

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/1079/P	Sophie Debaere	26/04/2022 15:21:30	COMMNT	Hi, I have been living on Englands lane (41B) for the past 7years and oppose this installation. Phone reception is satisfactory and there is no need for more magnetic pollution in this area. Best, Sophie
2022/1079/P	Sophie Debaere	26/04/2022 15:21:34	COMMNT	Hi, I have been living on Englands lane (41B) for the past 7years and oppose this installation. Phone reception is satisfactory and there is no need for more magnetic pollution in this area. Best, Sophie
2022/1079/P	Daniel Nathan	26/04/2022 12:30:12	OBJ	I object to the proposed installation of a 5G mast on the Lowlands. It will have a hugely detrimental impact on the aesthetics of the building and the surrounding community; an area which currently benefits from a great deal of tourism. The Lowlands is within a conservation area and the addition of this ugly mast will cause a great deal of disfigurement which can be seen from the Swiss Cottage end of Eton Avenue all the way to the Haverstock Hill end of Englands Lane.
2022/1079/P	Steven Reid	26/04/2022 15:14:43	SUPPRT	Excellent News, I am in favour of the 5G Mast as Camden has one of the worst mobile receptions in the country.
2022/1079/P	Steven Reid	26/04/2022 15:14:39	SUPPRT	Excellent News, I am in favour of the 5G Mast as Camden has one of the worst mobile receptions in the country.
2022/1079/P	Steven Reid	26/04/2022 15:14:47	SUPPRT	Excellent News, I am in favour of the 5G Mast as Camden has one of the worst mobile receptions in the country.

Printed on: 27/04/2022 09:10:07

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/1079/P	Jeffrey Young	25/04/2022 12:04:47	INT	

As a Director representing the residents and freeholders at Lowlands, I am requesting a conversation or a face-to-face meeting with the planning team to convey in person our complete objection to this application, but also to understand our rights and the process to which decisions are made by the council on this.

Please be advised that the application is unsolicited and has not been made with any input from the residents and owners at Lowlands and appears to be an unwarranted request by a company to install an unsightly structure on our premises without our consent.

I confirm that I have the full backing of the residents and freeholders at Lowlands to convey that the Telecoms mast applied for Application is not wanted on our property for a diverse number of reasons, which I, residents and other community members will outline in due course once.

Moreover, to have only three weeks for the residents to prepare their comments and defence for this significantly detrimental application is not sufficient.

Please can you also let me know if there will be a formal consultation process taking place beyond this commenting period.

Kind Regards,

Jeffrey

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/1079/P	Peter Blausten	27/04/2022 01:01:49	OBJNOT	<p>I object to the proposal to install mobile masts etc to Lowlands. In many instances the application by Cornerstone/Telefonica (C/T) is faulty and its assertions are incorrect.</p> <p>Coverage: throughout the application, C/T is vague, sometime referring to the needs of Eton Ave specifically, and sometimes the 'area of Eton Avenue', and sometimes 'service in and around Eton Avenue'. It also fails to explain why the previous site on the Britannia Hotel in a different location to Eton Avenue was previously acceptable to provide the service to the vaguely-defined area. It is also noted that coverage plots/maps have not been submitted with the application, on the basis they do not provide the full story. Whether or not this is true, the application does not provide evidence (indeed ANY evidence) that the location has to be on Lowlands from a coverage point of view. All this is particularly relevant when considered in the context of the inadequate consideration of alternatives in the application.</p> <p>Alternative locations: the alternatives listed betray no real motivation to consider suitable alternatives on buildings. For example, the nearby former-Fine Arts College site (now vacant) which is higher than Lowlands (Belsize Pk Gdns/Lambolie Rd), roof of Starbucks building on Englands Lane, Kings College Court, immediately opposite and higher than the Britannia Hotel (and Lowlands), and the roof of the old fire station bell tower on Eton Avenue. I am not recommending these, but - by way of example - there is no evaluation of these alternatives. Also, there is no consideration of the new construction site at the Swiss Cottage end of Eton Avenue.</p> <p>Site and mast-sharing: the application shows no proper consideration of this consistent with NPPF guidelines. For example, 'Dorney' is a much higher building in Fellows Road, running parallel with Eton Avenue. It has existing antenna, as far higher than Lowlands, and, to quote the C/T proposal '...the taller the site, the further it can send signal and negates the need for additional sites'. The application does not deal with Dorney, nor does it show any consideration of 'Bray', also in Fellows Road. Dorney clearly is suitable for mobile antenna (it already has them), but C/T have failed to demonstrate consideration of the above much more realistic alternatives than the ones they have gone through the motions about for the purposes of trying to justify Lowlands.</p> <p>There is no indication in the proposal that Telefonica has considered mast sharing with competitors existing masts/locations.</p> <p>Schools: the applicant is required to consider nearby schools. 'Nearby' is not defined in the legislation, and so C/T have tried to get away with a very limited definition. The applicant has not shown consultation with The Hall and Trevor Roberts' schools, also in Eton Avenue, and therefore their application is faulty. Furthermore, the application has not responded or addressed the relevant concerns raised by Sarum Hall School.</p> <p>Amenity: the applicant has carefully tried to select a very limited definition of amenity to suit their argument. In RIBAs 110 Characteristics of Places where People want to Live' they include 'A place to enjoy and be proud of' and 'A place where people feel at home'. These are valid considerations for amenity for Lowlands residents that the appearance and anxiety of having new, very large and powerful antenna visibly on our roof will destroy.</p> <p>The RTPJ practice note 'Mental Health and Town Planning' gives advice on how planners can work within the current UK planning systems and with other professionals to take account of mental health when making changes. Contrary to this, the C/T application shows no proper consideration of the anxiety of Lowlands and neighbouring residents. Whereas it accepts...'. Recent court cases have confirmed that the public perception</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>of health risks can be a material consideration within the land-use planning system... it has not shown it has weighed up the anxieties of residents in its application, and how these have been taken into account. Instead, it has dismissed them as 'not appropriate'.</p> <p>It is widely accepted in planning terms, 'amenity' is more usually used to refer to the quality or character of an area and elements that contribute to the overall enjoyment of an area. Residential amenity considers elements that are particularly relevant to the living conditions of a dwelling. The health and well-being of residents is often directly related to the level of residential amenity occupants can enjoy. The C/T proposal represents unbalanced consideration of this and incorrectly dismisses the anxieties of residents as being out of scope. It is therefore deficient in dealing with this planning criteria. The proposal does not acknowledge there are at least 6 children currently living in Lowlands for whom the health and related impact considerations should be the same as those children in a school. The anxiety of their parents has not been taken into account.</p> <p>As far as the visual impact relating to amenity is concerned, the C/T application is incorrect to claim that the new installation will not be visible from street level. It will be mostly visible from street level in Belsize Park Gardens (pedestrians and residents), and partially visible from the opposite pavement and houses on Eton Avenue.</p> <p>Design: Although there is a line drawing of the installation in C/T's application, there is no photograph of similar installations: the point being that how it looks aesthetically in reality will be very different from the drawing. Telefonica have the means and resources to include photographs and rendered simulations, but have omitted these from the application because they know it will look so bad. It would disprove all the nonsense in the submission about the lines and design of the installation being sympathetic with the nearby street furniture and lampposts etc.</p> <p>Whereas it is true that Lowlands is not a listed building, it still has architectural merit. This is more significant on the elevation along Eton Avenue. The architect has chosen continuous lateral lines, particularly so along the roof line. This appears uninterrupted from street view, and in particular, no roof structure can currently be seen from low level. This will certainly change when the much higher installation of 6 Antenna, 2 dishes and 3 cabinets.</p> <p>At one point in the application C/T claim that it cannot be seen from street level, and then elsewhere claim that other things 'will draw the eye away from rooftops'. Clearly, they are confused!</p> <p>I would like to impress upon you the deep upset and worry this planning application has caused residents and neighbours of Lowlands. Telefonica's application shows no appreciation of this, and the deficiencies in their application show the superficiality of their interest in our conservation area and community interests. Please reject the application.</p> <p>Lowlands freeholder.</p>
2022/1079/P	Francesca Corbarn	26/04/2022 17:05:58	OBJ	<p>I have objected to this project already and yet my objection on the grounds of the fact that it will be "an eyesore" and not in keep with this part of the neighbourhood is now down as "comments" rather than OBJECTION! What is Camden playing at? First this is described as a "minor alteration" despite being half the height of the current building and now a clear objection becomes a "COMMENT"?</p>

Printed on: 27/04/2022 09:10:07

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/1079/P	Juliana Lemos	25/04/2022 15:17:05	OBJ	<p>Good afternoon,</p> <p>I wouldn't agree to the installation of antennas on Lowlands at NW33EJ.</p> <p>Lowlands is located in one of the prettiest streets in London. This would create a dominant visual clutter on a prominent position within the conservation area. It would cause material harm to the character and appearance of the street scene.</p>
2022/1079/P	Imogen Pelham	26/04/2022 13:51:01	COMMENT	<p>I am happy with this proposal - I don't have concerns about 5G towers, apart from as a potential eyesore, so anything that can be done to hide or camouflage their appearance is appreciated.</p>