Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Printed on: 16/11/2020 09:10:05			
Application 140: 2020/4559/P	Georgiou Georgiou	Keceived: 15/11/2020 19:23:47	OBJ	 Response: We wish to object to this planning application on the following grounds: The application 2020/4559/P closely resembles the earlier application 2020/1456/P which was rejected. The application site is a relatively high residential block of 7 storeys which is surrounded by low level housing along Gordon House Road, Highgate Road, Chetwynd Road and Glenhurst Avenue. As a result of this contrast between the height of the host property and the low level neighbouring properties, and the setting of the host building with open space surrounding it, the roof of Haddo House is clearly visible in short, medium and long range views from a variety of vantage points including Parliament Hill. Therefore, even if the equipment and antennae were to be located into a more discreet position in the middle of the roof, they would still be very prominent and would cause unacceptable visual harm to both the building and local area. Choice - majority of residents have already expressed their objections and this needs to taken into consideration. We have concerns regarding 5G on the impact on health and the environment, results are inconclusive irregardless of the apparent scientific data that backs up the applicant. Currently, there are 2 judicial reviews in process and until the findings have been fully examined we urge the council to prioritise the safety of its residents. 			
2020/4559/P	Linda Bourn	11/11/2020 12:37:10	OBJ	I am unable to paste images into this space. Please see additional email for my objections. I wish to register my objection to this planning application.			
2020/4559/P	St John Wright	15/11/2020 19:50:20	OBJ	I am the Chairman of the Lissenden Gardens Tenants Association and on behalf of the Committee who represent the residents, I want to object to the installation of telecommunications equipment on the roof of Haddo House, Highgate Road.This is a well known landmark in a Conservation Area and the skyline will be spoiled by the equipment that would be placed there. We support the residents of Haddo House in their objection but also we in Lissenden gardens would find it out of place, unsightly, and out of proportion on the skyline. We already raised objections when the same application was raised last year.			

					Printed on:	16/11/2020	0
Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:			
2020/4559/P	Frances Singer	15/11/2020 19:28:18	OBJ	This is a serious situation for those of us who fear the long term health consequences of	of 5G		
				Our objection is as follows:			
				We wish to object to this planning application on the following grounds:			
				1. The application 2020/4559/P closely resembles the earlier application 2020/14 rejected.	456/P which	was	
				 The application site is a relatively high residential block of 7 storeys which is surrounded b housing along Gordon House Road, Highgate Road, Chetwynd Road and Glenhurst Avenue. As a this contrast between the height of the host property and the low level neighbouring properties, and of the host building with open space surrounding it, the roof of Haddo House is clearly visible in sho and long range views from a variety of vantage points including Parliament Hill. Therefore, even if the equipment and antennae were to be located into a more discreet position in the middle of the roof, still be very prominent and would cause unacceptable visual harm to both the building and local are 3. Choice - majority of residents have already expressed their objections and this needs to ta consideration. We have concerns regarding 5G on the impact on health and the environment, results are inconclusive irregardless of the apparent scientific data that backs up the applicant. Currently, there judicial reviews in process and until the findings have been fully examined we urge the council to pr safety of its residents. 			

2020/4559/P natasha nuttall 15/11/2020 20:33:36 OBJ I object to this planning application, residents in this area have already objected to a similar application on the basis that we do not want this type of elem trivial signal structure so near to a highly populated area.

					Printed on:	16/11/2020	09:10:05
Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:			
2020/4559/P	Jeremy Walker	10/11/2020 20:22:31	OBJ	We object to the proposals on the following grounds:			
				1. Haddow House is in a prominent location in the conservation area and can be seen from many locations in the local area. Its roof scape is highly visible from Parliament Hill Mansions and Lissenden Mansions, and we assume Heath House. The building and its roof scape is also very prominently visible when viewed along Chetwynd Road, as one climbs up the hill from Dartmouth Park Road. The photo montages do not adequately represent the visual impact of these proposals, showing only perspective views from ground level near the building where they are least visible. The proposed masts would be prominently visible from many locations, both from their homes and from the street level.		ns, and we d along adequately near the	
				2. Haddow house is also a very striking example of modern architecture which has its is drama of the glaze stair enclosures. The design and massing of the roof scape with its carefully considered to scale down the massing of the building as it meets the sky and feature of the skyline when viewed from Lissenden Mansions. The proposals to install disfigure the building and be highly visible on the skyline, undermining the contribution the local area. The visual appearance equipment of this type also gives the impression neglect of the building and its immediate area; Haddow House deserves better.	water tanks I is an intere nobile mast this building	s has been esting ts would g makes to	
				3. For all of the above reasons the proposals would therefore also have a negative imp area, and as outlined above would be visible from many locations in the area, includin peak of Chetwynd Road.			
				4. This proposal has already been rejected in a previous application and should therefore same grounds.	ore be refus	ed on the	