functions of local authorities and Secretary of State as to improvement of public health
- (1) Each local authority must take such steps as it considers appropriate for improving the health of the people in its area.
- (2) The Secretary of State may take such steps as the Secretary of State considers appropriate for improving the health of the people of England.
- (3) The steps that may be taken under subsection (1) or (2) include—
- (a) providing information and advice;
- (b) providing services or facilities designed to promote healthy living (whether by helping individuals to address behaviour that is detrimental to health or in any other way);
- (c) providing services or facilities for the prevention, diagnosis or treatment of illness;
- (d) providing financial incentives to encourage individuals to adopt healthier lifestyles;
- (e) providing assistance (including financial assistance) to help individuals to minimise any risks to health arising from their accommodation or environment;
- (f) providing or participating in the provision of training for persons working or seeking to work in the field of health improvement;
- (g) making available the services of any person or any facilities.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Pri Response:	ted on:	02/04/2021	09:10:04
				 (4) The steps that may be taken under subsection (1) also include providing grants or loans (on such terms as the local authority considers appropriate). (5) In this section, "local authority" means— (a) a county council in England; (b) a district council in England, other than a council for a district in a county for which there is a county council; 			
				See also "A Review of the Health Risks of Radiofrequency Radiation Employed in 5G Technological Implications for UK Policymaking" by Professor Tom Butler at University College Cork: https://ehtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/Prof-Tom-Butler-Submission-on-5G-RFR-Final-27-Camden must refuse this application.			