

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2024/5808/P	Kate Bagger	27/01/2025 19:00:29	OBJ	Dear all,

I strongly object to this application, and the reasons for my objection are set out below. I drafted this with my partner Ewan, but I am submitting an individual response to lodge my personal objection separately.

Kind regards,  
Kate

-----

I wish to strongly object to this planning application for the reasons outlined below. These objections fall into two broad categories:

- Opposition in principle to the use of Crestview as a site for unsightly and potentially disturbing telecoms equipment; and
- Opposition to an application which is misleading, riddled with inaccuracies, and full of unsubstantiated claims.

1. Proposed equipment would be an eyesore in a conservation area:

Crestview is located in the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area, next to a Grade II\* listed building (St Mary Brookfield Church). The images in the planning application clearly show that the equipment Waldon proposes to install is an eyesore which would dominate the surrounding area. In fact, the height of the equipment is over one third of the existing height of the block. Despite Waldon's claims to have addressed the appearance of the equipment, they clearly have not. I therefore strongly object to the application on the basis that we should be preserving the appearance of conservation areas and respecting heritage assets.

The visual impact of the equipment would be made worse by the fact that Crestview is located on a ridge, which makes it visible not only from within the conservation area but also from further away, including Hampstead Heath and the neighbouring conservation areas of Holly Lodge and Highgate. The installation would therefore have a negative visual impact from both within the conservation area and from much further away.

Waldon's statement that the 'impact on the surrounding area would be minimal' is therefore laughable. As is their argument that visual impact should not be considered because Crestview itself is not an architectural masterpiece ('the building is of little architectural merit, therefore its use is considered appropriate'). This is completely missing the point - the current appearance of Crestview is irrelevant because it does not dominate the skyline. However, with the addition of Waldon's domineering and unsightly equipment, it would dominate the skyline and therefore ruin the appearance of the surrounding area. Waldon's application offers no credible defence against this concern.

2. Misleading use of previous planning decisions to support application:

Application No:    Consultees Name:    Received:

Comment:    Response:

The supplementary information document submitted by Waldon references a decision to overturn the refusal of planning permission for a 12.5m high monopole to be replaced by a 20m high monopole. The title of this case is EE Ltd and H3G UK Ltd Vs Birmingham City Council (APP/P4605/W/19/3241791). The basis for this decision is cited in support of Waldon's application. However, it is not an analogous case. In the cited case, there was already telecoms equipment installed and the decision to overturn specifically noted that 'the proposal would be roughly in a similar location to the existing apparatus, which is an accepted part of the street scene'. The decision also noted that the apparatus was not situated in a sensitive area. By contrast, Waldon's proposal relates to entirely new equipment where there is no existing mast and in a conservation area. The case cited therefore strongly undermines Waldon's proposal and, in fact, supports a refusal of the application.

Waldon also cites CTIL and Vodafone Vs Winchester City Council (APP/L1765/18/31975). This appeal decision cannot be found on Google, the Planning Inspectorate's website, or Winchester City Council's own website. Therefore, the comments made by Waldon in respect of that decision should be disregarded unless the case can be properly cited and reviewed by relevant parties

### 3. Misleading claims about 'replacing existing equipment':

The application form claims that this proposal is about replacing existing equipment. This is misleading because it implies that there is already similar equipment on the roof at Crestview, and therefore underplays the impact that the proposal would have. In fact, the equipment Waldon claims is being 'replaced' was located in a different location entirely, about a 15-20 minute walk away.

The application is also extremely vague as to when the previous equipment was removed from the old site at Hill House in Archway. There are constant references to 'when the old site was lost' without giving any details about dates. The suspicion is that the equipment was removed from the old site many years ago, perhaps as far back as 10 or so years ago when developers first purchased Hill House. This raises questions including:

Why is Waldon not just being transparent about this? It is extremely relevant to the planning application and has simply been left out. If the equipment was removed from Hill House many years ago, can Waldon really claim to be 'replacing existing equipment'? Surely 'existing equipment' has to actually exist?

### 4. Lack of evidence to support claims that moving equipment from Archway to Crestview will benefit anyone:

There is no concrete justification in the application as to why this equipment actually needs to be moved from its previous area. There are vague statements about how the old location provides overlapping coverage and how 5G is important for economic growth. Some coverage maps are included in the application, which show that moving the mast to Crestview might provide very slightly broader coverage for a very small area. This also appears to just be for the benefit of EE customers. Nobody actually seems to think that moving the location is necessary apart from Waldon. No data or statistics are provided which demonstrate the need or demand for more telecoms equipment from locals. How can Waldon therefore claim that what they are doing is for the public benefit? This is just an empty statement.

Application No:    Consultees Name:    Received:

Comment:    Response:

5. Concern that equipment would disturb residents and neighbours, as well as the structure of the building:

Significant concerns have been raised elsewhere across the country about the incessant noise caused by 5G masts. I therefore have serious concerns that the equipment, once installed, would lead to a constant drone being heard not just by those living in Crestview but also by others in the vicinity. There is also a risk of vibrations from the equipment being transmitted down through the concrete structure of the building. This would be a huge distraction to both living and working in our homes. It is ironic that Waldon's application specifically mentions the increase in home working since the pandemic as a reason for needing more telecoms equipment. In fact, as someone who does work from home occasionally, the last thing I want is to be distracted by the noisy hum of pointless equipment on my roof.

6. Security and privacy concerns:

The work required to install and maintain the equipment would require telecoms workers to have uncontrolled access to our building. This raises serious security and privacy concerns, given that unknown individuals would be able to walk around the block whenever they want.

7. Residential building not appropriate for this equipment and lack of detail around site selection:

These points about noise and security lead on to the broader question of why it is deemed necessary to install this equipment on a residential building. Such equipment is clearly more suited to a commercial or industrial building where it would not interfere with the daily lives of residents. There is a section of the application which covers site selection. However, at no point are the criteria for site selection actually laid out. It is therefore completely unclear how much weight Waldon has actually given to the impact of the installation on local residents. The list of sites included in the site selection includes token sites which Waldon has previously rejected. It would have been helpful if this section laid out further details, such as criteria for selection and which new sites have been considered since the previous application was rejected.

8. Repeated mistakes in the application:

There are also a number of repeated mistakes in the planning application. Many of these have been highlighted previously but still have not been addressed, including:

- The application still references 'existing satellite dishes & aerial antennas' despite the fact that there have been none on the roof since the planning application was first applied for.
- The rear of Crestview on the site drawings is inaccurate, for example Elevation D does not exist.
- Elevation A shows 9 garages instead of 8.

This raises serious questions as to how much thought has gone into the planning application and the extent to

**Application No:**    **Consultees Name:**    **Received:**    **Comment:**    **Response:**

which Waldon has considered its impact on residents. Such basic errors undermine the entire application, and cast doubt on whether Waldon's statements on site selection and the suitability of Crestview as a site can be accepted.

I understand that many of these objections were already raised in response to the previous Planning Application No 2022/4190/P, which was rejected. It seems that little has changed since then.

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/5808/P	Ewan Roberts	27/01/2025 19:00:53	OBJ	<p>I wish to strongly object to this planning application for the reasons outlined below. These objections fall into two broad categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Opposition in principle to the use of Crestview as a site for unsightly and potentially disturbing telecoms equipment; and</li> <li>- Opposition to an application which is misleading, inaccurate, and full of unsubstantiated claims.</li> </ul> <p>1. Proposed equipment would be an eyesore in a conservation area:</p> <p>Crestview is located in the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area, next to a Grade II* listed building (St Mary Brookfield Church). The images in the planning application clearly show that the equipment Waldon proposes to install is an eyesore which would dominate the surrounding area. In fact, the height of the equipment is over one third of the existing height of the block. Despite Waldon's claims to have addressed the appearance of the equipment, they clearly have not. I therefore strongly object to the application on the basis that we should be preserving the appearance of conservation areas and respecting heritage assets.</p> <p>The visual impact of the equipment would be made worse by the fact that Crestview is located on a ridge, which makes it visible not only from within the conservation area but also from further away, including Hampstead Heath and the neighbouring conservation areas of Holly Lodge and Highgate. The installation would therefore have a negative visual impact from both within the conservation area and from much further away.</p> <p>Waldon's statement that the 'impact on the surrounding area would be minimal' is therefore laughable. As is their argument that visual impact should not be considered because Crestview itself is not an architectural masterpiece ('the building is of little architectural merit, therefore its use is considered appropriate'). This is completely missing the point - the current appearance of Crestview is irrelevant because it does not dominate the skyline. However, with the addition of Waldon's domineering and unsightly equipment, it would dominate the skyline and therefore ruin the appearance of the surrounding area. Waldon's application offers no credible defence against this concern.</p> <p>2. Misleading use of previous planning decisions to support application:</p> <p>The supplementary information document submitted by Waldon references a decision to overturn the refusal of planning permission for a 12.5m high monopole to be replaced by a 20m high monopole. The title of this case is EE Ltd and H3G UK Ltd Vs Birmingham City Council (APP/P4605/W/19/3241791). The basis for this decision is cited in support of Waldon's application. However, it is not an analogous case. In the cited case, there was already telecoms equipment installed and the decision to overturn specifically noted that 'the proposal would be roughly in a similar location to the existing apparatus, which is an accepted part of the street scene'. The decision also noted that the apparatus was not situated in a sensitive area. By contrast, Waldon's proposal relates to entirely new equipment where there is no existing mast and in a conservation area. The case cited therefore strongly undermines Waldon's proposal and, in fact, supports a refusal of the application.</p>

Application No:    Consultees Name:    Received:

Comment:    Response:

Waldon also cites CTIL and Vodafone Vs Winchester City Council (APP/L1765/18/31975). This appeal decision cannot be found on Google, the Planning Inspectorate's website, or Winchester City Council's own website. Therefore, the comments made by Waldon in respect of that decision should be disregarded unless the case can be properly cited and reviewed by relevant parties

### 3. Misleading claims about 'replacing existing equipment':

The application form claims that this proposal is about replacing existing equipment. This is misleading because it implies that there is already similar equipment on the roof at Crestview, and therefore underplays the impact that the proposal would have. In fact, the equipment Waldon claims is being 'replaced' was located in a different location entirely, about a 15-20 minute walk away.

The application is also extremely vague as to when the previous equipment was removed from the old site at Hill House in Archway. There are constant references to 'when the old site was lost' without giving any details about dates. The suspicion is that the equipment was removed from the old site many years ago, perhaps as far back as 10 or so years ago when developers first purchased Hill House. This raises questions including:

Why is Waldon not just being transparent about this? It is extremely relevant to the planning application and has simply been left out.

If the equipment was removed from Hill House many years ago, can Waldon really claim to be 'replacing existing equipment'? Surely 'existing equipment' has to actually exist?

### 4. Lack of evidence to support claims that moving equipment from Archway to Crestview will benefit anyone:

There is no concrete justification in the application as to why this equipment actually needs to be moved from its previous area. There are vague statements about how the old location provides overlapping coverage and how 5G is important for economic growth. Some coverage maps are included in the application, which show that moving the mast to Crestview might provide very slightly broader coverage for a very small area. This also appears to just be for the benefit of EE customers. Nobody actually seems to think that moving the location is necessary apart from Waldon. No data or statistics are provided which demonstrate the need or demand for more telecoms equipment from locals. How can Waldon therefore claim that what they are doing is for the public benefit? This is just an empty statement.

### 5. Concern that equipment would disturb residents and neighbours, as well as the structure of the building:

Significant concerns have been raised elsewhere across the country about the incessant noise caused by 5G masts. I therefore have serious concerns that the equipment, once installed, would lead to a constant drone being heard not just by those living in Crestview but also by others in the vicinity. There is also a risk of vibrations from the equipment being transmitted down through the concrete structure of the building. This would be a huge distraction to both living and working in our homes. It is ironic that Waldon's application specifically mentions the increase in home working since the pandemic as a reason for needing more

**Application No:**    **Consultees Name:**    **Received:****Comment:**    **Response:**

telecoms equipment. In fact, as someone who does work from home occasionally, the last thing I want is to be distracted by the noisy hum of pointless equipment on my roof.

6. Security and privacy concerns:

The work required to install and maintain the equipment would require telecoms workers to have uncontrolled access to our building. This raises serious security and privacy concerns, given that unknown individuals would be able to walk around the block whenever they want.

7. Residential building not appropriate for this equipment and lack of detail around site selection:

These points about noise and security lead on to the broader question of why it is deemed necessary to install this equipment on a residential building. Such equipment is clearly more suited to a commercial or industrial building where it would not interfere with the daily lives of residents. There is a section of the application which covers site selection. However, at no point are the criteria for site selection actually laid out. It is therefore completely unclear how much weight Waldon has actually given to the impact of the installation on local residents. The list of sites included in the site selection includes token sites which Waldon has previously rejected. It would have been helpful if this section laid out further details, such as criteria for selection and which new sites have been considered since the previous application was rejected.

8. Repeated mistakes in the application:

There are also a number of repeated mistakes in the planning application. Many of these have been highlighted previously but still have not been addressed, including:

- The application still references 'existing satellite dishes & aerial antennas' despite the fact that there have been none on the roof since the planning application was first applied for.
- The rear of Crestview on the site drawings is inaccurate, for example Elevation D does not exist.
- Elevation A shows 9 garages instead of 8.

This raises serious questions as to how much thought has gone into the planning application and the extent to which Waldon has considered its impact on residents. Such basic errors undermine the entire application, and cast doubt on whether Waldon's statements on site selection and the suitability of Crestview as a site can be accepted.

I understand that many of these objections were already raised in response to the previous Planning Application No 2022/4190/P, which was rejected. It seems that little has changed since then.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/5808/P	Stefan Wagstyl	26/01/2025 16:31:31	OBJ	<p>I write to object to this plan on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The towers will loom large over the sky of Dartmouth Park, casting a real and metaphorical shadow over a community that works hard to preserve its reputation as a tranquil conservation area in the heart of London. What point is there for the council to spend taxpayers' money on lovingly maintaining the york stone pavements if these derrick-like constructions are then allowed to dominate the landscape?</li> <li>2. Views from Hampstead Heath will be compromised.</li> <li>3. So will the appearance of St Mary's Brookfield, a listed building and a historic site of considerable importance in social and religious history.</li> <li>4. The applicant's pre-filing consultation was inadequate as I received only the barest details of the plan and no drawings whatsoever.</li> <li>5. The applicant has repeatedly failed to explain why they cannot return to Archway, the previous location of these towers. To say "reasons beyond our control" as they have done is to say nothing.</li> </ol>
2024/5808/P	Chris Curtis	25/01/2025 17:44:55	OBJ	<p>I STRONGLY OBJECT TO THE APPLICATION ON THE FOLLOWING GROUNDS.</p> <p>The height of the mast as shown in Waldons drawings is approximately 1/3rd -1/2 the total height of Crestview. It fails to minimise the visual impact in a conservation area adjacent to the grade 2 * listed St Mary Brookfield Church and on a building which holds a prominent sight line from Hampstead Heath. The visual amenity of the area has not been considered or protected as it pays no regard to the location nor does it fit with this residential site nor the wider setting within a conservation area.</p> <p>It furthermore contravenes the code of practice for wireless network development in England and Wales which states "the siting of equipment housing adjacent to any listed building and/ or scheduled monument should be avoided".</p>