

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/5808/P	Matthew Lunn	03/02/2025 20:22:34	OBJ	<p>I am a close neighbour to Crestview and strongly oppose this application for several reasons.</p> <p>The plans submitted contain inaccuracies, such as the extra garage and non-existent telecoms equipment, which persist despite being pointed out in previous submissions. This raises concerns about the accuracy and integrity of the documentation.</p> <p>Crestview is located within the Dartmouth Park and St John's Grove Conservation Areas, and the proposed development would significantly increase the building's height, impacting local views, particularly of the Grade II* listed St Mary Brookfield Church. The height and design of the development would contribute to visual clutter, contradicting the Camden Local Plan and Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Plan, both of which emphasize preserving the area's character.</p> <p>The proposed telecoms equipment could also result in disruptive noise and vibrations, severely affecting the living conditions within Crestview. The bulk and scale of the installation are disproportionate to the size of the building and would harm its visual appearance.</p> <p>Overall, this development would harm the local heritage and environment, and a more appropriate location for such a project should be considered.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/5808/P	Sally Fanning	03/02/2025 18:52:25	OBJ	<p>I am resident of Crestview Flats and strongly object to the proposed development of the siting (and operation) of telecommunications equipment on and around the Crestview block of flats. My objections are based on the issues mentioned below:</p> <p>Environmental Issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is concern about noise pollution. It is understood that such installations can cause appreciable noise output. This could be experienced by those walking adjacent to the building (some of the equipment is at street level) but predominantly by residents in the building. Noise vibration within the building, which due to its method of construction (un-dampened load-bearing structure with a lightweight roof), would be almost impossible to modify to counteract this expected phenomenon. <p>Visual Amenity</p> <p>The visual amenity of the immediate, surrounding and neighbouring areas will be severely and detrimentally affected by such an installation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Despite apparent re-design, the proposed installation is so prominent, both in size and scale (not necessarily made clear, or indeed evident by poorly constructed inaccurate drawings) that it will be able to be seen as an overpowering mass, by anyone adjacent to the building. • It will offer a distracting and invasive industrial styled street-view focus when moving around the building, while both driving, cycling and walking on the surrounding streets. This would be particularly evident (and indeed dramatic) when approaching the building, being on the crest of a hill, from 3 directions (Dartmouth Park Hill, Dartmouth Park Road and Laurier Road). See also below reference to the adjacent building of particular architectural merit. The amendments to the previously refused application only serve to increase that shown before as the current application suggests antenna of twice the height. • The view of the roof from adjacent and surrounding properties will be greatly detrimental to their owners enjoyment of the immediate tree and skylines (a particularly appreciated and valued aspect of living in this location by residents of flats and houses of differing architectural provenance and residential occupation and local residents walking eg. in Dartmouth Park) • The delightful view of the skyline of this section of Dartmouth Park Hill from Hampstead Heath, particularly descending from Parliament Hill towards the east, would be severely and horrendously spoilt for anyone's enjoyment, both locals and visitors alike. In addition the view from any building (predominantly housing) within the same eye-line would be similarly affected. <p>St Mark's Church</p> <p>The different but individual styles of Crestview and St Mark's Church seen in juxtaposition from various aspects are a familiar and appreciated feature of the local street scene. The addition of a jagged and industrial forest of aerials projecting from a height very similar to that of the church would completely destroy the appreciation of any vista of the church, a Grade II* listed building, in which it was seen together with Crestview.</p>