

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/4559/P	Linda Bourn	20/11/2020 11:06:07	OBJ	<p>This is the objection that I emailed to the council on 11/11/20</p> <p>I expected that my objection would have been posted on this website along with the accompanying images. It is vital that these are made available to people who are looking at this application. The company's photographs, as mentioned below, are completely misleading.</p> <p>The images are part of my grounds for my objections.</p> <p>I have put in another request that these should appear speedily.</p> <p>Visual Impact</p> <p>I am pleased that, this time, the company has recognised that Haddo House is a noted building.</p> <p>The estate is regarded as a modernist treasure.</p> <p>It features in the Camden entry for 'A Guide to Modernism in Metroland' which celebrates Modernist and Art Deco buildings.</p> <p>It is included in the North London Guide by architectural historian Sir Nikolaus Pevsner.</p> <p>Unfortunately, the 'tweak to the design on sector 3' (Additional information document) isn't a sufficient improvement.</p> <p>Parliament Hill</p> <p>The photograph on page 10 of the Heritage impact assessment document Fig 4 (mislabelled Fig 1), is misleading.</p> <p>It does not show the view from Parliament Hill. It is a view of part of Parliament Hill.</p> <p>Here is a view of Haddo House from the slopes of Parliament Hill.</p> <p>MISSING PHOTOGRAPH</p> <p>View from Glenhurst Avenue</p> <p>Images 1a and 1b from the Photo Montage pack are also misleading.</p> <p>The company hopes that the works will be 'camouflaged by the colour of the building' and the 'bright backdrop of the skyline'.</p> <p>Here is a clearer image of Haddo House taken from Glenhurst Avenue.</p> <p>MISSING PHOTOGRAPH</p> <p>Community Consultation</p> <p>The Site-Specific Supplementary Information and Design Access document on pages 1 and 2 states that consultation letters were sent on 22nd November 2019.</p> <p>This appears to be referring to planning application 2020/1456/P which was rejected.</p> <p>There has been no consultation for this application.</p> <p>The company seems to be assuming that there was no need to consult the community (not even the residents</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>of Haddo House), perhaps because nothing much has changed-just a 'tweak to sector 3'.</p> <p>If this is the case, they must also accept that all the previous objections still stand. That includes the petition of more than 60 residents of the estate who registered their objection.</p> <p>As before, we are presented with this during 'lockdown' making community discussion hard.</p> <p>I wish to register my objection to this planning application.</p>
2020/4559/P	Emma White	22/11/2020 18:31:28	OBJ	<p>I object to the planning application on the following grounds:</p> <p>This is a residential block of homes and not a commercial property. As a Council block there are families and vulnerable people living here who need to and have a right to feel secure and safe in their homes.</p> <p>There are unanswered questions about the potential impact on people's health at a time when there is much anxiety about risks to health due to Corona. Stress has an impact on health in that it lowers immunity and at present residents are already managing many concerns about health and income security.</p> <p>This architecturally special block lies on a junction with significant views of it across the protected area of Dartmouth Park. The Ariel would disrupt this view and create an eye sore.</p> <p>Residents in the block and surrounding area should have a say in decisions that impact their lives and wellbeing</p>

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

2020/4559/P	Gus Cavanagh	20/11/2020 14:19:45	OBJ	
-------------	--------------	---------------------	-----	--

I wish to object to this planning application on the following grounds:

1. The application 2020/4559/P closely resembles the earlier application 2020/1456/P which was rejected.
2. ANY addition to the roof would be visually harmful and harm the character of the building.

As suggested by Nathaniel Young - Camden's Planning Officer

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.

3. Choice - the majority of residents have already expressed their objections and this needs to be taken into consideration.

4. I have concerns regarding 5G on the impact on health and the environment, results are inconclusive regardless 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.