

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/1593/P	Lesley Stevas	03/05/2021 21:36:18	OBJ	<p>I strongly object to this proposed 18-meter-high telecom mast application. It is a resubmission, refused in September 2020 when it was proposed to be positioned on the pavement to the side of 100 Kilburn High Road Birchington Road, London NW6 4HX. Although efforts have been made to reduce the impact, it is still considered to have detrimental impact on the values of the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The prior application resulted in the maximum height of 20m for this monstrosity. The reduction in height to 18 m would not sufficiently mitigate the visual impact of the proposal on its surroundings.</p> <p>Now it is to be sited around the corner outside a council estate. This is unfair and is causing unreasonable anxiety to residents on the housing estate. Loss of amenity which will prevent them from enjoying their homes. It will have negative potential impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, especially sited next to No. 2 West End Lane which dates back to the 19th Century, a historic former school building built in 1856.</p> <p>The surrounding area is closely residential with families and children living here. Their health is at risk from the proposed mast.</p> <p>The height of the monopole is out of keeping with the character and setting of the area. The siting is not sensitive to the area. The structure will be able to be seen from many angles and will detract from the character of the area. The skyline of the area will be ruined as the structure will be prominent in this area. This pole is to be sited with cabinets in the middle of a pedestrian way.</p> <p>Looking at the wider area nothing comes close to the height of the mast and so would be in direct conflict with planning requirements that it must not be over bearing and make the place look bad, and this mast does both. The proposed monopole and cabinets, by reason of their size and location, would reduce the amount of useable footway and so would be harmful to highway safety and pedestrian movement, contrary to policies A1 (Managing the impact of development), C6 (Access for all) and T1 (Prioritising walking, cycling and public transport) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.</p> <p>There is immense concern about future radiation to be pulsed from antennae on this mast based on current ICNIRP guidelines of up to 300 GHz. This would negatively impact my own safety, health and wellbeing of both as a resident of Camden and a visitor to this area. And, the health of all living, working and visiting the area.</p> <p>It is not considered that the public benefits of the proposed installation would outweigh the harm caused to the surrounding buildings. It is not considered that the public benefits of the proposed installation would outweigh the harm caused to the residents who have been put under extreme stress and anxiety at the idea of having the great ugly monolith erected near their homes.</p> <p>I would want to know along that line, what commitments have Camden Council to its residents in terms of quality of life as stated in the Human Rights of October 2000 - article 8. Which states: "You have the right to respect: for your private &amp; family life and your home"?</p> <p>St Mary's C of E Primary School, Busy Bees at Kilburn and Teddies Nurseries are located within 200m of the proposed site. Have these schools and nurseries including the parents been consulted?</p> <p>5G has never been tested. Even the new Covid-19 vaccines are being put through rigorous tests before being released to the public. So why a frequency which will affect all life?</p> <p>"Because this is the first generation to have cradle-to-grave lifespan exposure to this level of man-made microwave (RF EMR) radiofrequencies, it will be years or decades before the true health consequences are known. Precaution in the roll out of this new technology is strongly indicated".</p> <p>See 5G Wireless Telecommunications Expansion: Public Health and Environmental Implications.  <a href="https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29655646/">https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29655646/</a></p> <p>The EMF's in that area will increase as will radiation levels, even though it is non-ionising it still becomes a</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p data-bbox="873 124 1948 188">problem as ICNIRP (International Commission of Non Ionizing Protection) have never said it is a safe technology in any documents read.</p> <p data-bbox="873 188 2047 311">The most significant and potentially damaging aspect of the proposal is the danger to health the erection of the mast will pose. Irrespective of whether the danger is perceived or real, the proposal has already caused a considerable amount of anxiety, worry and stress. These ill effects will be intensified if the application was to be approved.</p> <p data-bbox="873 311 1948 375">The community is being made to feel unsafe. Genuine public perception of danger is a valid planning consideration.</p> <p data-bbox="873 375 1276 402">Camden must refuse this application.</p>

---