

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/5808/P	Laurence Cendrowicz	07/02/2025 17:35:56	OBJ	<p>Objection. I strongly object to an inappropriate industrial installation in a totally residential area. The proposed structures would be visible on the skyline interfering and obstructing views of Grade II Star St Mary Brookfield Church. This is a heritage building that is clearly seen from Parliament Hill viewing points amongst others. Being on the brow of a hill the structures would be prominent and inconsistent with the surrounding architecture.</p> <p>The proposed cabinets would create noise and vibration that will affect the properties on the floors directly below.</p> <p>The scale of the structures would require interference with the Crest View building structure. Extensive drilling, high voltage cabling causing disturbance to the walls and roof.</p>
2024/5808/P	Ewan Roberts	08/02/2025 14:47:00	OBJ	<p>I previously submitted an objection to this proposal on 28 January 2025. I wish to supplement this objection with the following procedural objection. This is in relation to the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (the "GPDO"), which is the relevant legislation in this case.</p> <p>Waldon's application does not seem to state the size of the antennas (other than the dish). However, the measurements provided on Page 7 of the Supplementary Information and from the drawings in the application suggest that the distance from the top of the plant room to the top of the antennas is 3.44m. This means that the antennas are more than 3m in height and would reach 6.49m above the height of the building roof.</p> <p>Since "height" in Paragraph A1(2)(f)(ii) of Part 16 of Schedule 2 to the GPDO must refer to height above the highest point of the building or the building roof (not the height of the antenna taken by itself - contrast Paragraph A1(2)(a) - or height from the ground - Article 2(2) notwithstanding), the installation of the antennas and support poles is specifically not permitted by Paragraph A (see A1(2)(f) and (4)(a)(iv) of Part 16 of the GPDO).</p> <p>So the question of prior approval for that aspect of the development does not arise at all, as there is no permission granted by the GPDO to which the conditions for siting and appearance, or for their prior approval, can attach. If the applicants want permission for this development, they should apply to the council for planning permission in the usual way.</p> <p>I would also like to draw attention to Chapter 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph 213 states that negative impact on Grade II* listed buildings (including by development within the area of a listed building) should only be allowed in exceptional circumstances. As outlined in my initial objection, there is no justification for or evidenced benefit from Waldon's proposal. It therefore does not even come close to meeting exceptional circumstances and so, in accordance with the Framework, should be rejected.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/5808/P	Peter Wickenden	08/02/2025 21:27:47	OBJ	<p>Consultation response from Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Forum (DPNF)</p> <p>DPNF led the neighbourhood planning process that produced the Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Plan 2020, and we try to ensure that development proposals comply with the plan. The Applicants refer briefly to the plan in their Supplementary Information form but fail to show how this third attempt to install telecoms equipment on Crestview meets plan requirements.</p> <p>The Plan places great emphasis on maintaining and enhancing the character and appearance of the neighbourhood (which is also a Conservation Area) and makes clear that any development should respect this objective and not cause harm to the significance of a Grade II * listed building through an effect on its setting.</p> <p>Crestview is located on the crest of Dartmouth Park Hill, on the Eastern edge of the neighbourhood. It lies in a setting of listed buildings and is immediately adjacent to the Grade II* listed St Mary Brookfield Church. Due to the topography of the area, Crestview roofscape can be seen throughout the neighbourhood and from Holly Lodge estate and Hampstead Heath locations, including Parliament Hill.</p> <p>The height, bulk and appearance of the equipment proposed in this development are unacceptable. The height of the antennas/masts from Crestview's rooftop would be almost an additional 3 storeys (the dwellings themselves comprise 6 storeys). Additional bulky ancillary equipment includes a large, hooped CAT ladder with gate leading up to join a four-sided pen of safety railings all on top of the white lift housing.</p> <p>The scale and industrial appearance of this installation is totally out of place in a residential setting. Crestview currently presents a neutral façade to St Mary's Brookfield church. The impact of this development is wholly detrimental, both to its immediate setting and when it's roof and spire are viewed from afar on the skyline.</p> <p>Our Neighbourhood Plan clearly states: "...the people of Dartmouth Park wish to ensure that the area's village character, rich architectural heritage, attractive green streets, open spaces and natural environment are not only maintained but enhanced". We firmly believe that the proposals put forward in this planning application contravene every aspect of the above policy statement.</p> <p>Please refuse this application.</p> <p>Peter Wickenden on behalf of Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Forum</p>
2024/5808/P	Andrew Owen	07/02/2025 22:31:12	INT	<p>Lending my support to the residents of Crest View who are neighbours and most affected by the proposal. Noise, vibration and inconvenience with little or no benefit to them. Additionally the antenna will be very visible, including from my property and further detract from the conversation area. I have further concerns over the potential adverse impacts on our diminishing summer swift and other bird populations.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/5808/P	Oliver Butt	08/02/2025 09:06:55	OBJ	<p>I have been a resident of Dartmouth Park (York Rise) for almost 40 years and I am a regular attender at St Mary Brookfield Church (and I am on the PCC). I think the proposal is awful. Since I first moved here much has been done by individual households to improve their dwellings. The area is altogether more attractive and the Victorian architecture is now well preserved. This development would move in the opposite direction. The area would be subject to ugly visual clutter placed on one of the tallest structures on a ridge so all from far and wide will have to look at it. I type this comment as I look from my bathroom window where the existing building already rises above the surrounding houses and is directly in my line of vision. I spend some time here every morning, cogitating on life, looking out the window. If this development goes ahead, I shall instead be ruminating over the detritus of the modern age and how ugly we have made our environment. Also every Sunday as I trudge up Laurier Rd to church I would, if this is approved, have to look at evidence of further decline in our civic and aesthetic standards. Please, please reject this latest attempt to impose the unwanted scheme on the neighbourhood.</p>
2024/5808/P	Ian MacGregor	08/02/2025 11:21:07	PETITNOBJ E	<p>I write as Churchwarden of St. Mary Brookfield which lies adjacent to Crestview.</p> <p>Our building is listed and we take great pride and responsibility for caring for the building to ensure it is maintained to the highest standards. It is a significant building in the area, and of great architectural importance and adds so much to the beauty of the area.</p> <p>This proposed development risks dominating the landscape and views of Dartmouth Park for miles around and is not sympathetic to the neighbourhood. Our Church is such an important building in the area which serves the community in many ways, including a winter night shelter for the homeless, and it would be disastrous if it were to be overshadowed by this very substantial and ugly addition to Crestview.</p> <p>I urge you to reject this application.</p>
2024/5808/P	Foulla Pashkaj	09/02/2025 21:38:32	OBJ	<p>I object to this planning application as it's imperative that we protect Crest View, the conservation area and the skyline. Phone masts on this building will not be discreet and will be seen far and wide due to its positioning. I am sick and tired of seeing phone masts desecrating buildings and surrounding areas.</p> <p>This is the third application made for 5G phone mast to the roof of Crest View, how many times do residents and neighbours need to object? This is tantamount to bullying and harassment. Our feelings haven't changed since the last time. Stop bullying the residents!</p> <p>No means No!</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/5808/P	susan rose pp Highgate CAAC	07/02/2025 15:20:03	OBJ	<p>The original application to instal telecom equipment on the roof of this block of flats was refused and this revised scheme is subject to the same objections as the original one and in no way mitigates the adverse effects on the surrounding CAs of such an installation</p> <p>The height, size and prominent location of the proposed equipment on the aptly named Crestview would appear as incongruous visual clutter to the detriment of the character and appearance of the building and to the adjoining streets of Dartmouth Park. It will also cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the immediate vicinity , St John's Islington and Holly Lodge. It is also very visible from the protected viewpoints on Hampstead Heath. Furthermore it is adjacent to St. Mary's Brookfield a Grade II* listed building . . There is no natural screening offered by mature trees, nor any man-made screening in the form of buildings. Nor are there any existing rooftop features which could minimise the visual impact on the skyline and to the surrounding areas. Any attempt to disguise the installation would accentuate it even further. Visual clutter, in such an exposed position, would cause serious visual harm not only to the CA as a whole but particularly to the adjacent landmark and listed building of St Mary's Brookfield. The drawings show the full height of these installations to be the equivalent of almost three storeys (half the height of the total dwellings above the roof-line. The thin, asphalt roof is not designed to take any weight or traffic; noise would also caused by the vibrations of the cabinets and any wind resistance. This application must be refused as in breach of the requirements of the NPPF to protect heritage assets from significant harm as demonstrated above.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/5808/P	The Revd Damien Mason	07/02/2025 17:14:04	OBJ	<p>I write as the Vicar of St Mary Brookfield Church on behalf of our PCC and church community. We are writing to formally object to the proposed mobile phone masts and buildings on top of Crestview, directly adjacent to St Mary Brookfield Church.</p> <p>We strongly oppose any further development next to our church. St Mary Brookfield is a Grade II* listed building, currently on the Heritage at Risk (HAR) register under Priority C, which indicates the need for significant restoration work that we are planning to undertake in the near future. We aim to ensure that this investment addresses the building's heritage needs while also making it suitable for 21st-century use.</p> <p>Since 1875, St Mary Brookfield has been a cornerstone in the Dartmouth Park community, serving as a place of Christian worship and a hub for social responsibility, particularly for the poor, vulnerable, and all who seek support within our doors. As custodians of this historically significant building, we take great pride in maintaining it, as well as the surrounding environment, including paths, gardens, and local spaces. Our commitment to caring for this heritage is evident in our ongoing efforts.</p> <p>The proposed development on Crestview, however, would compromise the integrity of our church. Crestview already detracts from the architectural beauty of St Mary's, and further construction or masts would only worsen this. It would also conflict with the principles that define the conservation area of Dartmouth Park Road. Such development would drastically alter the character of the area, particularly for the many people who use our vibrant and active church space.</p> <p>We urge you to reconsider this application. The concerns raised by many in the community are valid (especially the views of the Victorian Society and Historic England), and we ask that you also consider the considerable effort and responsibility involved in preserving a historic building like St Mary's. This development would not only hinder our preservation efforts but could also discourage investment in the future care of this important church.</p>
2024/5808/P	Hannah Mason	07/02/2025 18:18:54	OBJ	<p>I strongly oppose the proposals presented here. There has been little change since my last objection, and my previous comments remain relevant. If this development proceeds, it will significantly harm the beauty of the local environment and cause substantial damage to the nearby conservation area. I have noted the concerns raised, particularly those from community leaders and amenity societies (Victorian Society and Historic England), and I urge you to reject these proposals in light of these objections. It would be a great loss to detract from the stunning St Mary's Church next door, a historic building visible from far and wide. The impact of this development on local residents, including my family, will be deeply detrimental to both our community and our quality of life.</p>
2024/5808/P	Natasha Cendrowicz	07/02/2025 18:46:19	COMMNT	<p>I am objecting to this application to install 3 antenna on Crest View. I live nearby on Dartmouth Park Road and feel this is inappropriate and not supported by Crest View residents (my brother Laurence Cendrowicz included).</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/5808/P	Terry Mckie	08/02/2025 15:16:27	OBJ	<p>This is the third Application made by Waldon and I object to this application for the same reasons I objected to the previous two.</p> <p>Crestview is a not particularly noteworthy building but it is very prominent as it is higher than all surrounding structures and stands on the crest of a hill.</p> <p>The addition of a mass of antenna, dishes and cabinets on the roof will considerably increase the overall height of the building and the resulting visual clutter will impact negatively on its appearance both in the immediate area, including the two neighbouring Conservation areas, and even more so when seen from high points in the surrounding areas such as Hampstead Heath and the Holly Lodge Estate.</p>
2024/5808/P	Martin Lewy	09/02/2025 09:10:51	OBJ	<p>We are concerned at the visual intrusion caused by the equipment on the roof of a prominent local building which is next to a listed church.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/5808/P	A Richardson	07/02/2025 15:14:46	COMMNT	Crestview Flats (Freehold) Ltd wishes to strongly oppose this third Application on the following grounds:

Technical specification and inaccuracies:

It is difficult to put any reliance on the plans which have been submitted since, despite our having commented on the inaccuracies in the plans submitted in the previous applications, the misrepresentations continue to appear.

Waldon again state in this application that the building has previously housed telecommunications apparatus. As explained before, a much smaller telecoms installation was already in place when this Company took over the Freehold in 1995. This Company had it removed as soon as it was legally possible to do so.

A Planning Application submitted by Commpro Telecommunications in 2000 to expand the existing development was withdrawn by Camden Council on 22 January 2001. In a letter to Commpro in December 2000 the then Planning Officer said:

“You are probably aware that the installation of telecommunications equipment has recently become very contentious, and that there is a lot of opposition to it from residents.”

This Company continuously rejected any advances (despite the offer of financial rewards) to place telecoms equipment on Crestview’s roof.

Siting:

Crestview is located within the eastern border of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area. As its name implies, it lies on the crest of Dartmouth Park Hill along the Highgate ridge and is therefore widely visible from the surrounding conservation areas (Dartmouth Park CA, Holly Lodge and Highgate CA, St John’s Grove CA) as well as further afield.

We are already a relatively tall building for the area, and the development would add significantly to our height and visibility.

The Camden Local Plan 2017 requires any developments to take into account the wider historic environment and buildings, spaces and features of local historic value. We believe that the development, by reason of the location, number of pieces of equipment, height and design, would result in visual clutter which would cause significant harm to local views, in particular to the views of the Grade II* listed St Mary Brookfield Church, and to the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area.

We understand that any development within a conservation area should preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the area and should not cause harm to the significance of a listed building through an effect on its setting. The Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Plan 2020 places great emphasis on maintaining and enhancing the character of the area. It states (2.10): “...the people of Dartmouth Park wish to ensure that the area’s village character, rich architectural heritage, attractive green streets, open spaces and natural environment are not only maintained but enhanced”. We firmly believe that the proposals put forward in the Planning Application would contravene every aspect of the above policy statement.

Crestview, by virtue of its location high up on Dartmouth Park Hill, is clearly visible in short, medium and long-range views from a variety of vantage points within the area, most notably from several locations on

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/5808/P	Nicola Pittam	08/02/2025 16:05:51	OBJ	<p>Hampstead Heath itself. Crestview is also located immediately adjacent to the Grade II* listed St Mary Brookfield Church, a building of more than special interest and of significant architectural heritage. This is of a similar height to Crestview and from many locations the proposed development would severely impact on the views of the church itself.</p> <p>Appearance:</p> <p>In view of the size and scope of the proposed installation, it is considered overly dominant, and entirely inappropriate for a small compact block of 18 flats. The height, bulk and massing of the structures would be disproportionate to the size of the building itself, and are likely to have an extremely negative impact on Crestview's visual appearance. The exposed position of the building means that there would be no screening from surrounding trees or other buildings and would have a significant detrimental effect on the skyline.</p> <p>The Camden Local Plan 2017 requires developments to take into account the character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings as well as the character and proportions of the existing building, where alterations and extensions are proposed. We believe this development would impact severely on the appearance of the building, as well as being visible from many points in the conservation area, including Laurier Road, Dartmouth Park Hill, Dartmouth Park Road, and further afield. The height of the masts would significantly increase the visibility throughout the area.</p> <p>In summary, we firmly believe that this proposal would result in significant harm to the local heritage assets, their settings and the setting of the Conservation Area. This should outweigh any potential benefits from the development, and the Waldon submission fails adequately to address this issue. This matter is of grave concern to the Company and its constituent Leaseholders.</p> <p>Terry Mckie Amanda Richardson Directors, Crestview Flats (Freehold) Ltd</p> <p>I write as a member of St Mary Brookfield Church. I want to object to the proposed mobile phone masts and buildings on top of Crestview, directly adjacent to St Mary Brookfield Church.</p> <p>I oppose this proposed development to Crestview (as I also objected to the previous proposal for development of Crestview). St Mary Brookfield is a grade II* listed building, designed by the well-known Victorian architect William Butterfield. St Mary's makes a significant contribution to the Conservation Area, and in particular a positive contribution to the appearance of the surrounding streets. Crestview is not a building of any architectural distinction, and its height already detracts from the impact of St Mary Brookfield. Installing the proposed equipment on top of Crestview will add further to its height – making it even more prominent, to the detriment of St Mary Brookfield, and harming the Conversation Area. In this, there is no significant difference between the current proposals and those which were previously made, and rejected by the council. I therefore urge the council to reject these new proposals.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/5808/P	Allan Roberts	07/02/2025 18:20:29	OBJ	<p>1. I object to this development in a Conservation Area right next to a listed building. The Council has rightly rejected two previous applications for planning permission and nothing material has happened since to suggest that the outcome should be any different this time, as this application relates to substantially the same development.</p> <p>2. I live on Dartmouth Park Road. The view up the road ends with the Grade 2* listed Butterfield church, St. Mary Brookfield, and the Crestview flats. The applicants' proposal is to place on the roof directly across the road from the church a structure which, by any standards, is both very noticeable indeed and very ugly. Crestview is mentioned specifically in the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Statement as a building which, with sensitive enhancement, could contribute more positively to the character of the Area. This makes the applicants' assertion that "The building is of little architectural merit, therefore its use is considered appropriate" (supplementary information p.21) rather surprising.</p> <p>3. The applicants answered "Yes" to "Are you replacing an existing installation?". They may once have had a different installation at a different site on Highgate Hill. But, as they acknowledge, that installation no longer exists, nor has it done so for a number of years. This is an application about an entirely new development, not a replacement, and must be viewed as such.</p> <p>4. The information in the supplementary information form fails to demonstrate a public need for this development. In particular, the maps at section 3 show only coverage for the networks operated by EE and HG3. They don't show coverage for networks operated by any of their competitors, so are little help in determining which areas may have inadequate coverage of 2G, 4G or 5G. They merely show marketing opportunities for the applicants in areas where their competitors may currently have the upper hand.</p> <p>Visual Impact</p> <p>5. The negative impact of the development compared with the previous applications is slightly reduced in one respect by the reduction in number of antennas to 3, but comparison of the previous design with the current design shows only a minimal difference in visual impact. For instance, the antennas this time round are shown on the drawings as taller than in the last application. And the actual visual impact of the antennas is in practice exaggerated by their position on the top of the plant room, which itself is on top of the flat roof. The impact is further exaggerated by the fact that the flats are on the crest of a hill. The applicants' assertion that the development would have "only minimum visual impact" (supplementary information, p.9) is unsustainable. The development would be highly visible not just from within the conservation area, but from further afield as well. There is little evidence that the siting of the antennas is such as to minimise the effect on the building's external appearance.</p> <p>Procedure</p> <p>6. The application doesn't seem to state the size of the antennas (other than the dish), though the drawings suggest that the distance from the top of the plant room to the top of the antennas is 3.44m, ie that the antennas are more than 3m in height. Since "height" in para A1(2)(f)(ii) of Part 16 of Schedule 2 to the GPDO must refer to height above the highest point of the building (not the height of the antenna taken by itself - contrast para A1(2)(a) - or height from the ground - Article 2(2) notwithstanding), the installation of the antennas and support poles is specifically not permitted by para A (see para A1(2)(f) and (4)(a)(iv) of Part 16). So the question of prior approval for that aspect of the development doesn't arise at all, as there is no permission granted by the GPDO to which the conditions for siting and appearance, or for their prior approval,</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/5808/P	James Maxwell	09/02/2025 20:37:51	SUPPRT	<p>can attach. Since part of the development isn't covered by the GDPO, it can't be relied on for any of it; so if the applicants want permission for this development, they should apply to the council for planning permission in the usual way.</p> <hr/> <p>I fully support the application (2024/5808/P) for the installation of telecommunications equipment at Crestview, 47 Dartmouth Park Hill, London, NW5 1JB.</p> <p>This development will enhance mobile connectivity in the area, benefiting residents and businesses. The proposal aligns with the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, ensuring compliance with national policy objectives for digital infrastructure.</p> <p>This installation is a necessary step toward modernising London's digital network and should be approved.</p>
2024/5808/P	Georgia Georgiou	09/02/2025 21:43:21	OBJ	<p>I wish to object to this application as it will affect the view from Hampstead Heath. Additionally the mast will be highly visible from all angles due to the buildings positioning. We must do everything to preserve the beauty of our area.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/5808/P	Hamish Birchall	08/02/2025 12:00:21	OBJ	<p>Objection/comment to the Waldon Crest View revised phone mast planning application, ref 2024/5808/P, by Hamish Birchall, submitted 08 February 2025.</p> <p>I strongly object to this latest application by Waldon (on behalf of its clients EE and H3G), as I did to Waldon's previous two such applications: 2021/0598/P and 2022/4190/P.</p> <p>The grounds remain broadly the same, but due to the Prior Approval nature of the present application, I prioritise my objections as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The application is not compliant with the relevant conditions of the General Permitted Development Order (GPDO). 2. Despite a reduced equipment manifesto, the visual impact is just as bad as before. 3. Implications of Grade II* listed status of St Mary Brookfield Church. 4. Waldon's "loss of nearby site" rationale remains demonstrably false. 5. Dartmouth Park Hill reservoir remains a viable alternative site. <p>1. Application not GPDO compliant Waldon state that the overall height of the installation would be "25.49 metres to the top of the antennas". (p7, Supplementary information form).</p> <p>Waldon also state on the same page that the existing height of Crest View is 22.05 metres, meaning to the top of the small lift machinery and water tank housing. The main building height, again by their measurement, is 19 metres.</p> <p>So, by their own estimate, the three antennae will stand 3.44 metres above the lift/water tank housing (and 6.49 metres above the main building height).</p> <p>The antennae height therefore exceeds the maximum 3 metres permitted under GPDO "Development not permitted", section A.1(2)(f)(ii), which provides: "Development consisting of the installation, alteration or replacement of electronic communications apparatus (other than small antenna and small cell systems) on a building is not permitted by Class A(a) if ... "(f) in the case of the installation of an antenna on electronic communications apparatus on a building on article 2(3) land ... "(ii) the height of any antenna other than dish antenna to be installed would exceed 3 metres, or the number of such antennas which have been installed on the building since 21st August 2013 would exceed 3."</p> <p>2. Visual impact just as bad Waldon argues that having reduced the number of antennae from six to three, the visual impact will be "minimal", and that in any case "... the equipment is not proposed to be located on a building of any architectural merit." (Supplementary Report, pages 1 and 10 respectively).</p> <p>If Crest View is not of particular architectural merit, its prominence on the skyline for miles around is an excellent reason NOT to put large and ugly attachments on its roof.</p> <p>Waldon add on p21 of the same document: "The impact on both the host building and the surrounding area would be kept to an acceptable level. This will</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

be illustrated in the following section, by the use of photomontages.”

But Waldon’s photomontage document is a wholly and, I would say, deliberately misleading visualisation of the proposed installation. For example:

- Only two antennae are shown when three are proposed.
- Their height is well below that in the Proposed site elevation plans.
- The antennae and fittings are represented in a pale grey, whereas in reality they would stand in stark silhouette against the sky.
- The negative visual impact on views of St Mary Brookfield church is absent due mainly to there being no views from the east or south, or from the Holly Lodge to the north west.

I attach photos I have previously used to illustrate the prominence and close proximity of both Crest View and St Mary Brookfield Church, a Grade II* church.

3. Grade II* listed status of St Mary Brookfield Church

St Mary Brookfield Church qualifies as a heritage asset “of the highest significance”, according to section 213, Chapter 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Section 212 of the NPPF states:

“When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.”

And this applies to development within the setting of such heritage assets (also s213).

4. Waldon’s “loss of nearby site” rationale for choosing Crest View

This is an entirely specious argument.

In an email to me dated 22 November 2024, Chris Andrews of Waldon confirmed that: “The Hill House site was decommissioned in January 2017.”

So, for eight years EE, 3 and MBNL have managed without Hill House. Moreover, nowhere does Waldon cite any customer complaints that their coverage has suffered.

5. Dartmouth Park Hill reservoir a viable alternative site

Waldon consider but reject the Dartmouth Park Hill covered reservoir:

“A substantial greenfield site would be required which would have a greater visual impact than a rooftop site. In addition, there is a lack of space for an installation on the site.”

But this too is nonsense. The site is large, at the right height and within 50m of Crest View. Thames Water, the owner, has recently carried out major building works, providing deep concrete pillar supports around the reservoir perimeter.

It is eminently suitable for an imaginative use of disguised 5G mast installation as I argued in my objection, or a compact mast of the sort announced by Vodafone last year (Google “Vodafone unveils space-saving 5G mast design”).

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/5808/P	Kate Bagger	08/02/2025 15:44:29	OBJ	<p>[PHOTOS SUBMITTED SEPARATELY BY EMAIL]</p> <p>I previously submitted an objection to this proposal on 28 January 2025. I wish to supplement this objection with the following procedural objection. This is in relation to the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (the "GPDO"), which is the relevant legislation in this case.</p> <p>Waldon's application does not seem to state the size of the antennas (other than the dish). However, the measurements provided on Page 7 of the Supplementary Information and the drawings in the application suggest that the distance from the top of the plant room to the top of the antennas is 3.44m. This means that the antennas are more than 3m in height and would reach 6.49m above the height of the building roof.</p> <p>Since "height" in Paragraph A1(2)(f)(ii) of Part 16 of Schedule 2 to the GPDO must refer to height above the highest point of the building or the building roof (not the height of the antenna taken by itself - contrast Paragraph A1(2)(a) - or height from the ground - Article 2(2) notwithstanding), the installation of the antennas and support poles is specifically not permitted by Paragraph A (see A1(2)(f) and (4)(a)(iv) of Part 16 of the GPDO).</p> <p>So the question of prior approval for that aspect of the development does not arise at all, as there is no permission granted by the GPDO to which the conditions for (a) siting and appearance, or (b) their prior approval, can attach. If the applicants want permission for this development, they should apply to the council for planning permission in the usual way.</p> <p>I would also like to draw attention to Chapter 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph 213 states that negative impact on Grade II* listed buildings (including by development within the area of a listed building) should only be allowed in exceptional circumstances. As outlined in my initial objection, there is no justification for or evidenced benefit from Waldon's proposal. It therefore does not even come close to meeting exceptional circumstances and so, in accordance with the Framework, should be rejected.</p>
2024/5808/P	Camron Aref-Adib	08/02/2025 11:22:38	OBJ	<p>As a councillor for Highgate ward I wish to echo my fellow ward councillor, Anna Wright's, comments on this application and object to it. I endorse her full comments which are included below and have been submitted:</p> <p>"As Labour Ward Councillor for Highgate Ward, I wish to register my objection to this application. This is the third submission for placing telecoms antennas on the roof of Crestview. Whilst this proposal claims to be reduced in size, I believe these plans if approved will create a greater, not lesser, visual mass than the previous proposals which have been rejected by Camden. The exposed position on a geographical ridge will cause significant visual impact within the conservation area, most specifically on the Grade 11 listed St Mary Brookfield Church and on views from Holly Lodge estate and from Hampstead Heath. While I recognise the need for communications infrastructure I have not been convinced that other options in the vicinity have been fully explored. The installation of the antenna would be better suited to a new build where it could be incorporated in the design or on a tall building which would likely still be visible on the skyline but would not be adjacent to and directly detrimental a protected heritage landmark."</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/5808/P	Adam Preston	08/02/2025 13:58:14	OBJ	<p>My home Crestview lies in the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area which is primarily residential and we are highly visible from Hampstead Heath and further afield. Such an ugly installation would be completely out of place on this small, residential building and have a harmful effect on the views in the surrounding areas such as Parliament Hill Fields, Hampstead Heath and the Grade II * listed building of St Mary Brookfield (next door). The roofline of our building is almost level with that of the church - anything on our roof would therefore dominate this heritage building and have a negative impact on its setting and that of the conservation area.</p> <p>The last planning application was refused for the above reasons plus the overwhelming oversized scope of the proposed installation. Nothing has changed in this latest application. In fact there are additional items like railings surrounding the roof perimeter of the lift-housing unit plus gates on the lift-housing roof and a large, hooped CAT ladder descending from the top level down to the main roof. Antenna numbers may have been reduced from 6 short ones (two per mast) - but now they propose 3 long ones (one per mast)</p>
