

<b>Delegated Report</b> (Refusal)		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>	<b>18/02/2025</b>
		N/A / attached		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	<b>09/02/2025</b>
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>		
Sam FitzPatrick			2024/5808/P		
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>		
Crestview 47 Dartmouth Park Hill London NW5 1JB			Please refer to decision notice.		
<b>PO 3/4</b>	<b>Area Team Signature</b>	<b>C&amp;UD</b>	<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>		
<b>Proposal(s)</b>					
Installation of 3 x antenna apertures, 1 x 300mm transmission dish, and 5 x equipment cabinets to the roof of existing building and ancillary development thereto.					
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		<b>Prior Approval Required – Approval Refused</b>			
<b>Application Type:</b>		<b>GPDO Prior Approval Determination</b>			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice			
Informatives:				
<b>Consultations</b>				
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. of responses	48	No. of objections	47
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>Site notices were displayed from 15/01/2025 to 08/02/2025 and a press notice was published on 16/01/2025 that expired on 09/02/2025.</p> <p>Over 45 objections and one letter of support were received from local residents from Crestview and the surrounding area, as well as from groups including the Victorian Society and the Dartmouth Park Road Residents' Association. The concerns raised by objections can be summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed equipment would be inappropriate for the context of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area;</li> <li>• The proposed equipment would negatively impact the listed church of St Mary Brookfield located directly opposite;</li> <li>• The proposed equipment would be highly visible from Hampstead Heath and visible in the skyline;</li> <li>• The view from nearby properties would be harmed by the proposed works;</li> <li>• The topography of the surrounding area would mean that the proposed works would be very visible and prominent;</li> <li>• The proposed equipment may result in health implications;</li> <li>• The evidence provided as part of the application is incorrect, such as the inclusion of satellite dishes and aerial antennas in drawings that do not exist and the incorrect number of garage doors;</li> <li>• The application is not GPDO compliant as the height of the antenna is over 3m;</li> <li>• The choice of Crestview over alternative sites is not clearly demonstrated;</li> <li>• The equipment would likely have a noise impact that would result in disturbance to residents;</li> <li>• The installation of the proposed equipment would require access to the building by telecommunications companies which would impact on the privacy of residents.</li> </ul> <p><u>Officer Response</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. For all concerns relating to siting and appearance, including the impact on heritage assets such as the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area and listed St Mary Brookfield, please see section 3 'Siting and appearance' of this report;</li> <li>2. For all concerns relating to the choice of installation site and justification of works, please see section 2 'Justification' of this report;</li> <li>3. Impacts on amenity such as views and noise are not a consideration in the determination of prior approval applications;</li> <li>4. There is a significant amount of advice and information available on health issues that concludes that base stations do not pose any health risks to people, including from (amongst others) Public Health England. Additionally, the NPPF makes clear that planning authorities must determine applications on planning grounds only, and has no scope to determine health safeguards beyond</li> </ol>			

*compliance with ICNIRP guidelines; the applicant has provided an ICNIRP Declaration to demonstrate that the proposed equipment would be fully compliant with precautionary guidelines;*

- 5. With regards to inaccuracies, the points and concerns raised by the local residents and objectors have been noted and taken into account when viewing the drawings. The case officer has also visited the site to confirm relevant details;*
- 6. The GPDO sets out development that is 'not permitted', including where antennas would exceed 3m tall when installed on electronic communications apparatus. This is taken to mean that the antenna must be smaller than 3m, not the antenna and electronic communications apparatus. Although the structure of the antenna and its support frame is taller than 3m, the actual antenna has a height of less than 3m, so is still compliant;*
- 7. Issues relating to ownership, access, or property values are not material planning considerations.*

<p><b>Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Advisory Committee</b></p>	<p>The Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Advisory Committee (DPCAAC) objected to the proposal, on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The equipment to the roof would be highly intrusive and widely visible on the skyline, including from within and outside the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area;</li> <li>• The full height of the structure of the equipment and roof enclosure would be excessive in relation to the rest of the building and its appearance (which is simple in character);</li> <li>• The setting of the adjacent conservation area (St John's) would also be harmed by the proposal;</li> <li>• The setting of the immediately adjacent St Mary Brookfield Grade II* listed church would be harmed by the proposed installation, as the height of the equipment would be greater than the church.</li> </ul> <p><u>Officer response:</u></p> <p>1. <i>For all concerns relating to siting and appearance, including the impact on heritage assets such as the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area and listed St Mary Brookfield, please see section 3 'Siting and appearance' of this report.</i></p>
<p><b>Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Forum</b></p>	<p>The Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Forum (DPNF) objected to the proposal on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal would cause harm to the host Conservation Area and the adjacent Grade II* listed building;</li> <li>• Due to the topography of the area, the proposed works would be highly visible, which would exacerbate the impact.</li> </ul> <p><u>Officer response:</u></p> <p>2. <i>For all concerns relating to siting and appearance, including the impact on heritage assets such as the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area and listed St Mary Brookfield, please see section 3 'Siting and appearance' of this report.</i></p>
<p><b>Highgate Conservation Area Advisory Committee</b></p>	<p>The Highgate Neighbourhood Forum (HCAAC) objected to the proposal on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal would cause harm to the host Conservation Area and the adjacent Grade II* listed building;</li> <li>• The proposal would be visibly from neighbouring conservation areas and would cause harm to these too.</li> </ul> <p><u>Officer response:</u></p> <p>1. <i>For all concerns relating to siting and appearance, including the impact on heritage assets such as the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area and listed St Mary Brookfield, please see section 3 'Siting and appearance' of this report.</i></p>
<p><b>Historic England</b></p>	<p>Historic England responded to the application and did not object, but provided the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The location of the building and the proposed communications equipment would result in conspicuous and widespread visibility,</li> </ul>

including in conjunction with the church, which would distract from its landmark role and degrade the area's character;

- The proposal would result in less than substantial harm to both the church and the conservation area;
- The revisions made as part of this third iteration of the proposed works do not meaningfully reduce or change the nature of the impact on heritage significance, which should be given great weight when determining the application.

Officer response:

1. *For all concerns relating to siting and appearance, including the impact on heritage assets such as the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area and listed St Mary Brookfield, please see section 3 'Siting and appearance' of this report.*

<p><b>Cllr Anna Wright</b></p>	<p>Councillor Wright objected to the proposal on the grounds that the roof equipment would result in a more significant visual mass that would be very visible from the surrounding area, including the conservation areas and the listed building. Whilst the need for communications infrastructure is recognised, there does not appear to have been sufficient exploration of other options in the vicinity. The equipment would be better suited elsewhere.</p> <p><u>Officer response:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. For all concerns relating to siting and appearance, including the impact on heritage assets such as the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area and listed St Mary Brookfield, please see section 3 'Siting and appearance' of this report;</li> <li>2. For all concerns relating to the choice of installation site and justification of works, please see section 2 'Justification' of this report.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Cllr Camron Aref-Adib</b></p>	<p>Councillor Aref-Adib objected to the proposal on the grounds that the installation would have a significant visual impact, including within the Conservation Area and on the adjacent listed building. Whilst the need for communications infrastructure is recognised, other options have not been clearly explored and it would likely be better suited in an alternative location.</p> <p><u>Officer response:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. For all concerns relating to siting and appearance, including the impact on heritage assets such as the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area and listed St Mary Brookfield, please see section 3 'Siting and appearance' of this report;</li> <li>2. For all concerns relating to the choice of installation site and justification of works, please see section 2 'Justification' of this report.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Cllr Lorna Jane Russell</b></p>	<p>Councillor Russell objected to the proposal on the grounds that it would cause harm to the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area due to introducing an industrial and incongruous element that is out of character, as well as cause harm to the setting of the Grade II* listed building immediately adjacent. Additionally, Cllr Russell noted that the previous two refusals at the site were very similar to this refusal, and that there has not been a clear justification as to why alternative sites have not been chosen.</p> <p><u>Officer response:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. For all concerns relating to siting and appearance, including the impact on heritage assets such as the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area and listed St Mary Brookfield, please see section 3 'Siting and appearance' of this report;</li> <li>2. For all concerns relating to the choice of installation site and justification of works, please see section 2 'Justification' of this report.</li> </ol>

## Site Description

The application site is Crestview, a six-storey residential block located on the corner junction between Dartmouth Park Hill and Dartmouth Park Road. The building was constructed in the early 1960s and contains residential flats with garages at ground floor level. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character and the site is in close proximity to Dartmouth Park and Reservoir to the north-east, a Victorian covered reservoir and public park. Also located directly to the west approximately 500m away is Hampstead Heath.

The application site is located within both the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area and the Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Forum Area. Crestview is identified in the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (adopted in January 2009) as making a negative contribution to the conservation area. Although the building itself is not listed, it is located directly opposite St Mary's Brookfield, a Grade II\* Listed church, constructed between 1869 and 1875 by William Butterfield and recognised as making a major contribution to the streetscape in the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy.

## Relevant History

### Application site

**2022/4190/P** – Installation of telecommunications equipment (6 x antenna apertures, 1 x transmission dish, and 7 x equipment cabinets) to the roof of existing building and ancillary development thereto. **Planning permission refused 20/04/2023.**

#### Reason for refusal:

- 1) The proposed telecommunications equipment located at roof level, by reason of its design, size, height, number, and location, would result in visual clutter which would detract from the character and appearance of the host property and the Dartmouth Park Conservation and Neighbourhood Areas, and would cause harm to the openness and character of the nearby public parks, as well as the settings of neighbouring conservation areas and the adjacent Grade II\* Listed church building (St Mary Brookfield).

**2021/0598/P** – Installation of electronic communications equipment on rooftop comprising 6 x antennas on tripod structures, 4 x dishes, 8 x cabinets and ancillary works, including 1 x meter cabinet at ground level on public highway. **Planning permission refused 03/08/2021.**

#### Reason for refusal:

- 1) The proposed electronic communication equipment located at roof level, by reason of its design, size, height, number and location, would result in visual clutter which would detract from the character and appearance of the host property and the Dartmouth Park Conservation and Neighbourhood Areas, and would cause harm to the openness and character of the nearby public parks, as well as, the settings of neighbouring conservation areas and the adjacent Grade II\* Listed church building (St. Mary Brookfield).

**PE9800146** – Installation of 3 cabinets and raised platform at roof level in connection with telecommunications equipment. **Prior Approval granted 23/03/1998.**

**9501040** – Installation of a handrail and telecommunications facilities on the roof including 6 antennae, 3 cabins, and one radio transmitter dish. **Planning permission granted 17/11/1995.**

### Other application sites

#### Tavis House, 1-6 Tavistock Square

**2023/0651/P** – Installation of a telecoms base station with installation of 6 antennas, 2 transmission dishes, a power supply cabinet, two flatpack frames and ancillary development. **Prior approval refused 05/04/2023.**

#### Reason for refusal:

- 1) The proposed equipment, by reason of its design, siting, height, size, and prominence, would be detrimental to the appearance of the host building and character and appearance of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area and the setting of nearby listed buildings.

Hillview, 2-4 Primrose Hill Road

**2020/4214/P** – Installation of telecommunications equipment at main roof level including 6 pole-mounted antennas, 2 x 300mm dishes, 4 cabinets and ancillary works thereto. **Prior approval refused 04/11/2020 and dismissed at appeal 07/12/2021 (APP/X5210/W/21/3274361).**

Reason for refusal:

- 1) The proposals, by reason of their location, scale, height, and design, would result in visual rooftop clutter which would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host property, local views including those from Primrose Hill, the nearby Primrose Hill Conservation Area and the setting of adjacent listed buildings.

## **Relevant policies**

**National Planning Policy Framework 2024**

**The London Plan 2021**

**Camden Local Plan 2017**

- **A1** Managing the impact of development
- **A2** Open Space
- **D1** Design
- **D2** Heritage

**Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Plan 2020**

- **DC2** Heritage assets
- **DC3** Requirement for good design
- **ES1** Green and open spaces

**Camden Planning Guidance**

- CPG Amenity (Jan 2021)
- CPG Design (Jan 2021)
- CPG Digital Infrastructure (Mar 2018)
- CPG Public Open Space (Jan 2021)

**Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy 2009**

**Code of Best Practice on Mobile Network Development (November 2016)**

**Draft Camden Local Plan**

The Council has published a new Draft Camden Local Plan (incorporating Site Allocations) for consultation (DCLP). The DCLP is a material consideration and can be taken into account in the determination of planning applications, but has limited weight at this stage. The weight that can be given to it will increase as it progresses towards adoption (anticipated 2026).



### 1. Proposal

- 1.1. The application has been submitted under part 16 of schedule 2 of the town and country planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order (GDPO) 2015 (as amended). The GDPO sets out the details in regards to the type of development for which planning permission is 'deemed' to be granted, more commonly known as 'permitted development'. In particular, the application seeks determination as to whether the prior approval of the Local Planning Authority is required as to the siting and appearance of the proposed development in relation to telecommunications equipment.
- 1.2. In this instance, prior approval is sought to install new telecommunications equipment on the existing rooftop area. The proposal includes the installation of three antennas, one transmission dish, and five cabinets, along with ancillary safety railings and cabling. Whilst telecommunications equipment has been installed on the rooftop previously (see 'relevant history' section of this report), there is currently no significant existing equipment in situ. The proposal therefore involves the installation of new equipment to a new rooftop site and the establishment of a new base station. This would provide improved connectivity in network enhancement (including 5G coverage) to the surrounding areas on behalf of established electronic communications operators, EE and H3G.
- 1.3. The height of the main roof of the existing building (not including the roof access structure positioned to the centre of the roof) is approximately 19.3m above ground level, and including the roof access structure, the highest point is approximately 22.1m above ground level. There are a very limited number of guardrails present to the roof, which are sited at necessary locations rather than lining the perimeter of the roof.
- 1.4. The antenna and dish installations are proposed to be sited to the roof, along with the additional cabinets. The antennas would be comprised of three main installations fixed to the north, east, and south of the existing roof access structure, and the transmission dish would be located to the southeast corner of the roof. The antennas shall rise above the existing highest point of the roof (including the roof access structure) by approximately 3.4m, resulting in a maximum height of 25.5m – however, each of the support structures for the antennas would rise above by 4.1m, resulting in a maximum height of 26.2m. The transmission dish would be approximately 3.1m tall, and the safety railings around the relevant parts of the roof would be approximately 1.1m tall (in line with safety requirements). The new cabinets would be installed as part of a plant area to the immediate south of the roof access structure, positioned on a steelwork frame, and an access ladder would be installed to the roof access structure, along with additional safety railings to the top of this.
- 1.5. It is noted that previous applications for very similar works have been refused at this site in recent years, in 2023 (2022/4190/P) and 2021 (2021/0598/P). These applications were for planning permission (rather than prior approval) and were both refused as a result of the impact of the proposed works on the character and appearance of the host property and the Dartmouth Park Conservation and Neighbourhood Areas, the openness and character of the nearby public parks, and the settings of neighbouring conservation areas and the adjacent Grade II\* listed church building.

### 2. Justification

- 2.1. The proposal is a new installation intended to enhance existing network services by increasing capacity and allowing for new 5G provision in the area. It would provide replacement and enhanced 2G and 4G coverage for EE and 4G for H3G. The site would also provide 5G coverage for both EE and H3G.
- 2.2. The applicant has provided confirmation of a sequential approach to site selection

for the proposal that has been adopted; this outlines how alternative sites nearby were considered but not chosen. However, the detail given for a number of these options is limited, specifically when considering the impact on the level of coverage; the information provided for a number of locations states that the coverage would be lower than the application site, but does not give any specific figures or maps to demonstrate this or make clear how much lower the coverage would be. Given that for a number of sites it does not state that the coverage requirement would not be met, it can be assumed that these could provide alternative sites for the development (albeit with reduced coverage levels). It is also not clear why Hill House would be an inappropriate site for the development. The supplementary information states that this site was the original location of equipment for EE and H3G (prior to redevelopment), but does not make clear why it would not be possible to re-provide at this site, other than indicating a preference for Crestview due to its ability to improve coverage to the south-west.

2.3. The applicant has confirmed that, prior to submission of this application, a pre-application consultation request was sent to Camden Council on 07/11/2024. Following the Council's response on 14/11/2024 to confirm that pre-application would entail a fee of £1217.50, the applicant decided not to proceed with pre-application advice. On the same date that the pre-application request was sent to the Council (07/11/2024), the applicant also sent out pre-application consultation letters to Ward Councillors, the relevant Member of Parliament, three schools in the general area of the site, and residents of the host property and neighbouring buildings. Letters were also sent to Heathrow Airport and London City Airport ahead of submission of the application, both of which confirmed that they have no objections to the proposal.

2.4. The applicant has declared with appropriate documentation that all of the proposed equipment would comply with the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) standards and guidelines.

2.5. Chapter 10 (Supporting high quality communications) of the National Planning Policy Framework sets out the approach that Local Authorities should take with regards to development involving electronic communications. Paragraph 123 also states that "*local planning authorities must determine applications on planning grounds only. They should not seek to prevent competition between different operators, question the need for an electronic communications system, or set health safeguards different from the International Commission guidelines for public exposure*". The NPPF does also state in paragraph 120 that "*the number of radio and electronic communications masts, and the sites for such installations, should be kept to a minimum consistent with the needs of consumers, the efficient operation of the network, and providing reasonable capacity for future expansion... equipment should be sympathetically designed and camouflaged where appropriate*".

### **3. Siting and appearance**

3.1. The host property is located at a prominent position on Dartmouth Park Hill, immediately at the intersection with Dartmouth Park Road; due to the topography of the surrounding area, the streets to the west (Laurier Road and Dartmouth Park Road) slope up to the application site, which appears dominant in views up these roads.

3.2. The building itself is a non-listed residential building dating from the 1960s. It is six storeys tall from Dartmouth Park Hill, though due to the change in ground level along Dartmouth Park Road and Laurier Road, also includes garages below ground level (but accessed from the street on Laurier Road). The host building is located within Dartmouth Park Conservation Area and Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Area, and it is considered to make a negative contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

3.3. The building is located at one of the highest points of Dartmouth Park Hill and the top of Dartmouth Park Road. As such, it is highly visible from a number of locations and

directions, and can be appreciated in many views from the surrounding area. This includes from neighbouring streets such as Laurier Road, Dartmouth Park Road, York Rise, and Boscastle Road (see Figure 1 below). The building itself is also substantially taller in comparison with neighbouring buildings in the surrounding area, which are mostly lower-level residential properties of around 2-3 storeys. The only building which reads as being of a similar height is St Mary Brookfield, the Grade II\* listed church immediately opposite the road south of the site. Therefore, due to its location, siting, and scale, the host building is already emphasised and extremely prominent within the area.



Figure 1: The application site as viewed from Laurier Road (left) and the intersection of Dartmouth Park Road and York Rise (right).

3.4. Although the building itself is recognised as contributing negatively to the character and appearance of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area, it is noted that the rooftop is notably clear of visual clutter and has a relatively simple form (with the exception of the white painted roof access structure). It is also recognised that the residents of Crestview have spent time attempting to declutter the roof space through measures such as the removal of external aerials and dishes. Although the building is a negative contributor, the simple form of the building and the lack of further additions to the roof allow it to avoid attracting unwarranted attention in spite of its prominent location.

3.5. The site is also located in close proximity to open spaces, including Hampstead Heath and Dartmouth Park. Due to the site's elevated location and the significant contrast with surrounding buildings, the roofscape of Crestview is highly visible from a number of local park views and public vantage points, such as Parliament Hill and Dartmouth Park and Reservoir. Due to the flat roof and lack of surrounding buildings, any further addition to the roof of the building would be highly visible and notable within the skyline from various points within the spaces and parks identified (see Figure 2 below).



Figure 2: The application site, as viewed from Dartmouth Park and Reservoir (left) and Parliament Hill, Hampstead Heath (right). St Mary Brookfield Church visible in both pictures.

- 3.6. Local Plan policies D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) make clear that the Council will aim to secure high quality design in development that gives careful consideration of the characteristics of a site to allow it to integrate into its surroundings, and will resist proposals that cause harm to the character or appearance of conservation areas and the significance of listed buildings, including through impacting their settings. Additionally, policy A2 (Open space) aims to protect all designated open spaces, including resisting development that would be detrimental to the setting of designated open spaces.
- 3.7. The Council's Local Plan policies are supported by the Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Plan, including policies DC2 (Heritage assets), DC3 (Requirement for good design), and ES1 (Green and open spaces). These aim to protect conservation areas and listed buildings within the neighbourhood area, ensure that development respects the character of the local area, and preserve and enhance the open feel and prevent harm to the visual character of the area.
- 3.8. As set out above, any installation of equipment to the uncluttered roof of the application building would be highly visible from multiple directions around the site. The result of this would be that any installation would create intrusive and conspicuous visual clutter on a rooftop otherwise clear of such additions. Additionally, the close proximity to the Grade II\* listed building combined with the relatively similar heights of the two structures, means that the two buildings are almost always appreciated together. As such, any development to the roof of Crestview will necessarily impact on the setting of St Mary Brookfield, due to the fact that additional equipment would rise above the height of the church building and appear as a dominant addition. The church is notable in that it is one of the highest buildings in the immediate area, with the surrounding development being restrained in height and featuring uncluttered roofs; the exception to this being Crestview, which reads as a similar height in most views, as shown in Figure 2 above. Excluding Crestview, the lack of competition from other buildings emphasises the building's importance in the streetscape and conservation area, and its setting therefore contributes to its special significance. As such, any further addition to the roof of the application building would add height and additional clutter, which would therefore negatively impact the setting of the heritage asset and views of the building, (whether that be in the foreground or background) and subsequent harm the listed building's special significance and the conservation area.
- 3.9. Although it is acknowledged that the extent of equipment has been reduced compared to previous refusals for planning permission at the site, this application for prior approval must be considered on its own merit. The proposed equipment would still mean an increase in height of 4.1m from the highest point of Crestview, which is approximately a quarter of the height of the main building. When taken together, the rooftop additions (both the roof access and the antennas) would reach 6.75m, which is over a third of the height of the main building. It is accepted that attempting to camouflage the equipment would likely result in a more visually prominent appearance, however the inability to either conceal or sensitively design the equipment would mean that it would have an unavoidable impact on the building, wider Conservation Area, and adjacent listed building.
- 3.10. The existing roofline of the building is largely unimpaired and free from telecommunications equipment or other similar and visible clutter. The prominence and scale of equipment proposed would mean that the works would be clearly visible from a number of elevations, as well as from both close proximity and afar (including from within designated open spaces).
- 3.11. Whilst it is understood that electronic communications equipment is unlikely to integrate with all environments due to their function, design, and aesthetic, the proposed installation would be particularly at odds with the environment and context at Crestview. This is particularly important given the very close proximity to a Grade II\* Listed building, which would be harmed by the proposed equipment's impact on its setting. The submitted

supplementary information document does note the heritage impacts of the proposal, however this mostly notes the lack of architectural or historic merit of Crestview and the less than substantial harm to the listed building. The reduction from previous schemes of six antennas to three antennas is also noted, though as detailed above, this does not alleviate the concerns regarding the impact on the listed building. The reduction in the extent of equipment would reduce the amount of visual clutter, however the addition of any such equipment would necessarily have an imposing and overbearing impact on the listed building. The appeal decision referenced in this document is also not relevant to this application, not least for the fact that the appeal site was in a very commercial location and the setting of the listed buildings is completely different to that of St Mary Brookfield.

#### **4. Planning balance**

- 4.1. Considerable importance and weight have been attached to the harm to the designated heritage assets, and special attention has been paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area, under s.72 of the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990.
- 4.2. Policies D1 and D2 of the Local Plan, consistent with Section 16 (Conserving and enhancing the historic environment) of the National Planning Policy Framework 2024, states that the Council will not permit harm to a designated heritage asset, including conservation areas and listed buildings, unless it can be demonstrated that the harm is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm.
- 4.3. Given the assessment as outlined above, it is considered that the installation of the proposed telecommunications equipment would result in 'less than substantial' harm to the setting of the listed building (specifically; St Mary Brookfield) and the character and appearance of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area. It is recognised that the proposed scheme would result in better network coverage, and as such, some public benefit would be derived from the scheme. However, in weighing the harm caused as a result of the development against this public benefit, the proposal is considered to be contrary to Section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which seeks to preserve heritage assets.
- 4.4. The Council does not dispute the public benefit entailed by improving connectivity and does indeed welcome this aspiration; however, the harm arising from the prominent visibility of the proposed equipment to the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area and the significance of the adjacent Grade II\* listed building is considered to outweigh this public benefit. It is therefore considered that the heritage constraints of this site prevent the Council from recommending for approval.
- 4.5. The proposal would therefore fail to accord with policies D1 and D2 of the London Borough of Camden Plan 2017, as well as policies DC2 and DC3 of the Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Plan 2020.

#### **5. Recommendation**

- 5.1. It is considered that Prior Approval is required and it is recommended that Prior Approval is refused, on the grounds that the proposal, by way of its design, siting, height, size, and prominence, would be detrimental to the appearance of the host building, the character and appearance of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area, and the significance of the nearby listed building (St Mary Brookfield).
- 5.2. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policies D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan and policies DC2 (Heritage assets) and DC3 (Requirement for good design) of the Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Plan 2020.