

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/0598/P	Hakim Boudjemai	14/04/2021 18:41:18	OBJ	<p>I wish to object to this application on the basis that this proposed development is not suitable for the Area. The existing mobile coverage and availability is currently sufficient for the area. The increase of telephony capacity is currently not required or proven to be a valid requirement. In addition, the community and parish members around the proposed installation is composed of seniors or young families. The increase risk of cancers and others health issues for the elderlies and young children between the age of 2 to 6 is a concern due to the increase level of electromagnetic radiation. It will be detrimental to the spirit of the community and the development of our children who are living in our Crestview surrounding and attend Acland Burghley School. The Contractor has so far failed to engaged our community, addressed our concerns, and trying to mitigate the personal risks that they are presenting to us for their own personal commercial benefits.</p> <p>As a result, due to health concerns, Community impact assessment, and the lack of collaboration from the provider, I urged the council to reject this application.</p>
2021/0598/P	Hakim Boudjemai	14/04/2021 19:18:27	OBJ	<p>I note that the contractor issue correspondence with Acland Burghley School, La Sainte Union Catholic Secondary School, York Rise Nursery on the 17th of June 2020 without response. While in ordinary time, I would have accepted the procedure to be appropriate. 2020 wasn't a normal year, and issuing a letter 2 days after the reopening of Acland Burghley School due to Covid, I strongly believe that the school management team had other pressing matters than to deal with a planning application. I do not find any evidence in the proposed documentation that the contractor has taking all necessary steps and due care to receive formal approval from these schools. The technology documentation is no more than a marketing brochure which doesn't stipulate the frequency bandwidth and the field strength radiation the antennas will be operating off. Due to the lack of approval or notices from the listed schools, and a closer nusery that is not listed in the provided documentation. There is not enough evidence that due process in this application has been taken. In addition, due to the lack of technical evidence that these children and the community will be exposed on, I strongly object this application and urge the council to reject it.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
2021/0598/P	Colin Richardson	14/04/2021 17:37:32	OBJ	<p>I also wish to object on the basis that this development will be intrusive to the residents. I have a concern over noise in the building. Sound insulation in the block is already poor. A bang or drilling in one part of the building is amplified throughout the building over the concrete skeleton and pots construction. All the construction will, for a time, inconvenience the residents, however, the long-term drone of amplifiers and cooling fans will also permeate the building and not be confined to the top floors.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/0598/P	Colin Richardson	14/04/2021 17:36:59	OBJ	<p>I wish to object to this application on the basis that this development is totally unsightly and not fitting to the conservation area. I admit that Crestview is not a building of architectural grace on the crest of the hill, however, this added carbuncle will be detrimental to the whole area. Visual clutter, in such an exposed position would cause serious visual harm not only to the Conservation Areas as a whole but particularly to the adjacent landmark and listed building of St Mary's. Crestview is on the crest of a hill so dominates the skyline in every direction.</p> <p>There is no attempt to mask or hide the antennas from direct view. Further the diagrams offered are misleading and deceitful. How it can be considered as Minor Alterations?</p> <p>Waldon has shown the south elevation with 7 floors. There are only 6 floors in the building. This will mean that the structures are much closer to ground level than portrayed. Thus, more observable on the approach to the building. The structures would, if erected, be equivalent to two or three extra floors on the building.</p> <p>The diagram also is dishonest in its colour rendering. The added coloured arrows are directly disarming the viewer from the outline of the equipment. These antennas and equipment are not white and see-through. At best they are battle ship grey or worse they will be black. Further Waldon has not offered any other elevations for consideration. I can only assume they chose the best of a bad bunch!</p>
2021/0598/P	Simon Mohun	14/04/2021 18:54:12	OBJ	<p>I strongly object to this proposal. This planning application is designed to support MNBL's business development. I do not think this is sufficient reason to override the objections of the residents of a building on which large quantities of telecom equipment will be sited, nor those of the local neighbourhood forum.</p> <p>Putting such an array of masts and dishes on a residential building, where will undoubtedly cause noise, vibrations and disruption to residents is not appropriate. It will also be an eyesore for the community. St Mary's Brookfield next door is a Grade II* listed building and the view of it will be severely damaged by a large structure on the top of Crestview. Dartmouth Park's conservation area status should apply to its skyline too.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/0598/P	Pamela Hampshire	14/04/2021 11:27:41	OBJ	<p>I am a resident of Crestview which is located within the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area and is adjacent to the St John's Grove Conservation area in Islington. It is 6-storey development of 18 flats. The Waldon proposal outlines a monstrous conglomeration of equipment which is entirely unsuitable for location on our roof, or on that of any similar sized residential development. It would be far better placed on a non-residential building which is not located within a conservation area. The masts are over 6 metres in height and will add substantially to the height of the building and to its visibility from all over the conservation area and from many other local areas, including Hampstead Heath. I am particularly concerned that it will cause significant harm to local views of the adjacent beautiful St Mary Brookfield Church, a Grade 2* listed building designed by William Butterfield and consecrated in 1875.</p> <p>The Camden Local Plan 2017 requires any developments to take into account the wider historic environment and buildings, spaces and features of local historic value, whilst the Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Plan 2020 states that it wishes to ensure that "the area's village character, rich architectural heritage, attractive green streets, open spaces and natural environment are not only maintained but enhanced." This development would severely compromise these stated aims.</p> <p>I also have serious concerns about the impact on the building itself. There is no detail given as to how the proposed equipment would be affixed. We know that our roof is flimsy and would require re-enforcement, but no detail of how this might be addressed is contained in the application as submitted. Would this add still further to the height and bulk of the development? There is too the possibility of noise pollution and vibrations from the equipment which could severely impact our daily lives. The building is largely concrete beneath the brick so both sounds and movements carry very readily around the whole building. It is not self-evident that any action to minimise this would be effective. Noise from wind in the arials may be audible to our immediate neighbours, too.</p> <p>The applicant states these masts are required to improve inadequate network coverage in the area. I see no justification in the Waldon submission as to why the location needs to be within the conservation area, nor how any potential benefit would outweigh the substantial harm. I understand that prior approval was recently granted (2020/2420/P) for 12 antennae and associated equipment on Grangemill House, Ingestre Road, less than half a mile away and outside the Conservation Area. This will presumably provide coverage for 3G, 4G and 5G locally. It may also be appropriate for Waldon to liaise with the developer of the current Murphy site to design a telecommunication development which would meet the requirements of Camden's Local Plan.</p> <p>Finally, I have concerns on safety and security grounds. As I understand it the jury is still out on the long-term effects of 5G. PHE guidance states that it is possible that there may be a small increase in overall exposure to radio waves when 5G is added to an existing network or in a new area, and that their guidance will be kept under review. I would not feel happy living below equipment which is potentially detrimental to our health. Both the installation and maintenance of the proposed equipment would entail other organisations having keys to our building. We are responsible for our own building security, and it would not be possible to monitor the increased comings-and goings, thus potentially making our building less secure than it is now.</p> <p>For all of the above reasons I strongly oppose the Waldon Telecom Ltd proposal.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/0598/P	Justin De Syllas	14/04/2021 18:38:54	OBJ	<p>COMMENT ON APPLICATION 2021-0598/P IN RESPECT OF CRESTVIEW 47 DARTMOUTH PARK ROAD BY JUSTIN DE SYLLAS OF FIRT HOUSE, DARTMOUTH PARK ROAD, NW5 1SU.</p> <p>14TH MARCH 2021</p> <p>As a resident of Dartmouth Park Road I object to this application for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Crestview is a very conspicuous building which can be seen on the skyline from locations all around Dartmouth Park and Hampstead Heath. The proposed telecom antenna and equipment would be highly prominent and would introduce an unsympathetic and inappropriate visual element into a protected residential area. 2. Because Crestview lies within the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area and can be seen from Camden Highgate CA, Holly Lodge CA and the adjacent St John's CA in Islington, the addition of the telecom antenna and equipment on its roof would damage the protected heritage asset of all of these conservation areas. 3. The addition of the telecom antenna and equipment on the roof of Crestview would compromise the setting of the adjacent Grade II* St. Mary's Brookfield church by William Butterfield, an important heritage asset in the area. 4. The Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Plan, includes Policy DC2 Heritage assets which states: 'Preserve or enhance the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area, historic buildings and buildings of architectural merit and their settings, by: (a) in the case of developments within the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area, including alterations or extensions to existing buildings, ensuring that the development preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Conservation Area; (b) in the case of Listed Buildings, only permitting development where the design of the development is demonstrated to be of a high standard led by the character, appearance and scale of the Listed Buildings themselves; (c) in the case of development affecting any of the buildings (or the setting of any such buildings) that make a positive contribution to the character or appearance of the conservation area, as identified in the Conservation Area Appraisal (Appraisal Appendix 2), only permitting development that is designed to a high standard, or preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the conservation area and makes a positive contribution to local distinctiveness'. Approval of this application would violate this policy. 5. The impact on the appearance of the proposed telecom antenna and equipment and the proposed trunking running from pavement level all the way up the South Elevation to the roof would have a detrimental impact on the appearance of Crestview itself and would reduce the market value of its flats. 6. The applicant's Site Specific Supplementary Information states that Crestview is "a six-storey building in residential use", whereas the elevation submitted shows eight storeys. Is this inaccuracy a deliberate attempt to reduce the apparent impact of the two story high masts on the appearance of the building with the masts in place? 7. The applicant's drawings only show (inaccurately) the impact of the masts on one elevation although the proposed telecom antenna and equipment would be clearly visible from all sides. 8. The thin, asphalt roof was not designed to take the weight of the masts, regular foot traffic, or the vibrations of the masts and cabinets caused by wind resistance. These may cause structural damage. It also seems very likely that noise and vibrations from the equipment will have a negative impact on residents, not only on those living on the top floor but, because of the concrete structure, on others. 9. The telecoms infrastructure would not provide any direct benefit to the residents on whose roof the equipment is intended to be installed. Given the existing negative impact of 3G and 4G on terrestrial television reception, the impact of 5G installations on residents in Crestview and neighbouring residents might be even greater. If the planning application were approved, many local residents might be forced to incur the cost of changing to satellite reception. 10. In the application, Site Specific Supplementary Information states 3900A Cabinet, H3G APM5930 Cabinet

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>and EE APM5930 Cabinet, failing to state that these are manufactured by Huawei. The initial period for a telecoms agreement is usually 10 years. In December 2020, according to the UK government, such Huawei equipment would have to be removed by 2027.</p> <p>11. The maintenance of the telecom antenna and equipment will cause disruption to the occupants of Crestview and reduce the security of the building.</p>
2021/0598/P	Susan Himmelweit	14/04/2021 18:42:54	OBJ	<p>I strongly object to this proposal to place a large quantity of telecoms equipment on top of the block flats, Crestview. It is not appropriate to put such an array of masts and dishes on a residential building. It will cause noise and vibrations highly distressing to the residents and be a blot on the skyline for the rest of us. Dartmouth Park is a conservation area for good reason and that should apply to its skyline too. St Mary's Brookfield next door is a Grade II* listed building and the view of it will be severely damaged by a large structure on the top of Crestview.</p> <p>I'm sure some other solution to MNBL's business development requirements can be found, but even if not a private firm's business development is not good enough reason to grant a planning application that goes against the wishes of the local community and undermines the character of the conservation area.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/0598/P	Colin Richardson	14/04/2021 17:58:14	OBJ	<p>Objection by Waldon to 5G mast CrestView , 47 Dartmouth Park Hill, London, NW5 1JB (Application Number: 2021/0598/P)</p> <p>I would like to object strongly to the installation of a 5G mast on CrestView , 47 Dartmouth Park Hill, London, NW5 1JB, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Key scientific literature points to very real, non-thermal negative biological effects of electromagnetic radiation (EMR) which is being ignored by the mobile and broadband industry as well as bodies like the ICNIRP. Our government relies upon the PHE, which in turn relies on the ICNIRP, to give us guidance regarding the safety of 5G. 2. These negative non-thermal biological effects occur as a direct result of extremely low EMR levels, (2-10 $\mu\text{W}/\text{cm}^2$) which are several orders of magnitude lower than the current safety limits (10,000,000 $\mu\text{W}/\text{m}^2$) set by ICNIRP. Ofcom's published results (23) at 5G sites (1.5% of 10,000,000 $\mu\text{W}/\text{m}^2$ for 3G-5G) and (0.039% of 10,000,000 $\mu\text{W}/\text{m}^2$ for 5G only) still equate to 150,000 fold higher and 3,900 fold higher than the safe levels (<1 $\mu\text{W}/\text{m}^2$) set by the Building Biology and Austrian Medical Association standards which don't ignore the above negative effects. 3. Cornerstone quote the Stewart report (updated in 2010), saying the evidence did not suggest that exposures to EMR below international guidelines could cause adverse health effects. They state that they adhere to the Stewart report and ICNIRP rules, but since 2010, there have been many publications pointing to actual harm of EMRs on children's health by mobile base stations – e.g. Meo et al (2019) (22) studied exposure of adolescents at 2-10 $\mu\text{W}/\text{cm}^2$ EMR exposure from a mobile base station 200 metres from a school and this resulted in impairment of spatial working memory and attention, and delayed motor skills. They state that mobile base stations should be 'installed away from thickly populated residential zones particularly in or near the school buildings or there must be some system to shield human beings from RF-EMF'. 4. The planned 5G mast at CrestView , 47 Dartmouth Park Hill, London, NW5 1JB is within 150 metres to Ceesay Nursery School Charity & Dartmouth Park (Park) where children will be studying and will be exposed to untested frequencies of 5G EMR which is dangerous. 5. Wireless carriers have conceded to U.S. Senator Richard Blumenthal that they are not aware of any independent scientific studies on the safety of 5G technologies. (7) 6. Safer underground fibre optic wired technology has already been used for Northumberland County Council and National Parks England – we should be doing the same for the safety of our children and the public. (24) Lower cost 5G masts should not be installed at the expense of damaging our health. 7. The current plans for the roll out of 5G are misguided by Public Health England (PHE) which relies entirely on ICNIRP safety guidelines on EMRs which have been shown to be deeply flawed – see Pall, M. (2018) (1) ,Hardell & Nyberg (2020) (3), Naren et al. (2020) (15), and Hertsgaard & Dowie (2018) (13) . 8. The ICNIRP safety guidelines are flawed because: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. They assume average EMR intensities and average SAR can be used to predict biological effects and therefore safety. In fact, negative non-thermal biological effects occur approximately 100,000 times below current allowable levels. b. They ignore demonstrated biological heterogeneity and established biological mechanisms c. They ignore pulsed EMRs which are much more biologically active than are non-pulsed EMRs of the same average intensity d. They ignore complex sinusoidal dose-response curves e. They also ignore many important scientific reviews which show non-thermal negative biological effects caused by EMRs f. There are many articles which state that EMRs produce diverse non-thermal effects through voltage gated calcium channels (VGCCs) in cells and produce negative biological effects such as oxidative stress, cellular

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

DNA damage and increased calcium signalling but the voltage sensor of the VGCC is ignored by the 2020 ICNIRP safety guidelines. (see the following articles for which Pall,M. 2018 (1) & Doyon PR et al, (2017) (4) Herbert MR & Sage C (2013) (9) ,Panagopoulos et al (2002) (10) .

9. Negative non-thermal biological effects of electromagnetic radiation listed in the literature across humans and other species are : (see References below from Pall (2018) (1))

- a. Lowered adaptive immune responses or immune system dysregulation
- b. Cardiac effects, including tachycardia, bradycardia and arrhythmias, and ventricular developmental defects
- c. Cancer including initiation, promotion and progression (Morgan et al 2015) (18)
- d. Pathological damage to multiple organs (e.g. liver, kidneys, uterus, bladder, testis)
- e. Trace element disturbances in tissues
- f. Ocular damage
- g. Lowered fertility
- h. Hormonal dysregulation
- i. Neurological / neuropsychiatric effects
- j. Sleep disruption
- k. Memory, motor skill, attention, cognition impairment
- l. Apoptosis / programmed cell death
- m. Oxidative stress / free radical damage
- n. Single strand and double strand breaks in cellular DNA
- o. Increased intracellular calcium levels causing chronic effects

10. Therefore, many scientists globally have asked for a moratorium on the deployment of 5G until the electromagnetic radiation risks associated with this new emerging technology have been fully investigated by industry-independent scientists, but this is falling on deaf ears. The responses from the EU seem to have thus far prioritized industry profits to the detriment of human health and the environment. Hardell & Nyberg (2020) (3)

11. This means that the current situation in the United Kingdom is a violation of Human Rights similar to that which has been tabled to the United Nations Human Rights Council in early 2019 for Australia by S.J.

Toneguzzo. (See

<https://www.radiationresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/pace-UN-Human-Rights-Council-5G-statement.pdf>)

12. The deployment of 5G without safety testing in the UK violates over 15 international agreements, treaties and recommendations, including article 7 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and principle 9 of the Declaration of Helsinki of 1964. (see links as follows:

<https://treaties.un.org/doc/publication/unts/volume%20999/volume-999-i-14668-english.pdf>

and

<https://www.wma.net/policies-post/wma-declaration-of-helsinki-ethical-principles-for-medical-research-involving-human-subjects/>

13. Clearly if existing low level EMRs are having damaging biological responses such as those listed in point 5 above, surely untested frequencies such as 5G, should mean that we should be invoking the precautionary principle on 5G, and re-evaluating and revising current safety limits, as well as putting a moratorium on the roll out of 5G? Naren et al. (2020) (15) have stated that 5G should only be deployed after having safety testing, as the EMR exposure levels they see with 2-4G are well over the safe limits set by Building Biology, Austrian Medical Association, and the BioInitiative standards which do take into account non-thermal negative biological EMR effects. Also the denser networks needed to support 5G will mean that the unsuspecting public will be exposed to continuously higher levels of electromagnetic radiation indoors and outdoors.

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

14. The precautionary principle has already been applied by multiple local city councils in England (Brighton, Hove, Devonshire, Shepton Mallet, Somerset, Frome, Totnes, Wells, Glastonbury, Trafford) as well as other rightly concerned countries like Nigeria, Slovenia, etc. – see URL links 5 and 6 in References for a full list.
15. Central Government should not be dictating to local planning authorities and contending with them to insist that they “not seek to determine the health safeguards of the planning proposal” (paragraph 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework) and whether the ICNIRP guidelines for public exposure are deeply flawed. Scientists world-wide have been writing to governments for years now asking them to revise the safety guidelines of wireless exposure for the public, as they know it is harmful to the health of not just humans, but also other species in our ecosystem. This is interfering with local planning authority decision making, authority and independence in choosing outcomes that are best for its people and community.
16. We should be insisting that adequate safety testing is done for 5G, and that current safety limits are re-evaluated in the light of the overwhelming body of current scientific literature which points to non-thermal negative biological responses across multiple species, not just human beings. (see reference 8) Naren et al. (2020) (15) state that “If 5G networks are deployed without careful analysis of expected exposure levels, almost all people in the area of coverage may be exposed to dangerous levels of power flux density, the outcomes of which, in the near future, may turn out to be calamitous.”
17. Only after safety testing of 5G had been done by the mobile and broadband industry and by independent non-industry scientists who have no economical allegiance or scientific bias towards such emerging technology, should 5G have even be considered to be deployed in the UK. Any such safety testing data needs to be independently verified by a non-industry scientific committee (ISC -see below for composition).
18. We should be consulting and informing constituents of their rights in those parts of the UK, for whom 5G has been rolled out, without safety testing, as well as putting a halt to access to 5G, until we are aware of the full impact of 5G on, not just humans, but also on all species. This is because we now know that existing low level EMRs, is already damaging humans as well as less complex species such as plants, insects, birds and lower mammals (see References below and Naren et al. (2020) (15)).
19. Having assessed the latest data on EMR (see References section below) we should be trying to:
- a. protect our public from harmful EMR by doing safety testing of 5G
 - b. prioritise/incentivise the use of safer wired fibre optic solutions in our homes, shopping centres, airports, hospitals, workplaces and schools
 - c. encourage families to protect their future generations by minimising the use of portable devices (mobile phones, tablets, laptops) (see letter requesting the same in reference 8 below)
 - d. suggest urgent research on the safety and efficacy of shielding methods combined with use of generators emitting weak pulses of similar frequency, intensity, and waveform with the natural atmospheric resonances - Panagopoulos & Chrousos (2019) (10)
 - e. understand the molecular mechanisms underlying the EMR potential challenges to multiple biological systems, to improve preventive strategies - Santini et al. (2018) (11)
 - f. put in place mobile and broadband industry-independent safety and usage regulations to protect our public and all species
 - g. advise appropriate restrictions on the use of EMR emitting mobiles and all portable devices in order to protect the health of all users, i.e. not with respect to only one organ but with respect to our bodies as a whole, as well with respect to the health of the delicate ecosystem around us.
20. Barnes & Greenebaum (2020) (16) state that we don't yet know whether biological effects seen due to lower level, long term EMR exposure are resulting in medical problems for a much larger number of people. Therefore, governments need to investigate long-term exposure to weak EMRs, and put in place safety guidelines to address this issue.

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

I strongly urge the council to:

- i. use an independent scientific committee to re-evaluate the body of scientific evidence on extremely low EMRs (continuous and pulsed)
- ii. put a moratorium on the roll out of future 5G installations until adequate safety data is available
- iii. decommission the operation of existing 5G installations until safety testing has been verified and approved by not just the mobile and broadband industry but by a non-industry working group of scientists, physicians and members of the public who can assess the data independent of 5G manufacturers
- iv. contact the public in any area where 5G is going to be deployed or already deployed and ask them if they still want to have the greater connectivity of 5G despite the potential long term harms associated with exposed to very high levels of power flex density emitted by 5G EMR. Leave the choice to the public, and where they still want access, ensure that 5G is made available only through wired fibre optic technology thereby protecting us all
- v. take action now for all those persons with Electromagnetic Hypersensitivity (EHS) where they have been already subjected to 5G to inform them that the existing 5G masts will be decommissioned and a wired fibre optic technology solution put in to replace 5G masts
- vi. to take action to immediately to rectify masts that are close to residential buildings and schools which should be protected from close by sources of EMR.

Not everyone in every community in this country needs or wants superfast broadband / mobile connectivity. Individual connectivity needs are different across this country. 5G roll out should only ever have been considered after appropriate safety testing had been completed by the mobile and broadband industry as well as independent scientific bodies and after consultation with people in this democratic country as to its downstream health, economic and sociological impact on our future overall wellbeing.

If gigabit connectivity is necessary for particular industries, the council needs to ensure that it doesn't compromise the safety, health and wellbeing of people, where lower speed connectivity is sufficient for a given community. Where gigabit connectivity has to be installed for functional and economic reasons, they should remove long term EMR exposure of all constituents in that area, by using wired fibre optic solutions, which protects populations from chronic and possibly acute diseases. Naren et al. (2020) state: "The carcinogenic nature of EMR which results in mutation of sperm cells as well as testicular cancer has also been reported. Thus, the probability that future generations will inherit unhealthy or low-immunity genes is also increased." This has a massive impact on residential areas and schools.

The literature shows the existence of damaging outcomes to multiple reproductive systems both human (Santini et al 2018) and other species like rat (Yang et al 2018 (20)) and mice (Li et al 2017 (21)), by EMR, backing up Naren et al. (2020) (15) in their prediction that future generations are most at risk.

Both Pall (2018) (19) and Wilke (2018) (12) advocate getting rid of Wi-Fi in schools to protect future generations as well as teachers from EMR damage. Santini et al. (2018) (11) after showing oxidative stress effects of EMR in male and female reproductive systems urge that we should be aiming to get "a better understanding of the molecular mechanisms underlying EMR potential challenge to our reproductive system in order to improve preventive strategies."

Affected residents near 5G masts should be informed about scientific data that points to negative non-thermal biological responses to pulsed electromagnetic radiation, and that existing 5G has had no safety testing. Existing installations should be decommissioned until further notice, and future 5G roll outs halted, until adequate safety testing has been conducted. Deployed installations of 5G are probably already having a direct, negative, cumulative effect on the short term and long term health of the UK public.

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment:

Response:

Government, PHE, AGNIR, HPA, local authorities and Ofcom need a rethink of how they assess the safety, ethics and use of not just mobile and broadband technologies. They heavily rely on a non-independent body (ICNIRP) for their safety guidelines on current EMR limits and are too heavily reliant on segregated government bodies and the mobile and broadband industry, for their understanding of EMR emitting emerging technologies. Members of the public should be used as independent scrutinisers in order for government to be held accountable to ensure that they are indeed acting in the best interests of all of the UK population. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/radiofrequency-electromagnetic-fields-health-effects/health-protection-agency-response-to-the-2012-agnir-report-on-the-health-effects-from-radiofrequency-electromagnetic-fields>

“AGNIR’s main conclusion is that, ...there is no convincing evidence that RF field exposures below guideline levels cause health effects in adults or children.” AGNIR concludes there is increasing evidence that RF fields below guideline levels do not cause symptoms and cannot be detected by people, even those who consider themselves sensitive to RF fields. HPA agrees with AGNIR that this does not undermine the importance of the symptoms that are experienced, but it does suggest causes other than those directly related to RF fields should be considered.”

As long as the health governing bodies that advise the government and the council, like the PHE, AGNIR, HPA, and Ofcom are blinded by the flawed guidelines of the ICNIRP, and not bothering to look at actual biological data that is in Entrez Pubmed (a scientific database containing peer reviewed articles), our council too, will continue to make misguided decisions.

Government and councils need to understand that real scientists are speaking out to alert them of the dangers of EMR to the public. They need to stop allowing industry to upgrade mobile and digital technology without doing adequate safety checks and without consulting the public. This is the case, especially when it comes to wireless connectivity, which involves exposure of the unaware public, of just how damaging low level EMR is, to humans, as well as all species. There is enough data out there now, for the UK government and local city councils to be held accountable for blinded decisions.

The PHE, AGNIR or HPA are not independently assessing the scientific data, or they would have come to the conclusion that low level EMRs are having a direct, visible, detectable, measurable and negative biological impact on multiple species not just humans, which needs to be understood and managed safely, rather than allowing the mobile and broadband industry to upgrade to more penetrating and more pervasive digital technologies like 5G. 5G base stations will be more dense in the network, exposing the public to several fold higher and continuous EMR than before, (see Naren et al 2020 (15)) without any safety data.

Councils need to be aware that due to the base station density required for 5G to be effective, the UK public will be exposed to 60GHz frequencies of EMR indoors and outdoors with no chance of ever being able to switch it off. This is dangerous and all the scientific peer reviewed data for 2G-4G frequencies (1900 MHz – 2.6GHz) is already pointing to damaging biological effects for frequencies of electromagnetic radiation from existing digital sources. It is important when scientists worldwide, are calling for a moratorium, on the roll out of 5G, for reasons that lower frequencies than 5G are already causing negative biological responses, that questions should be asked of government, local authorities, Ofcom and the mobile and broadband industry, by an independent scientific committee.

We know that already deployed EMR at lower frequencies than 5G has negative effects on our physical wellbeing, and exposure to these frequencies is having a negative effect on future generations.

Barnes & Greenebaum (2020) (16) believe a carefully targeted program of research funds is called for, from both governmental and private entities that emit RF signals to elucidate and define threshold signal levels for the generation of long-term biological effects.

If a body such as the ICNIRP displays any scientific bias when assessing the biological impact of emerging

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

EMR technologies such as 5G from the mobile and broadband sectors, without adequate concern for public health, this results in misguided policy making by this government and councils, which will result in definite harm to our UK population.

MP's, Mayors, PHE and planning committees need to use joined up thinking with respect to the public's concerns of how and where and what 5G / gigabit installations are implemented. Mayors, MP's, PHE, Ofcom, planning committees and local city council digital teams should all work together to resolve matters of safety and public welfare – be they regarding our health, economic, sociological or environmental welfare. Each of these bodies need to be accountable and have a good understanding of the impact of their decisions regarding emerging technologies and their impact on existing and future generations as well as our environment. Currently, they seem to be passing the buck from one government department to the other, instead of taking ownership of the problem.

The disregard of the ICNIRP of important scientific data on EMR harms, has resulted in the current situation in the UK where current PHE safety guidelines used by this government are deeply flawed, and unfortunately reams of peer reviewed scientific data pointing to very real negative biological responses to EMR, in humans and other species, have been ignored. This problem can only be resolved by concerned scientists speaking out, to highlight current misguided decisions by government stakeholders, without truly considering independent science which has been shouting to the tree tops, that the global health of humans and other species is being damaged by rampant and ever increasing electromagnetic radiation.

The UNESCO 2005 Precautionary Principle (PP) (14) states: "Companies need to become partners with the public and the administration, and they thus need to adopt a principled attitude of transparency and knowledge sharing....Yet, precaution typically involves public consultations, deliberations and hearings that may focus on selected side effects or possible harms.

The roll out of 5G has not had any address to the public of its safety. There is no scientific safety data which has been scrutinised by independent parties regarding 5G being a good solution for better and safer connectivity.

There has been no attempt by the companies that have rolled out 5G to become 'partners with the public.' In fact the public are mainly unaware of the safety data around 5G, they have not been involved in its roll out, and there has been no deliberations involving the public in the UK that have addressed side effects or possible harms. In fact the Precautionary Principle has been completely ignored with respect to 5G roll out. This needs to be addressed urgently by the government and councils.

Much of the scientific evidence is pointing to deep concern regarding the dangers of 5G to our human population as well as even greater danger to delicate smaller mammals, birds and insects which "will be heavily impacted because of their large surface to volume ratios. The same thing will be true of plants where even large trees have their leaves and reproductive organs highly exposed." Pall 2019 (2) This is because the type of radiation that 5G consists of, is the type where due to its "low penetration and very high energy deposition per unit distance, this can lead to generation of high levels of free radicals in a short distance which in turn increases the risk of skin cancer." Mortazavi & Mehdizadeh (2019) (17) .

Naren et al (2020) (15) state: "5G is set to use frequencies between 30 GHz and 100 GHz and would have a bandwidth of 60 GHz, which is much higher than all previous generations. Owing to the increased frequency, the wavelengths in 5G communications will be in the order of few millimeters. Shorter wavelengths travel shorter distances; therefore, 5G networks will be much denser compared to existing networks. This necessitates that more base stations be placed at much closer distances in order to achieve good coverage... in the case of 5G networks, the base station (BS) density is expected to be increased to about 40-50 base stations/km² due to the high propagation loss of millimeter wave technology. ...The high data rate requirement of 5G, which is around 1000 times more than 4G, is expected to be solved by the use of massive-MIMO

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment:

Response:

technology, which incorporates a large number of antennas. ..Due to the extremely high density of BSs, street light access points, separate indoor BSs, relays and Massive MIMO technology employed in 5G, a person will be exposed to very high levels of power flux densities (PFDs), whether he is indoors or outdoors, or whether or not he is using any wireless devices in close proximity. In other words, it may be suspected that even the ambient PFD which a person is exposed to in most situations throughout the day may fall under the category of 'Severe Concern' according to the Building Biology Standard, 'Far above normal' according to the AMA standards, and may be higher than the precautionary action level recommended by the BioInitiative Guidelines."

Pall (2019) (2) predict that similar but much more severe effects are likely to be produced by 5G than seen currently. He also predicts that because of the roles of aqueous dissolved ions in producing these deep effects, that regions of the body with large such internal "bodies of water" may be expected to produce particularly severe problems such as:

1. birth defects because of the role of the amniotic fluids and the increased extracellular water content in the tissues of the foetus
2. blindness due to the role of the aqueous and vitreous humours of the eye
3. kidney failure due to the water in the kidney
4. cardiac changes in the electrical control of the heart, because of the large blood fluids in the heart, circulatory problems, possibly including aortic and other arterial aneurisms.

Hertzgaard and Dowie (2018) (23) state that " the wireless industry has obstructed a full and fair understanding of the current science, aided by government agencies that have prioritized commercial interests over human health and news organizations that have failed to inform the public about what the scientific community really thinks. In other words, this public-health experiment has been conducted without the informed consent of its subjects, even as the industry keeps its thumb on the scale."

5G technology that has been implemented in this country is untested as to the dangers it is placing mankind under. This is irresponsible and needs to be addressed as a matter of great urgency by our government and all our regulatory health bodies and the council.

References

1. Pall, M.L.(2018) PhD, Professor Emeritus of Biochemistry and Basic Medical Sciences, Washington State University, martin_pall@wsu.edu. 5G: Great risk for EU, U.S. and International Health! Compelling Evidence for Eight Distinct Types of Great Harm Caused by Electromagnetic Field (EMR) Exposures and the Mechanism that Causes Them, <http://bit.ly/RFguidelinesPall190523>
2. Pall, M.L. (2019) PhD, Professor Emeritus of Biochemistry and Basic Medical Sciences, Washington State University, martin_pall@wsu.edu, Eight Repeatedly Documented Findings Each Show that EMR Safety Guidelines Do Not Predict Biological Effects and Are, Therefore Fraudulent: The Consequences for Both Microwave Frequency Exposures and Also 5G Second Edition, May 23, <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1r92Ai2UfVpwh7dkl7sy5tvqypR1Hr996/view>
3. Hardell L, Nyberg R. (2020) Appeals that matter or not on a moratorium on the deployment of the fifth generation, 5G, for microwave radiation. Mol Clin Oncol. Mar;12(3):247-257.
4. Doyon PR1, Johansson O2.(2017) Electromagnetic fields may act via calcineurin inhibition to suppress immunity, thereby increasing risk for opportunistic infection: Conceivable mechanisms of action. Med Hypotheses. Sep;106:71-87.
5. Nigeria Researching Safety Of 5G Before Deployment: Government Prioritizing Health And Welfare Of Citizens.https://ehtrust.org/nigeria-researching-safety-of-5g-government-prioritizing-health-and-welfare-of-citizens/?fbclid=IwAR2Bvdo-AxyPHuOWaSSnogJ759SC_MvZ5cCacCrDIXIV4O_qnaLzN6tZFk4

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment:

Response:

6. International Actions To Halt And Delay 5G: <https://ehtrust.org/international-actions-to-halt-and-delay-5g/>
7. Wireless carriers concede they are not aware of any independent scientific studies on safety of 5G technologies:
<https://www.blumenthal.senate.gov/newsroom/press/release/at-senate-commerce-hearing-blumenthal-raises-concerns-on-5g-wireless-technologys-potential-health-risks>
8. Letter to DCMS at House of Commons by Eileen O'Connor:
<https://www.radiationresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/UK-Government-Parliament-Committees-Broadband-and-the-road-to-5G-Inquiry-2020.docx>
9. Herbert MR & Sage C (2013) Autism and EMR? Plausibility of a pathophysiological link part II. *Pathophysiology*. 2013 Jun;20(3):211-34.
10. Panagopoulos DJ, Chrousos GP.(2019) Shielding methods and products against man-made Electromagnetic Fields: Protection versus risk. *Sci Total Environ*. Jun 1;667:255-262.
11. Santini SJ, Cordone V, Falone S, Mijit M, Tatone C, Amicarelli F, Di Emidio G. Role of Mitochondria in the Oxidative Stress Induced by Electromagnetic Fields: Focus on Reproductive Systems. *Oxid Med Cell Longev*. 2018 Nov 8;2018:5076271.
12. Wilke I. 2018 Biological and pathological effects of 2.45 GHz on cells, fertility, brain and behavior. *Umwelt Medizin Gesselsha*; 2018 Feb 31 (1).
13. Mark Hertsgaard and Mark Dowie, March 29th 2018 - How Big Wireless Made Us Think That Cell Phones Are Safe: A Special Investigation - The disinformation campaign—and massive radiation increase—behind the 5G rollout. *The Nation*.
<https://www.thenation.com/article/how-big-wireless-made-us-think-that-cell-phones-are-safe-a-special-investigation/>
14. The Precautionary Principle – World Commission on the Ethics of Scientific Knowledge and Technology (COMEST) - UNESCO, 2005. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000139578>
15. Naren, Anubhav Elhence, Vinay Chamola, & Mohsen Guizani. Electromagnetic Radiation Due to Cellular, Wi-Fi and Bluetooth Technologies: How Safe Are We? (Special Section on Antenna and Propagation for 5G and beyond) *IEEE Access*, March 12, 2020. d.o.i 10.1109/ACCESS.2020.2976434,
<https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/stamp/stamp.jsp?tp=&arnumber=9016183>
16. Barnes, F & Greenebaum, B (2020) Setting Guidelines for Electromagnetic Exposures and Research Needs. *Bioelectromagnetics* 1—6, DOI:10.1002/bem.22267.
17. Mortazavi S. M. J., Mehdizadeh A R. 2019 5G Technology: Why Should We Expect a shift from RF-Induced Brain Cancers to Skin Cancers? *J Biomed Phys Eng*. Oct; 9(5): 505–506.
18. Morgan L L, Miller A B, Sasco A, Davis D L. (2015) Mobile phone radiation causes brain tumors and should be classified as a probable human carcinogen (2A) (review) *Int J Oncol*. 46:1865–71. doi: 10.3892/ijo.2015.2908.
19. Pall ML. 2018. Wi-Fi is an important threat to human health. *Environ Res* 164:404-416.
20. Yang MJ, Lang HY, Miao X, Liu HQ, Zhang YJ, Wang YF, Chen YB, Liu JY, Zeng LH, Guo GZ. *Toxicol Res (Camb)*. 2018 Jul 12;7(6):1120-1127.Effects of paternal electromagnetic pulse exposure on the reproductive endocrine function of male offspring: a pilot study.
21. Li JH, Jiang DP, Wang YF, Yan JJ, Guo QY, Miao X, Lang HY, Xu SL, Liu JY, Guo GZ. *Environ Toxicol Pharmacol*. 2017 Sep;54:155-161. Influence of electromagnetic pulse on the offspring sex ratio of male BALB/c mice.31.
22. Meo SA, Almahmoud M, Alsultan Q, Alotaibi N, Alnajashi I, Hajjar WM.*Am J Mens Health*. 2019 Jan-Feb;13(1):1557988318816914. Mobile Phone Base Station Tower Settings Adjacent to School Buildings: Impact on Students' Cognitive Health

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				23. https://www.ofcom.org.uk/about-ofcom/latest/features-and-news/clearing-up-myths-5g-and-coronavirus)
				24. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/732496/Future_Telecoms_Infrastructure_Review.pdf

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/0598/P	Crestview Flats (Freehold) Ltd	14/04/2021 17:48:20	OBJ	<p>Crestview Flats (Freehold) Ltd wishes to strongly oppose this Application on the following grounds:</p> <p>Incorrect and Inadequate information:</p> <p>It is difficult to put any reliance on the plans which have been submitted. These show our building, Crestview, as having seven storeys, whereas in reality it has 6. They also show a total of 9 garages beneath the ground floor where there should be 8. The effect of this on the plans is to make Crestview appear both taller and wider than it actually is.</p> <p>We have requested detailed information from Waldon Telecom Ltd on the dimensions of the antennae and pieces of equipment to be installed, but this has not been provided. The response received merely states that the "proposal involves six antennae, 4 dishes (600mm wide) and a total of eight cabinets" and "the proposed antennae are 3.3 metres long." We now see from the Plans submitted that the antennae and supporting structures are some 6 metres in height, although full details on other dimensions are still not included. In the Crestview plans the only elevation provided is for the 'South Elevation'. The East, North and West were not included, despite the fact that the top of the building is widely visible from all sides. Thus, we have no cohesive idea of what is proposed or where it will be placed. No supporting structure is shown for the equipment. A photograph of a similar installation which has been sent to us shows an unsightly grouping of large antennae on a multi-storey tower block significantly taller and wider than our own.</p> <p>Waldon state in their application the site was "previously considered appropriate to accommodate telecommunications equipment (an installation was on the roof between approximately 1995 and 2007)." In fact a much smaller telecoms installation was already in place when this Company took over the Freehold in 1995. This Company had it removed as soon as it was legally possible to do so. A Planning Application submitted by Commpro Telecommunications in 2000 to expand the existing development was withdrawn by Camden Council on 22 January 2001. In a letter to Commpro in December 2000 the then Planning Officer said:</p> <p>"You are probably aware that the installation of telecommunications equipment has recently become very contentious, and that there is a lot of opposition to it from residents."</p> <p>Siting</p> <p>Crestview is located within the eastern border of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area. As its name implies, it is on a crest in Dartmouth Park Hill and is therefore widely visible within this area, as well as within the St John's Grove Conservation area in Islington (opposite). We are already a relatively tall building for the area, and the development would add significantly to our height and visibility. The Waldon submission states that the masts will add over 3 metres to the overall height of Crestview and over 6 metres to our height measured from roof level.</p> <p>The Camden Local Plan 2017 requires any developments to take into account the wider historic environment and buildings, spaces and features of local historic value. We believe that the development, by reason of the location, number of pieces of equipment, height and design, would result in visual clutter which would cause significant harm to local views, in particular to the views of the Grade II* listed St Mary Brookfield Church, and to the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area.</p> <p>We understand that any development within a conservation area should preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the area and should not cause harm to the significance of a listed building through an effect on its setting. The Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Plan 2020 places great emphasis on maintaining and enhancing the character of the area. It states (2.10): "...the people of Dartmouth Park wish to ensure that the area's village character, rich architectural heritage, attractive green streets, open spaces and natural environment are not only maintained but enhanced". We firmly believe that the proposals put forward in the Planning Application would contravene every aspect of the above policy statement.</p> <p>Crestview, by virtue of its location high up on Dartmouth Park Hill, is clearly visible in short, medium and</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment:

Response:

long-range views from a variety of vantage points within the area, most notably from several locations on Hampstead Heath itself.

Crestview is also located immediately adjacent to the Grade II* listed St Mary Brookfield Church, a building of more than special interest and of significant architectural heritage. This is of a similar height to Crestview and from many locations the proposed development would severely impact on the views of the church itself.

We are also immediately adjacent to the St John's Grove Conservation Area and the development would have a negative visual impact on this area, too. We are diagonally opposite the green open space of Dartmouth Park.

Our current roof covering is insubstantial, and wholly unsuited to what is being proposed. Because of the specific nature of our building's construction, the humming/buzzing noises and vibrations associated with the telecoms cabinets (x8) would likely transmit through our entire building structure, making the acoustic environment in Crestview homes intolerable. Actions normally taken to mitigate this are likely to have little impact. Noise from wind around the antennae(x6) may be audible not only to us but also to our immediate neighbours.

The ground-level meter cabinet could make it easier for burglars to access the lower floor properties by facilitating access to our garage roofs. It would also protrude onto the pavement, impeding pedestrian traffic. This route is heavily used by schoolchildren going to and from La Sainte Union.

Appearance

Although there is a lack of detail on the actual size and scope of the proposed installation, it is considered overly dominant, and entirely inappropriate for a small compact block of 18 flats. The height, bulk and massing of the structures would be disproportionate to the size of the building itself, and are likely to have an extremely negative impact on Crestview's visual appearance. Scaffold rigs would significantly alter the roof form, alongside equipment cabinets dotted about which would maximise the impact of roof top 'clutter'. We believe that much of the proposed equipment would be visible from street level. The exposed position of the building means that there would be no screening from surrounding trees or other buildings and would have a significant detrimental effect on the skyline. Since a Company Management Meeting in May 2016 we have been actively looking at ways to de-clutter our roof to improve its appearance.

The Camden Local Plan 2017 requires developments to take into account the character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings as well as the character and proportions of the existing building, where alterations and extensions are proposed. We believe this development would impact severely on the appearance of the building and its own garden area, as well as being visible from many points in the conservation area, including Laurier Road, Dartmouth Park Hill, Dartmouth Park Road, and further afield. The height of the masts would significantly increase the visibility throughout the area.

Health and Safety:

It appears that health concerns carry little weight in planning decisions, but it is nevertheless considered worth mentioning as several of our residents/ Leaseholders have expressed concerns on this issue.

We are aware that a recent Briefing document from the European Parliamentary Research Service has stated the following in relation to 5G (March 2020):

"This raises the question as to whether there is a negative impact on human health and environment from higher frequencies and billions of additional connections, which, according to research, will mean constant exposure for the whole population, including children. Whereas researchers generally consider such radio waves not to constitute a threat to the population, research to date has not addressed the constant exposure that 5G would introduce. Accordingly, a section of the scientific community considers that more research on the potential negative biological effects of electromagnetic fields (EMF) and 5G is needed, notably on the incidence of some serious human diseases. A further consideration is the need to bring together researchers

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>from different disciplines, in particular medicine and physics or engineering, to conduct further research into the effects of 5G."</p> <p>We are concerned that the proposed development would be immediately above residents living in their homes, with what we know to be only a thin roof covering between the roof and the top floor flats.</p> <p>In summary, we firmly believe that this proposal would result in significant harm to the local heritage assets, their settings and the setting of the Conservation Area. This should outweigh any potential benefits from the development, and the Waldon submission fails to address this issue. This matter is of grave concern to the Company and its constituent Leaseholders.</p> <p>Terry Mckie Amanda Richardson Anna Zawilska Directors, Crestview Flats (Freehold) Ltd</p>
2021/0598/P	Colin Richardson	14/04/2021 17:50:56	OBJ	<p>I also wish to object on the basis that this development will be intrusive to the residents. I have a concern over noise in the building. Sound insulation in the block is already poor. A bang or drilling in one part of the building is amplified throughout the building over the concrete skeleton and pots construction. All the construction will, for a time, inconvenience the residents, however, the long-term drone of amplifiers and cooling fans will also permeate the building and not be confined to the top floors.</p>