

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:
2021/0598/P	MARGARET SHANKS	12/04/2021 14:41:02	COMMENT

Printed on: 14/04/2021 09:10:05

Response:

I object to application number 2021/0958/P.

While the aim of the proposal might be to make general improvements to connectivity with the roll-out of 5G, such as in Camden's Knowledge Quarter for businesses and academic institutions, the telecoms infrastructure would not provide any direct benefit to the residents on whose roof the telecoms equipment is intended to be installed.

Crestview is a residential block of flats. Given the existing negative impact of 3G and 4G on terrestrial television reception, the impact of 5G installations on residents in Crestview and neighbouring residents would be even greater. If the planning application were approved, many local residents might be forced to incur the cost of changing to satellite reception.

In the application, Site Specific Supplementary Information states 3900A Cabinet, H3G APM5930 Cabinet and EE APM5930 Cabinet, failing to state that these are manufactured by Huawei. The initial period for a telecoms agreement is usually 10 years. In December 2020, according to the UK government, such Huawei equipment would have to be removed by 2027. The applicant must have or should have been fully aware of this when the application was registered on 22 March 2021. This leads to the conclusion that application lacks transparency.

Site Specific Supplementary Information correctly states that Crestview is 'a six-storey building in residential use', whereas the design drawings show an inaccurate, larger number of storeys, balconies and garages, differing from those which actually exist. This inaccuracy is misleading, thereby making our building look larger.

Only one site elevation is submitted, although the top of the building with the potential apparatus protruding from the rooftop into the skyline would be clearly visible from all sides. No photomontage is provided.

Site Specific Supplementary Information also states 'An installation, comprising pole mounted antennas and equipment cabinets was housed on the building between approximately 1995 and 2007' and the applicant claims that 'the fact that the building was previously considered appropriate to accommodate telecommunications equipment is relevant.'

Whether the applicant has full knowledge of the complicated history of how the one-time telecoms installation came about and was later removed after legal action, suffice it to say the following: In 2000, Planning Application PEX0000653 for full planning permission was submitted by ORANGE PERSONAL COMMUNICATIONS (cell GLN0528) to install telecoms equipment on Crestview's roof. In December 2000, Camden Planning informed the applicant that 'the installation of telecommunications equipment has recently become very contentious'. By letter dated 22 January 2001 the applicant was informed that Camden Council had withdrawn the said Planning Application.

The current applicant's justification for its larger telecoms development in 2021 on the grounds that 'the building was previously considered appropriate to accommodate telecommunications equipment' is, therefore, not a viable justification.

Printed on: 14/04/2021 09:10:05

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

Conservation Area:

As Crestview is within the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area, the change to the roof-form by the telecoms installations would be unacceptable as they would be visible both from street level and public realm viewpoints. The installations would impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring buildings in terms of outlook.

Alterations to the roof-form are a matter of concern as they can be seen from a considerable distance within and beyond the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area.

Our block of flats is directly opposite the Church of Saint Mary Brookfield, a Grade II* listed building designed by William Butterfield and consecrated in 1875. The roof ridge line of the church is at an almost identical level with Crestviews. The impact of telecoms equipment on our roof would, therefore, cause visual harm, in particular, because the applicant stated that the proposed antennae 'need to be located close to the edge of Crestviews roof.

The proposed trunking running from pavement level all the way up the South Elevation to our roof would be unsightly.

Given their design and siting, their scale and height, the proposed incongruous antennae and accompanying fixtures would create dominant rooftop clutter. This would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area which is contiguous with St John's Grove, (Islington) Conservation Area. Other nearby Conservation Areas are the Holly Lodge Estate Conservation Area and the Camden Highgate Conservation Area. The proposed telecoms installations would have a detrimental effect on the visual amenity of these Conservation Areas.

As stated in The London Plan of March 2021, 'London's heritage assets and historic environment are irreplaceable'.

2021/0598/1 Doone Forsyth 13/04/2021 10:18:47 OBJ

Hello, my name is Doone, I am a resident at Crestview and I strongly object to the installation of telecommunications devices and equipment on the rooftop.

████████████████████ in the building for the foreseeable future and am deeply concerned with the effect these devices may have on ████████████████████. We chose to live at Crestview with the ████████████████████ and this is not what we expected and is causing worry.

Thank you for reading my objection.

Kind regards
Doone

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:	Printed on: 14/04/2021 09:10:05
2021/0598/P	George MacKay	13/04/2021 10:08:35	OBJ	<p>Hello there,</p> <p>Thank you for reading</p> <p>I strongly object to the installation of all telecommunications equipment, ancillary works and changes to the building.</p> <p>Firstly, as a member of the Crestview, and Dartmouth Park Community, I object vehemently on the grounds that such changes will damage the unique and special feeling of the area.</p> <p>This is not just a question of aesthetics, but the fundamental changes the installation of this equipment will do to the mental well being of those inside the property and surrounding area.</p> <p>Secondly, on a very personal note, my partner and I, who reside in Crestview [REDACTED] and genuinely fear for [REDACTED] given the proximity to which we will be living with these telecommunication devices.</p> <p>We will be looking to limit the [REDACTED] to cellular devices and electromagnetic waves in the household, and the installation of large and powerful communication equipment on the roof of the building, and the possible effect this may have on [REDACTED] is something we are truly fearful of.</p> <p>Thank you again for reading, and all the very best,</p> <p>George MacKay</p>	
2021/0598/P	Richard Keep	13/04/2021 11:25:52	OBJ	<p>I am a resident of Laurier Road and object to these proposals. The proposed location of the masts falls within the Dartmouth Park conservation area and is proposed in possibly the most prominent location along one of the nicest views. These will be a huge eyesore. While I recognise the need to improve infrastructure if they were located 100 yards further up Dartmouth Park Hill they would do the same job but in a more discreet location.</p>	

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/0598/P	Holly Churchill	13/04/2021 14:54:12	OBJ	<p>I strongly object to the proposal for electronic communications to be placed on the roof of Crestview. The plans show that the installation of these antennas, dishes and supporting structures are very large and intrusive on a residential block of flats. They would undoubtedly alter the appearance of the area, as well as the flats, which are located in the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area. The flats are opposite a grade II listed church and the proposed technology would be visible on the horizon from a very large area, considerably changing the aesthetic of the area in a negative way. The application does not make it clear how the implementation will benefit the local area or residents.</p> <p>Furthermore the site drawing (265-rev A-south elevation) is incorrect. It shows the block as having 7 floors (even though only 6 balcony levels have been drawn), therefore showing the little care and attention that has been put in by Waldons. It also makes the ratios of the antennas etc seem less intrusive against the size of the building than they will in reality be.</p> <p>I also object on the grounds that 5G may cause considerable disruption to the signals received by residents for televisions. This may lead people to need to get satellite dishes, further impacting the conservation area. I also object to any noise and vibrations that might be caused by the technology. Crestview was built in the 1960s so I have concerns about the impact of such huge amounts of equipment on an asphalt roof that was not designed to hold such technology.</p> <p>The fact that this planning application has been named as 'commercial minor alterations' seems ridiculous, considering the major alteration this will make to Crestview residents, local residents, and the views around North London. As a resident of the block I strongly object.</p>
2021/0598/P	Ben Ackland	13/04/2021 14:53:46	OBJ	<p>Objecting to impact of noise, vibration and aesthetics for surrounding buildings/Heath. Also, these masts are not permitted to be installed on schools, so why are they OK on a building with 30+ residents?</p>

Printed on: 14/04/2021 09:10:05

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/0598/P	Lucie Green	13/04/2021 11:06:40	OBJ	<p>Objection to proposed mast development on Crest view Flats</p> <p>We purchased our Flat in Crest View apartments due to it's location, peace and security as a safe haven and feel these aspects will be severely undermined by the proposed development. I strongly object to the proposed mast development as being inappropriate in the conservation area. Further details are below:</p> <p>Due to their siting and appearance the proposed antennas, dishes and supporting structures would</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. appear as dominant and discordant additions to the roof of the building within this location, and would therefore cause harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the setting of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area.2. be visible on the skyline for a considerable distance and would impact on the visual amenity of Hampstead Heath and other surrounding areas3. the application does not demonstrate that there is a greater good that might be gained from implementing the proposals4. the application is ill considered and silent on the potential impact on terrestrial television reception for residents in the neighbourhood. The impact of 3G and 4G installations on terrestrial television reception is already recognised, the impact of 5G installations is known to be greater. If the application's proposals are permitted many local residents may be forced to incur the cost of changing to satellite reception. A proliferation of satellite dishes would be of further detriment to the Conservation Area and its surrounds.5. the greater communications benefit that the proposals may claim to provide can be provided via other means which are not detrimental to the Conservation Area and surrounding areas.6. The application's proposals are contrary to the policies of the London Plan and the London Borough of Camden.

Printed on: 14/04/2021 09:10:05

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/0598/P	James Green	13/04/2021 10:36:10	OBJ	<p>Update to my objection received by council on 08/04/2021 12:28</p> <p>I would wish to add the following additional items to my objection to the mast development already submitted.</p> <p>Due to their siting and appearance the proposed antennas, dishes and supporting structures would</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. appear as dominant and discordant additions to the roof of the building within this location, and would therefore cause harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the setting of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area.2. be visible on the skyline for a considerable distance and would impact on the visual amenity of Hampstead Heath and other surrounding areas3. the application does not demonstrate that there is a greater good that might be gained from implementing the proposals4. the application is ill considered and silent on the potential impact on terrestrial television reception for residents in the neighbourhood. The impact of 3G and 4G installations on terrestrial television reception is already recognised, the impact of 5G installations is known to be greater. If the application's proposals are permitted many local residents may be forced to incur the cost of changing to satellite reception. A proliferation of satellite dishes would be of further detriment to the Conservation Area and its surrounds.5. the greater communications benefit that the proposals may claim to provide can be provided via other means which are not detrimental to the Conservation Area and surrounding areas.6. The application's proposals are contrary to the policies of the London Plan and the London Borough of Camden. <p>Thank you.</p>

Printed on: 14/04/2021 09:10:05

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/0598/P	Lesley Stevas	13/04/2021 10:16:39	OBJ	<p>I strongly object to this application.</p> <p>This is a conservation area and in the Best Code of Practice 2016 p.30 it states 'In conservation areas, special attention should be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the conservation area'. This application does not do that, the masts will be an eyesore and can be seen from all angles. The antenna and excess of roof services create far too much clutter. The railings on this building will be visible from many angles. Both masts and railings are ugly and intrusive. They are detrimental to the ambience of this space, to the detriment of the residents and members of the public.</p> <p>I think that it is clear that more antennae will be added or changed over time, making the initial application just the start. This omission prevents the public from making a meaningful representation now.</p> <p>According to 2016 Code of best practice on mobile network development in England: The design principles have not been observed. The plans are not three dimensional so the public cannot obtain a proper understanding of what the equipment will look like. There is therefore no appreciation of context.</p> <p>The plans are defective in that they do not show the near view aspects of the proposed work and they do not respect the distant vistas. Crestview dominates the skyline when travelling up either Dartmouth Park Road and Laurier Road and the proposed antennas and their equipment would increase the height of the roof thus spoiling the skyline forever. They would be visible from Hampstead Heath, Highgate, Islington and Tufnell Park.</p> <p>There are residents in the area who have [REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>Sunday School [REDACTED] at the church and events in the church hall. Their health will be put at risk if this application is approved.</p> <p>Camden has an obligation to safeguard the health of its residents as provided for in Section 2B of the National Health Service Act 2006:</p> <p>2B Functions of local authorities and Secretary of State as to improvement of public health</p> <p>(1) Each local authority must take such steps as it considers appropriate for improving the health of the people in its area.'</p> <p>If this application is granted then I shall not be able to visit the area without becoming affected by the installation. It will cause a loss of amenity for me.</p> <p>Recently JML Law of Los Angeles, CA announced that it has won a major appeal in the Californian Court of Appeal that established that a plaintiff who pleads symptoms and physical manifestations of 'electromagnetic hypersensitivity' has adequately alleged that they suffer from a 'physical disability' under California Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA).</p> <p>A precedent has been set and it won't be long before it happens here in the United Kingdom.</p> <p>https://www.accesswire.com/viewarticle.aspx?id=637661&token=hziivngfkuma2h2xz6rhu</p> <p>Loss of amenity to residents.</p> <p>I fully accept that it is not the role of the planning officers or the councillors on the planning committees to consider the health risks, nor to consider the validity of health issues or their personal beliefs in those issues. However, it is their responsibility to consider the vast amounts of new research pointing to serious health implications affecting the lives of residents near to mobile phone masts. It is clear that worrying about the implications to one's health from mobile phone masts, especially if the mast is 5G which has caused many concerns lately and it is going to be situated on top of or close to one's home.</p> <p>There are residents for whom, just by reason of the proposal of a base station on their roof, will suffer from</p>

Printed on: 14/04/2021 09:10:05

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>extreme anxiety. It is the perceived health risk which will cause loss of amenity irrespective of whether the danger is perceived or real. The proposal has already caused a considerable amount of anxiety, worry and stress. These ill effects will be intensified if the application was to be approved.</p> <p>I understand that Mobile UK has launched a 5GChecktheFacts Campaign being sent to all council planning departments, of course this is weighted on their side, they have a vested interest in promoting 5G. The ICNIRP guidelines, mentioned within it, such as they are, pertain to a 'general population' and make no allowance for particular and vulnerable groups who will be found in many communities.</p> <p>Camden must refuse this application.</p>
2021/0598/P	Duncan Frost	13/04/2021 14:19:50	OBJ	<p>The proposed equipment is in complete conflict with the aesthetic of the surrounding area. How planning permission could possibly be granted for such an installation in a conservation area is beyond me, never mind the fact that it will be visible for miles around.</p> <p>Ugly architectural design's negative impact on mental health is well documented. I would hope that the planning committee take this into consideration rather than be led by pure pragmatism, especially in light of this past year's events and their impact on mental health.</p>

Printed on: 14/04/2021 09:10:05

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021-0598/P	Lesley Stevas	13/04/2021 10:14:02	COMMENT	<p>I strongly object to this application.</p> <p>This is a conservation area and in the Best Code of Practice 2016 p.30 it states 'In conservation areas, special attention should be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the conservation area'. This application does not do that, the masts will be an eyesore and can be seen from all angles. The antenna and excess of roof services create far too much clutter. The railings on this building will be visible from many angles. Both masts and railings are ugly and intrusive. They are detrimental to the ambience of this space, to the detriment of the residents and members of the public.</p> <p>I think that it is clear that more antennae will be added or changed over time, making the initial application just the start. This omission prevents the public from making a meaningful representation now.</p> <p>According to 2016 Code of best practice on mobile network development in England: The design principles have not been observed. The plans are not three dimensional so the public cannot obtain a proper understanding of what the equipment will look like. There is therefore no appreciation of context.</p> <p>The plans are defective in that they do not show the near view aspects of the proposed work and they do not respect the distant vistas. Crestview dominates the skyline when travelling up either Dartmouth Park Road and Laurier Road and the proposed antennas and their equipment would increase the height of the roof thus spoiling the skyline forever. They would be visible from Hampstead Heath, Highgate, Islington and Tufnell Park.</p> <p>There are residents in the area [REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>Sunday School [REDACTED] at the church and events in the church hall. Their health will be put at risk if this application is approved.</p> <p>Camden has an obligation to safeguard the health of its residents as provided for in Section 2B of the National Health Service Act 2006:</p> <p>2B Functions of local authorities and Secretary of State as to improvement of public health</p> <p>(1) Each local authority must take such steps as it considers appropriate for improving the health of the people in its area.'</p> <p>If this application is granted then I shall not be able to visit the area without becoming affected by the installation. It will cause a loss of amenity for me.</p> <p>Recently JML Law of Los Angeles, CA announced that it has won a major appeal in the Californian Court of Appeal that established that a plaintiff who pleads symptoms and physical manifestations of 'electromagnetic hypersensitivity' has adequately alleged that they suffer from a 'physical disability' under California Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA).</p> <p>A precedent has been set and it won't be long before it happens here in the United Kingdom.</p> <p>https://www.accesswire.com/viewarticle.aspx?id=637661&token=hziyngfkuma2h2xz6rhu</p> <p>Loss of amenity to residents</p> <p>I fully accept that it is not the role of the planning officers or the councillors on the planning committees to consider the health risks, nor to consider the validity of health issues or their personal beliefs in those issues. However, it is their responsibility to consider the vast amounts of new research pointing to serious health implications affecting the lives of residents near to mobile phone masts. It is clear that worrying about the implications to one's health from mobile phone masts, especially if the mast is 5G which has caused many concerns lately and it is going to be situated on top of or close to one's home.</p> <p>There are residents for whom, just by reason of the proposal of a base station on their roof, will suffer from</p>

Printed on: 14/04/2021 09:10:05

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment:

Response:

extreme anxiety. It is the perceived health risk which will cause loss of amenity irrespective of whether the danger is perceived or real. The proposal has already caused a considerable amount of anxiety, worry and stress. These ill effects will be intensified if the application was to be approved.

I understand that Mobile UK has launched a 5GChecktheFacts Campaign being sent to all council planning departments, of course this is weighted on their side, they have a vested interest in promoting 5G. The ICNIRP guidelines, mentioned within it, such as they are, pertain to a 'general population' and make no allowance for particular and vulnerable groups who will be found in many communities.

Camden must refuse this application.
