

Rafi Miah



Dear Planning Dept.


Please see the email below regarding plans to install a mobile phone base station on the roof of our homes. If, as expected, a further planning application is submitted, we will object in the strongest terms.

To Matt and the team - on looking again through previous applications this would actually be the 4th such application! Previous applications in Jan 2019, Dec 2020 and March 2021, so once per year! All were refused for the same reason:

"The proposed rooftop equipment, by reason of its location, design, scale and height, would result in dominant visual rooftop clutter and cause harm to the character and appearance of the host property, the streetscene and the surrounding Rochester Conservation Area, as well as the setting of nearby locally listed buildings. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policies D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017."

Apart from the unsightly plastic screening on the last application, we fail to see any substantive difference between them. As such we struggle to see any way that the application can be approved. With this in mind, is there a way you could refuse to validate further applications on the basis of these being repeated and vexatious? It is tiresome for residents having to maintain this vigilance against these repeated attempts and surely a waste of your resources! Are there any limits on how many times the same application can be submitted and declined with no substantive changes - otherwise it would appear to be a disingenuous attempt by the applicant to simply wear residents and the council down?

I look forward to your reply.
Regards
James Tate
Artisans Dwellings TRA



Dear Ms Paracha

I'm responding to the Cornerstone/Waldon letter informing residents of plans to install a base station on the roof of our homes at 242-244 Royal College Street. Having spoken to the Chair and Secretary of the Tenants and Residents Association, as well as neighbours, we continue to object to these plans in the strongest possible terms. As far as I can tell this is the third attempt at seeking planning permission for this installation, all submitted without any meaningful engagement with residents whatsoever.

This time round we've had no communication other than the letter of intent and have had no responses to previous attempts on our part to engage. I can see no evidence of a planning application as yet, but we will continue to monitor for one. If any such application asserts that adequate consultation has taken place, we will challenge that in the strongest terms. Furthermore, there is no obvious detail on how any planned application differs from previous (rejected) applications.

I should say that in the event of yet another planning application, we will re-submit our comprehensive 9-point objection. This response will be copied to Camden planning and Major Works Departments and Leaseholder Services.

Regards
James Tate
Artisans Dwellings TRA