

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3621/P	Nicholas Martin	09/10/2021 16:01:12	OBJ	Dear Sirs

People living in the vicinity – and although I live outside the area I do visit – have alerted me to the above planning application.

I would like to ask - especially as I am a local councillor myself, in a different locality, if Camden Council are aware of the EECC – part of UK retained EU law – and the written parliamentary answer given by Matt Warman MP, then of the DCMS, in reply to Wera Hobhouse MP – on the public record of course – in which answer he stated that the local planning authorities (LPAs) are local competent authorities under the EECC – and that no amendment was required so as to make the LPAs conform with the EECC requirements. Under the EECC health is made an imperative.

If Camden Council is not aware of this and their role as a local competent authority and what that might legally imply in adjudicating the above planning application, Camden Council by logic should defer the planning application adjudication date until the Council has obtained clarity on this from the Secretary of State for Communities Housing and Local Government - so that the Council can know how to correctly adjudicate the application under due process.

In addition is the Council aware of the advice of PHE's solicitors DLA Piper - saying that if a council does not evaluate ICNIRP itself attracts liability and liability does not attract itself to the guidance nor to PHE. This weighing up aspect is itself of course in keeping with the requirement under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 – in which material planning considerations must be taken into account.

The serious point about liability if the Council were merely follow ICNIRP without its own evaluation of ICNIRP (which could include ISO risk assessments by the Telecom mast applicant) also by logic means the deferring of the application until the government answers Wera Hobhouse's question to the DCMS about councils facing potentially unlimited liability in the face of potential personal injury claims in relation to this uninsurable technology – and whether the government is willing to underwrite this risk faced by local councils or not.

The above paragraph is of great relevance as more and more of the public learn of the serious adverse non thermal health effects of microwave radiation which includes 5G , 4G , 3g and 2G

The recent appeal court judgement in the USA against the FCC (equivalent to the UK OFCOM perhaps) that non thermal effects must be considered might loom larger in public awareness not only in the UK but all over the world now – and of course OFCOM and ICNIRP do not adequately consider the non thermal effects of microwave radiation in air. The radiation emitted by telecom masts of course.

Nicholas Martin