

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/1813/P	Terence Bendixson	29/05/2021 23:03:52	OBJ	<p>Madam or Sir</p> <p>OBJECTION</p> <p>The proposed 5G mast and its associated junction boxes would be a jarring feature amongst the trees that mark the boundary of Primrose Hill. They would damage the amenity of what visitors most value.</p> <p>The mast and cabinets would also be a totally unsuitable addition to the row of distinguished early Victorian houses that make up Regent's Park Road. They are a strident technology that should not be allowed to disrupt the scene in a valued conservation area.</p> <p>May I therefore urge the Council to reject this application and steer the applicants towards a site on railway land.</p> <p>Terence Bendixson</p>
2021/1813/P	Rosemary Emanuel	31/05/2021 20:46:10	OBJ	<p>If a mast is needed it would be much less offensive placed at the other side of Primrose Hill, near the exit of the hill to St Edmunds Terrace. Alternatively it could be on top of Hillview or the block of flats in St Edmunds Terrace.</p> <p>Opposite number 68 would spoil the beauty of the hill and of Regents Park Road which is in a conservation area.</p>
2021/1813/P	Mariusz Stochaj	01/06/2021 13:16:44	OBJ	<p>The proposed location is quite obviously completely unsuitable. Putting up this 18m mast would ruin the character of the surrounding conservation area. It seems a much better solution would be to install the antennas and dishes on a roof of a tall building.</p> <p>I strongly object to this application.</p>
2021/1813/P	Harry Abrams	31/05/2021 19:55:58	OBJ	<p>We think it is a great shame to ruin the tranquility of the area - an area which is a real landmark of London. It will also look unsightly and it is unreasonable to place it where it is currently proposed to be placed. It is also a health and safety hazard.</p>
2021/1813/P	Sally Kindberg	01/06/2021 07:53:35	JUST	<p>How is the need for this mast justified?</p> <p>What are the vegetation plans for this application?</p> <p>How will adjacent trees be impacted and how will that impact be monitored and mitigated?</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/1813/P	Peter Darley	30/05/2021 12:28:17	OBJ	<p>An eighteen metre high 5G mast on the edge of the Royal Parks, adversely impacting both Primrose Hill and the Regent's Canal conservation areas, must be the very last site option to select if other sites are available. This application pretends to have been through a careful site selection process, but this is clearly not the case. Other sites have been rejected primarily on account of the width of the pavement. It is evidently cheaper to run cables along the pavement than site the mast further from the road. This shows that the applicant is concerned with the cost of installation to the exclusion of issues of amenity, visual impact, and environmental impact. No trade-off showing cost versus other factors is seen in the application but, given the sensitive location, this trade-off is absolutely paramount. Failing to expose this trade-off merely shows the arrogance of those responsible, who regard the need for 5G as a carte-blanche to push it through regardless of local views. The applicant should return to the site selection stage and examine other options far more seriously in terms of both their costs and their benefits to the community. These options could include siting on nearby buildings or in courtyards.</p> <p>The environmental damage envisaged is far from being justified by the applicant. I oppose the application on this basis.</p>
2021/1813/P	Robert Beecham	01/06/2021 13:03:08	OBJNOT	<p>I was both shocked and disappointed to see that despite the negative result of a pre planning consultation, the proposed 20m telecommunications mast has only been reduced by 2 meters! Primrose Hill is an area of natural beauty, visited and enjoyed by many, residents and visitors alike. This eyesore of a mast will destroy that precious sense of space and freedom and of being in a place where one can breathe and see greenery all around and open sky. I am sure there are many who would wish to benefit from a reliable network experience but not at the expense of degrading one of London's most beautiful recreational areas. One should not fail to mention the unfortunate residents who will have to look out on the unsightly mast.</p>
2021/1813/P	Mark Elliott	01/06/2021 15:45:53	OBJ	<p>I am writing on behalf of the Friends of Regent's Park & Primrose Hill to oppose the construction of an 18 metre high 5G mast at 68 Regent's Park Road, London, NW1 7SX .</p> <p>As Chairman of the Friends (an organisation with 800 members) I am representing our constitutional obligation to object on the grounds of the significant impairment it would cause to the environment by damaging the view from Primrose Hill. I oppose the application on this basis. I suggest that The applicant be asked to return to the site selection stage and examine other options in terms of both their costs and their benefits to the community.</p> <p>Mark Elliott Chair- Friends of Regent's Park & Primrose Hill</p>
2021/1813/P	Muriel Murch	01/06/2021 15:46:13	OBJ	<p>Dear Planning people,</p> <p>This is just not a sensible idea at all. It is hard to know where to begin in suggesting you re-think this idea all together. The pole, mast and even concept appear totally inappropriate to this area, the street, the community and in complete disregard to the fact this is a conservation area.</p> <p>Searching I found that ĩ</p> <p>"The applicant states the site has been ĩspecifically selected to minimize visual impact upon the immediate and wider areaĩ.</p> <p>That is really not correct and you need to reconsider what you are doing and where.</p> <p>Mrs. M Murch</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/1813/P	Roger Smith	28/05/2021 11:55:04	OBJ	<p>As a resident to the area for over a decade, I would echo wholeheartedly the comments and objections already made regarding this proposal. It really is the most inappropriate of locations to erect such a mast for all the reasons others have mentioned and this proposal should not be permitted.</p> <p>Very little consideration seems to have been given to the visual impact of such a large mast will have on the street scene at ground level and on views from within the park and from the hill, especially during winter. Given the very substantial income Camden has received from filming rights in this area due to its current relatively unspoiled nature, they also might like to consider how such a construction may impact on its suitability for such films in future?</p> <p>I am really at a loss to understand how anyone who has spent any amount of time in the vicinity of the proposed site can think that this proposal is reasonable and I would urge the Planning Committee to reject this application.</p>
2021/1813/P	Shanti Rebello	01/06/2021 10:55:10	OBJ	<p>I consider it to be highly inappropriate to locate an 18m mast adjacent to a major London park in a Conservation Area. The proposed location is right outside a 250 bed sheltered housing scheme (Oldfield Estate) - no mention has been made in the application of any consideration of the health and well-being of its residents.</p> <p>Primrose Hill is a unique environment and indeed the view from the top is one of the few views in London that is protected by statute. Surely the proposed 18m mast is entirely out of keeping with this environment and should be sited elsewhere.</p>
2021/1813/P	Linda	01/06/2021 14:51:14	COMMT	<p>I am wholeheartedly objecting to the terrible idea of erecting an 18 metre mast on the edge of Primrose Hill in the heart of a conservation area. What is the applicant thinking of?</p> <p>The applicant states the site has been specifically selected to minimise visual impact upon the immediate and wider area. On which planet?</p> <p>As another resident stated in their objection: "Erecting a mast on such a sensitive site would be absolute vandalism, in that it would destroy the precious sensation of freedom and 'a place to breathe' that the green space and open sky, offered by Regent's Park Road and Primrose Hill. I completely agree with this statement.</p> <p>In addition to be absolutely hideous, it is overwhelming in scale and totally inappropriate for our area.</p> <p>As a Primrose Hill resident, I cannot object strongly enough to the placement of this mast. By all means put one up, but not in an area that will impact the visual beauty of our village.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>Linda Seward 47 Kingstown Street London NW1 8JP</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/1813/P	Carolin Elliston	01/06/2021 19:10:05	COMMNT	I object to the 5G mast on Regents Park Road - it would be a blight on a particularly beautiful stretch of road.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/1813/P	Lesley Stevas	01/06/2021 10:55:19	OBJ	

I strongly object to this application of an 18m Phase 8 Monopole, and wrapround Cabinet and base and associated works (telecommunications installation)
 This is a conservation area next to a Royal Park. Our parks are such places that people visit for relaxation and recreation, and to escape the busy city.
 How can anyone relax if this monstrous ugly monolith is stuck here?
 The height of the monopole is out of keeping with the character and setting of the area. The siting is not sensitive to the area. The structure will be able to be seen from many angles and will detract from the character of the area. The skyline of the area will be ruined as the structure will be prominent in this area. This pole is to be sited with cabinets in the middle of a pedestrian way. It would be detrimental to the visual amenity of the streetscene.
 Looking at the wider area nothing comes close to the height of the mast and so would be in direct conflict with planning requirements that it must not be over bearing and make the place look bad, and this mast does both. The proposed monopole and cabinets, by reason of their size and location, would reduce the amount of useable footway and so would be harmful to highway safety and pedestrian movement, contrary to policies A1 (Managing the impact of development), C6 (Access for all) and T1 (Prioritising walking, cycling and public transport) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.

There is immense concern about future radiation to be pulsed from antennae on this mast based on current ICNIRP guidelines of up to 300 GHz. This would negatively impact my own safety, health and wellbeing of both as a resident of Camden and a visitor to this area. And, the health of all living, working and visiting the area.

It is not considered that the public benefits of the proposed installation would outweigh the harm caused to the surrounding buildings. It is not considered that the public benefits of the proposed installation would outweigh the harm caused to the residents who have been put under extreme stress and anxiety at the idea of having the great ugly monolith erected near their homes.

I would want to know along that line, what commitments have Camden Council to its residents in terms of quality of life as stated in the Human Rights of October 2000 - article 8. Which states: "You have the right to respect: for your private & family life and your home".

According to data almost 50% of visitors to the park go for relaxing, enjoying the views and Picnicking.
https://www.royalparks.org.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0003/113646/THE-REGENTS-PARK-REPORT-FINAL.pdf

Many of these visitors are young people. The mast will create polluting effects leading to an incompatible and unacceptable use of the site, particularly as it is so close to schoolchildren. Young people are more vulnerable to radiation from masts, with smaller children especially at risk. Safety limits are based on adult exposure and do not protect them.

There is a nursery close by at Auden Place Community Nursery, NW1 8NA for children 6 months – 5 years. Primrose Hill Primary School at Princess Road, NW1 9JL is also close by.

Camden has a duty under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to designate as conservation areas any "areas of special architectural or historic interest the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance." Designation provides the basis for policies designed to preserve or enhance the special interest of such an area.

<https://www.camden.gov.uk/documents/20142/7876534/Primrose+Hill.pdf/118c654c-9723-f50d-86a8-e3d5c93f9952?t=1588775831683>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>Planning History: The designation report notes that the character of the area "is made up of a series of well laid out Victorian terraces. It is residential in character....."</p> <p>These grand houses along Regents Park Road are Italianate Villas and grade II listed buildings.</p> <p>I am absolutely horrified at the idea of this unsightly 18 m. monopole being erected here!!! Please Camden you must refuse this application.</p>
2021/1813/P	P J White	01/06/2021 09:03:12	OBJ	<p>I wish to object in the strongest possible way to this application for the following reasons:</p> <p>it is in an area which is a Conservation Area and thus needs to demonstrate that it preserves and enhances the CA which this application clearly does not. it ruins and spoils it.</p> <p>It is proposed to be beside the park of Primrose Hill thus highly visible both from inside the park and from outside, in views towards the park. it thus spoils a natural feature of London parkland and damages the setting of the park and its environs and borders</p> <p>A phone mast is highly inappropriate in the site and should not be erected</p>
2021/1813/P	Claire	29/05/2021 14:30:46	OBJ	<p>It is a scandal that this has even been suggested. Erecting a large pole on the edge of a beautiful park is madness and lazy. There are plenty of areas not on the edge of the park that would be suitable. Down streets etc. This will be unsightly and ruin the views over the park from the houses on a Regent's Park road. This is typical of the planners looking for a quick fix when if you ask for planning for a change in window etc on Regent's Park road they are quick to decline. Saying will spoil area. Well am 18 m pole will spoil the park. I have no hesitation in protesting against this. Another example of planning trying to slip something through without letting the locals really know</p>
2021/1813/P	Linda Evans	02/06/2021 04:46:47	COMMNT	<p>I strongly object to a 5G mast being installed in this location in early trials of 5G masts entire flocks of birds literally dropped dead out the sky goodness knows how a mast there would negatively affect the animals in London Zoo.</p>
2021/1813/P	Susan Blum	31/05/2021 10:55:11	OBJ	<p>I strongly object to this application for the application of an 18m pole in the middle of a conservation area and right next to a treasured public park.</p> <p>Where is the consistency in protecting the look of the area viz housing and protecting the environment if this is approved by Camden?</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/1813/P	Iain Pattie	01/06/2021 11:21:59	PETITNOBJ E	<p>Whilst I welcome the prospect of improved connectivity in this area. I am appalled that this proposal is even being considered. The location within the Conservation Area and adjoining a Royal Park is simply wrong. It will be a complete eyesore and most certainly does not accord with NPPF requirements for 'good design'. There have been no design considerations taken into account and the location appears to have been selected on a pure economic and 'space available' basis. The assertion that it will be screened by mature trees is absurd. The adjoining trees are London Plane and loose their leaves in winter.</p> <p>The proposed mast could more sensibly be located on the roof of Oldfield a group of 6 and 7 storey building also adjacent to the search area. this may be more costly for the applicant but should be considered. Alternatively there are under used railway lands at the North East end of Fitzroy Road again adjacent to the search area.</p> <p>This is clearly and ill considered proposal which should be rejected out of hand.</p>
2021/1813/P	LESLIE SKLAIR	01/06/2021 08:56:27	COMMNT	PLEASE ADD MY NAME TO IN SUPPORT OF THE OBJECTIONS TO THE PROPOSED 5G MAST IN REGENTS PARK ROAD
2021/1813/P	Celia Hoyle	28/05/2021 16:13:50	OBJ	This is an incredible structure that is completely at odds with its situation near the entrance to a popular Royal Park in a Conservation area. I cannot imagine how it can be deemed appropriate by the Council.. We must preserve our green spaces at all costs
2021/1813/P	MICHAEL ANGUS CRAWFORD	31/05/2021 23:21:03	OBJ	<p>An 18 m mast on the top of Primrose Hill would destroy the natural simplicity of the view for all of us who live in the neighborhood and for the many millions that visit each year.</p> <p>It would also steal space for those wishing to enjoy the view from the top of the Hill.</p> <p>Moreover, I personally know of one person who visits regularly and is electronically sensitive. I do not know what proportion of the visiting population suffers from electrosensitivity, high-frequency wavelengths but about 2.5% of the population are thought to be sensitive to electromagnetics. These masts are hot spots for those sufferers.</p> <p>https://mcs-aware.org/electro-sensitivity/137-what-is-electrical-sensitivity.</p> <p>If a mast is needed for some high tec reason then put it on top of one of the high rise buildings on Adelaide road or the new builds in Swiss Cottage. There is absolutely no reason to defile our neighborhood. Unacceptable.For these and other ethical reasons, I and my family oppose this ugly and unnecessary intrusion on our neighborhood.</p>
2021/1813/P	S M McGregor	01/06/2021 13:06:38	OBJNOT	<p>I urge Camden council to find a more suitable location for this ugly intrusive mast and equipment. There can be no justification to spoil for ever, one of the few green spaces which has been a life saver for many of Camden citizens during lock down.</p> <p>The park is a joy and place of extreme beauty and should be preserved for future generations. It is surely the responsibility of the council to save guard this green space.</p> <p>It is essential not only for aesthetics but for the mental health of the population. We have enough people vandalizing the park by scattering rubbish and dog excreta, rather than adding to the destruction of the place we look to you to defend it.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/1813/P	Francoise Findlay Chairman Elsworthy Residents Association	28/05/2021 23:36:58	OBJ	There has to be a more appropriate position for this unsightly mast. The proposed position, adjacent to the boundary of Primrose Hill, a royal park famous for its views, close to an entrance for all those approaching from Camden Town couldn't be more strategic. A better location must be found.

2021/1813/P	Gavin Hunter	01/06/2021 23:11:07	OBJ	
-------------	--------------	---------------------	-----	--

TELECOMS MAST - Opposite 68 Regent's Park Road, Primrose Hill

The proposal for a 59 foot high (18m) mast for this particular site really is extraordinary and I object strongly to it. It is a jarring position in the Conservation Area, fully visible to foot, cycle and vehicle traffic in the most prominent road in Primrose Hill. It would literally tower over the two North-Eastern entrances to this (Royal) park and would blight the view from it.

Allowing this would run directly counter to Camden's declared policies.

Page 190 of Camden's Local Plan, Policy A2 Open Space...a) Protect all designated Open Spaces; c) Resist development that could be detrimental to the setting of designated open spaces; d) Conserve and enhance the heritage value of designated open spaces...The heritage here is Victorian, even down to the Grade 2 listed drinking fountain but yards away.

It is perfectly possible to find ways of introducing the aerials needed for additional or uprated signal coverage without violating the Conservation Area. In 2017 permission was granted to conceal such equipment within the spire of St Mark's Church and nobody objected. That site had been thought through - this one hasn't.

In addition to going against Camden's policy on Open Space it also goes against Camden's policies on Design. It doesn't:

- respect the local context and character
 - preserve and enhance the historic environment and heritage assets
 - respond to natural features and preserve...open space
 - preserve strategic and local views.
- (Policies D1 Design a),b),j),m)

Set out in bold, (Policy D2 Heritage, page 235 of Camden Local Plan) Camden addresses Conservation Areas, asserting that "The Council will:

require that development within conservation areas preserves or, where possible, enhances the character or appearance of the area". I put it to you that this proposal does the opposite - on both counts - and therefore must be rejected.

This is a lazy solution. And were it successful it would be a literal beacon to other Telecoms. Please ensure that the applicants respect Camden, its policies and this Conservation Area. Encourage them to find an alternative solution - on or within a tall building - and reject this application.

Thank you.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/1813/P	David Brown	01/06/2021 08:07:11	OBJ	<p>The tower is very tall, and will impact on the view of Primrose Hill.</p> <p>Is there not some better way of disguising it?</p> <p>And presumably this is one of the earlier masts - I suspect many more will be needed in the area.</p> <p>I object on the basis of size and impact on a conservation area and park.</p>
2021/1813/P	Suzan Stehlik	01/06/2021 23:23:19	COMMNT	<p>This unsightly pole is totally at odds with the calm and beautiful surroundings that it will spoil. The site is directly adjacent to our precious and popular Primrose Hill park and I object strongly to it being built in such a sensitive area in which which the public and wildlife enjoy unspoilt nature all year round. If it is absolutely necessary, then there are plenty other more suitable, less sensitive sites.</p>
2021/1813/P	audrey de Nazelle	01/06/2021 07:22:48	OBJ	<p>There has to be a better place for this than at the edge of a beautiful park where so many people come to enjoy a bit of nature, open space, beauty, sense of peace (and sometimes quiet). Please do not destroy our beauty.</p>
2021/1813/P	Harry Bicket	01/06/2021 09:20:49	OBJ	<p>I object to this application; it is unnecessary , unsightly and a blight on a rare unspoilt corner of London. The entire area has recently been dug up to provide FTP cabling; we are perfectly well provided for in terms of internet accessibility.</p> <p>I am a Three customer, and still object strongly to this proposal.</p>
2021/1813/P	Susan Brearley	01/06/2021 17:45:18	JUST	<p>Disgraceful to do this with no consultation with local residents.</p> <p>It will be an eyesore in an area of beauty. Also possibly dangerous</p> <p>To all the children who play on the hill.</p> <p>Why can't you situate it away from a densely populated area?</p>
2021/1813/P	Nick Leslau	31/05/2021 12:32:19	COMMNT	<p>Progress is important and this development part of that but I fail to understand the compatibility of this proposed 60ft mast with the aims and ambitions of such an important conservation area.</p> <p>Does this mast enhance the CA or detract from it and if the latter then why is it even being considered?</p> <p>I have had planters on a roof terrace opposed by Camden's professional planners even though they have zero visual impact on anyone except the birds. Why does this even get past 'Go' as justifiably breaching every purpose for which a CA is established?</p>
2021/1813/P	Nick Leslau	31/05/2021 12:32:20	COMMNT	<p>Progress is important and this development part of that but I fail to understand the compatibility of this proposed 60ft mast with the aims and ambitions of such an important conservation area.</p> <p>Does this mast enhance the CA or detract from it and if the latter then why is it even being considered?</p> <p>I have had planters on a roof terrace opposed by Camden's professional planners even though they have zero visual impact on anyone except the birds. Why does this even get past 'Go' as justifiably breaching every purpose for which a CA is established?</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/1813/P	Sam Beecham	29/05/2021 17:29:42	OBJ	<p>?It is ridiculous to me that I am even having to object to this.</p> <p>It is clear and obvious that the selected position is a conservation area with extreme value to the Camden council in its beauty and green environment.</p> <p>Erecting a large pole on the edge of a beautiful park is the height of ridiculousness.</p> <p>There are plenty of areas not on the edge of the park that would be suitable. Down streets etc.</p> <p>This will be unsightly and ruin the views over the park from the houses on a Regent's Park road.</p> <p>This is typical of planners looking for a quick fix. Around 6-months ago I asked for planning for a change in window etc on Regent's Park road they are quick to decline. Saying will spoil the area. Well, an 18 m pole will spoil the park.</p> <p>I have no hesitation in protesting against this. Another example of planning trying to slip something through without letting the locals really know.</p>

2021/1813/P	Ruth Naylor	02/06/2021 00:41:47	COMMNT	<p>I strongly object to the proposal of 5G masts of any size bring erected and/or installed in a unique area of parkland as is Primrose Hill & Regents Park.. this is an area which is treasured and valued by not only the people who are fortunate to live here but by all Londoners who Visit and bring their children here to play and enjoy the nature and wildlife it has been shown that:</p> <p>Cellular Radiation Negatively Impacts Birds and Bees. Published research finds the frequencies alter bird navigation and disturb honeybee colonies. Research EMF and Bees!!! Please look at the: Landmark US National Toxicology Program (NTP) Study Finds Clear Evidence of Cancer and DNA Damage The NTP studies found male rats exposed for two years to cell phone radiation developed significantly increased gliomas (brain cancer) and Cell Tower Radiation is Linked To Damage in Human Blood A published study compared people living close and far from cell antennas and found people living closer to cellular antennas had changes in blood that predicts cancer development. Over 200 scientists and doctors issued a declaration calling for a moratorium on the increase of 5G cell antennas citing human health effects and impacts to wildlife. *Read the 2017 Scientific Appeal on 5G To the European Commission Decreased property values: Studies show property values drop up to 20% on homes near cell towers. Would you buy a home with a cell tower in your back yard? Research shows decreased property value from cell towers near homes.</p>
-------------	-------------	---------------------	--------	---

2021/1813/P	Walter Wills	31/05/2021 22:26:23	OBJ	<p>I strongly object to this proposal. The structure and its positioning next to the park is not necessary and an a detriment to the conservation area.</p>
-------------	--------------	---------------------	-----	---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/1813/P	Zoe Croock	01/06/2021 12:38:12	OBJ	<p>As a local resident living close to the proposed site for the erection of the phone mast as contemplated in planning application 2021/1813/P, I wish to object in the strongest terms.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- The proposed siting falls within a conservation area with immense charm and the erection of the phone mast will detract from this hugely both at street level and above.- The siting is on the edge of one of the most important and beautiful green spaces in London. The views from the top of the hill are some of the best views of London. A phone mast would compromise the view of the park and its surroundings from within the park and outside.- There are a number of tall buildings and semi industrial and commercial areas in Camden which would provide a far more appropriate place for a mast.
