Jaspreet Chana

From: Mark Pampel [redacted]
Sent: 15 October 2021 14:25
To: Jaspreet Chana
Subject: Camden Planning Application - 2021/3621/P Site Address: St Mary with All Souls Church Abbey Road London NW6 4SN

Dear Jaspreet Chana,

I strongly wish to object to the planning application listed above being installed in a Grade II listed building in a conservation area (see point 1. below) and I object on the following points below also.

This is the second time I am having to make this objection. I note that all comments/objections should be received by 17th October 2021.

1. The proposed installation of further masts to be placed inside St Mary's Church in a where there should be no alterations in a conservation area. This will be an eyesore and in addition the cables on the exterior will be clearly visible.

2. Two nursery schools and a primary school are in close proximity to St. Mary's Church, within the 500m range of the radio frequency radiation (RFR). This is morally wrong for the network to be placed in a sacred place like a church that will damage the health of children as well as adults, even those who have not yet had their health affected by the 4G system in place and suffering from electro magnetic sensitivity which will only get much worse as a result leading to chronic sickness and possibly terminal illness due to the significant increase in radio frequency radiation and electromagnetic fields. The school and nursery schools have not been consulted and given their right to object.

3. There appears to be errors in the diagrams, drawings and plans submitted with the omission of more than one antenna.

4. Avison Young are using wording which is out of date, the A0355 planning statement p. 9/10 does not match up to the correct NPPF. The quoted content NPPF 80,112, 113, 114, 115 is not correct.

5. It is not stated that the mast(s) are 5G and this statement can only be found in the health documents; this is completely misleading.

6. PHE rely on out-of-date guidance as this is not updated to revise the specification and limits of radio frequency radiation that would be safe and not cause microwave sickness.

7. The council would be liable for claims by people living in the immediate area who become ill and sick due to the substantial increase in electromagnetic fields by 5G mast(s).

   As the Council appears to be following ICNIRP guidance, which has not been proven to be safe, and proven evidence to the contrary so far has been ignored, will mean that councils will receive uninsurable claims for personal injury as a result of microwave sickness. This is unacceptable and totally morally wrong as we are not being protected and not properly consulted to be exposed to these RFRs which is a clear breach of the Nuremberg Code.

As Camden Council planning application website has not been properly maintained to date, this is misleading as no comments/objections have been recorded, despite being aware that at least 2 other objections/comments have been forwarded which have not been placed on the website and possible others which means that we have no way of knowing what information has been withheld. I will also be adding my objection on the Camden Council planning application website.

Kind regards

Mark Pampel