

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/4190/P	Frances Singer	30/11/2022 18:01:28	OBJ	We absolutely & wholeheartedly object as we have done several times before There is a significant health risk Camden Council should analyse the research data with meticulous scrutiny There is so much reliable evidence out there that challenges the safety of this technology
2022/4190/P	Pinal	29/11/2022 22:05:40	COMMNT	I totally Object to this preposterous proposal yet again!!!! It is an ugly proposals, with utter disregard for its impact on the surrounding environment and the social and psychological effect it will have on all exposed to it on a daily basis. It may be somebody's 9 to 5 job at Waldens to put out such proposals but having to go through this a second time for normal people with jobs, family life and other things on our plates it is stressful, time consuming and life draining to have to deal with it yet again. It is a kin to harassment!!! We all said no last time and we say no again! And let this be the last time we have to ever say it!! This is a Conservation area and shall always remain one, with no place for an Ugley mast!
2022/4190/P	Pinal	29/11/2022 22:06:28	OBJ	I totally Object to this preposterous proposal yet again!!!! It is an ugly proposals, with utter disregard for its impact on the surrounding environment and the social and psychological effect it will have on all exposed to it on a daily basis. It may be somebody's 9 to 5 job at Waldens to put out such proposals but having to go through this a second time for normal people with jobs, family life and other things on our plates it is stressful, time consuming and life draining to have to deal with it yet again. It is a kin to harassment!!! We all said no last time and we say no again! And let this be the last time we have to ever say it!! This is a Conservation area and shall always remain one, with no place for an Ugley mast!
2022/4190/P	Emma White	30/11/2022 17:41:59	OBJ	As a resident of Dartmouth Park I object to our area consistently being targeted by companies to use our homes as sites for phone masts. The wishes of tenants of residential blocks have stated clearly and unanimously that they do not want to be put at risk by having masts above their homes. This preference should be respected and important decisions like this not imposed on us, pitting large corporate companies against residents. This is a conservation area and views should be protected; they matter to people. Thank you.
2022/4190/P	Emma White	30/11/2022 17:42:02	OBJ	As a resident of Dartmouth Park I object to our area consistently being targeted by companies to use our homes as sites for phone masts. The wishes of tenants of residential blocks have stated clearly and unanimously that they do not want to be put at risk by having masts above their homes. This preference should be respected and important decisions like this not imposed on us, pitting large corporate companies against residents. This is a conservation area and views should be protected; they matter to people. Thank you.
2022/4190/P	Jason Gormley	01/12/2022 11:19:42	OBJ	This ugly telecoms 'carbunkle' will detract not only from the existing building but the neighbouring church, and wider neighbourhood - which is a conservation area. There are potentially negative health implications for those who live in the building. I wouldn't want it on the roof of my home - why should they have it forced upon theirs? I'd like to see Camden Council ban all future applications of this nature that involve residential buildings - surely there's a better solution for all parties than telcos installing their equipment on residential buildings.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/4190/P	Stephanie Zonca	30/11/2022 10:37:48	OBJ	I reject this proposal
2022/4190/P	Stephanie Zonca	30/11/2022 10:37:51	OBJ	I reject this proposal
2022/4190/P	Stephanie Zonca	30/11/2022 10:37:52	OBJ	I reject this proposal
2022/4190/P	Stephanie Zonca	30/11/2022 10:37:54	OBJ	I reject this proposal
2022/4190/P	Stephanie Zonca	30/11/2022 10:37:55	OBJ	I reject this proposal
2022/4190/P	Stephanie Zonca	30/11/2022 10:37:57	OBJ	I reject this proposal
2022/4190/P	Stephanie Zonca	30/11/2022 10:37:58	OBJ	I reject this proposal
2022/4190/P	Frances Singer	30/11/2022 18:01:13	OBJ	We absolutely & wholeheartedly object as we have done several times before There is a significant health risk Camden Council should analyse the research data with meticulous scrutiny There is so much reliable evidence out there that challenges the safety of this technology
2022/4190/P	Ruth Galloway	30/11/2022 13:31:35	OBJ	A large antenna sending out strong electromagnetic radiation may be unhealthy for the residents of this block. Also it's an eyesore in a prominent location.
2022/4190/P	D Gorania	30/11/2022 11:13:26	OBJ	I object to this application. I visit my friend regularly and it will completely ruin the look and feel of the area.
2022/4190/P	Emmeline Keating	01/12/2022 19:37:44	OBJ	Objection I object to this planning application. The ugly equipment would be seen from miles around. This would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area in which Crestview is situated.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/4190/P	susan rose	04/12/2022 16:13:36	OBJ	<p>Planning Application No: 2022/4190/P Objection from Highgate CAAC.</p> <p>Revised scheme - the installation of 6 x antenna apertures, 1 x transmission dish and 7 x equipment cabinets on the roof of the building and development ancillary thereto at Crestview, 47 Dartmouth Park Hill, London (NW5 1JB).</p> <p>The original application to instal telecom equipment on the roof of this block of flats was refused and this revised scheme is subject to the same objections as the original one and in no way mitigates the adverse effects on the surrounding CAs of such an installation</p> <p>The height, size and prominent location of the proposed equipment on the aptly named Crestview would appear as incongruous visual clutter to the detriment of the character and appearance of the building and to the adjoining streets of Dartmouth Park. It will also cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the immediate vicinity , St John's Islington and Holly Lodge. It is also very visible from the protected viewpoints on Hampstead Heath. Furthermore it is adjacent to St. Mary's Brookfield a Grade II* listed building and Grove Terrace and Holly Village. These three II* locations are listed within the DPCA. There is no natural screening offered by mature trees, nor any man-made screening in the form of buildings. Nor are there any existing rooftop features which could minimise the visual impact on the skyline and to the surrounding areas. Any attempt to disguise the installation would accentuate it even further. Visual clutter, in such an exposed position, would cause serious visual harm not only to the CA as a whole but particularly to the adjacent landmark and listed building of St Mary's The drawings show the full height of these installations to be the equivalent of at least two storeys above the roof-line. The thin, asphalt roof is not designed to take any weight or traffic; noise would also caused by the vibrations of the cabinets and any wind resistance. This application must be refused as in breach of the requirements of the NPPF to protect heritage assets from significant harm as demonstrated above.</p> <p>SUSAN ROSE PP HIGHGATE CAAC</p>
2022/4190/P	Vikas	29/11/2022 22:15:01	COMMNT	I strongly object. This should not be permitted to go through.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/4190/P	Anthony Preston	02/12/2022 11:11:09	OBJ	<p>I object to this application. The applicant does not own the building and they have no right to carry out building works on someone else's property. There are private property rights in the UK. If the government has passed a law to allow such infringement then that law is ultra vires. These works if carried out will allow the applicant to make a profit year after year at someone else's expense. Equally important is the following:</p> <p>(1) The property is in a conservation area which is primarily residential and is highly visible from Hampstead Heath and further afield. The block is not particularly large but it is prominent because it is on a ridge, exposing the skyline.</p> <p>(2) The property is adjacent to the Grade II listed building of St Mary Brookfield (architect William Butterfield). Anything on the roof of the property would dominate this heritage building and negatively impact on its setting.</p> <p>(3) There are inaccuracies in the elevation and site plans designed to dupe the public.</p> <p>(4) This is a private property. One must feel safe in one's own home. If telecom workman have easy access 24/7 that infringes privacy and safety, enshrined under the Human Rights legislation.</p> <p>(5) The proportions of the equipment are excessive in relation to the height of the property. The property is six floors high. The equipment is at least one-third again.</p> <p>(6) The property borders other conservation areas - Holly Lodge CA, Camden Highgate CA and St John's Islington. An ugly development at the centre of these protected residential area effects all of them adversely.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/4190/P	PAMELA HAMPSHIRE	04/12/2022 17:00:16	OBJ	<p>I am a resident of Crestview which is located within the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area and is adjacent to the St John's Grove Conservation area in Islington. By virtue of its location high up on Dartmouth Park Hill, our building is clearly visible in short, medium and long-range views from a variety of vantage points within the area, most notably from several locations on Hampstead Heath itself. This is the second Planning Application which Waldon has made but is substantially the same as the previous one, albeit that the location on our roof of the antennae and related equipment has changed. The comments that I made in response to the earlier application therefore remain valid.</p> <p>Despite the fact that inaccuracies in the Plans were pointed out in the responses to the previous application, they are still present in the Waldon submission. Even simple things like the extra garage and non-existent "existing Telecoms equipment" continue to appear on the plans. How can we have any confidence in the accuracy of the documentation submitted when these basic errors persist? This is shoddy work.</p> <p>Crestview is 6-storey development of 18 flats. The Waldon proposal outlines a monstrous conglomeration of equipment which is entirely unsuitable for location on our roof, or on that of any similar sized residential development. It would be far better placed on a non-residential building which is not located within a conservation area. The masts are over 6 metres in height and the new proposal to site them on the side of the central plant room will add substantially to the total height of the building (over 2 metres), and thus will be highly visible from all over the conservation area and from many other local areas, including Hampstead Heath itself. I am particularly concerned that the proposed development would cause significant harm to local views of the adjacent beautiful St Mary Brookfield Church, a Grade 2* listed building designed by William Butterfield and consecrated in 1875.</p> <p>The Camden Local Plan 2017, which remains in force although under review, requires any developments to take into account the wider historic environment and buildings, spaces and features of local historic value, whilst the Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Plan 2020 states that it wishes to ensure that "the area's village character, rich architectural heritage, attractive green streets, open spaces and natural environment are not only maintained but enhanced." This development would severely compromise these stated aims.</p> <p>The applicant states these masts are required to improve inadequate network coverage in the area. I see no justification in the Waldon submission as to why the location needs to be within the conservation area, nor how any potential benefit would outweigh the substantial visual damage.</p> <p>Finally, I have concerns on both safety and security grounds. As I understand it the jury is still out on the long-term effects of 5G. Public Health England continues to monitor the health-related evidence and is committed to updating its advice as required, and the WHO is currently carrying out a major comprehensive evidence review. I would not feel happy living below equipment which could potentially be detrimental to our health. On the security side, both the installation and maintenance of the proposed equipment would entail other organisations having keys to our building. We do not have a resident caretaker and are responsible for our own building security. It would not be possible to monitor the increased comings-and goings, thus potentially making our building far less secure than it is now.</p> <p>For all the above reasons I strongly oppose the Waldon Telecomm Ltd proposal.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/4190/P	Terry Mckie	30/11/2022 12:39:43	OBJ	<p>Crestview is located in the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area and dominates the skyline being a 18 metre high building on top of a ridge.</p> <p>The equipment it is intended to place on the roof would make an already indifferent looking building positively ugly. It would dominate the street view locally and would mar the view from many local vantage points e.g.Hampstead Heath, and the other local Conservation Areas. The clutter of masts and transmission dishes will also overpower and dominate St Marys Brookfield, the adjacent listed church, which is a similar height to Crestview.</p> <p>For these reasons I object to this Planning Application.</p>

Application No: 2022/4190/P
Consultees Name: Margaret Shanks
Received: 30/11/2022 14:41:51
Comment: OBJ

Response:

APPLICATION 2022/4190/P

I object to application number 2022/4190/P

Supplementary Information Form

In the application, in Supplementary Information Form it is stated that “It is noted the building has previously housed telecommunications apparatus on the building.”

However, it is not stated that because the “building” [Crestview] is in a conservation area, all such apparatus had been removed prior to Waldon’s first and second applications. Indeed, Crestview began its efforts to have such apparatus removed as early as in 2016, documented in Management Meeting records. Consequently, all households adopted the use of internal aerials, enabling the removal of all apparatus from the roof.

This fact is clearly shown in the applicant’s photo in both applications, yet the applicant refers to apparatus on the roof despite the fact that there was no apparatus.

Inaccuracies in Design Drawings

The applicant’s first application included various inaccuracies in the design drawings. These were pointed out in online comments which were available, and still are, for the applicant to read. They were also stated in the Case Officer’s report.

In the current application some of the same inaccuracies appear, and additionally new ones occurred. In Point 3 of the Supplementary Information Form the applicant states “The application site is a six-storey building in residential use.” This is correct. However, the drawing shows a seven-storey building with a balcony on each storey. Nine garages are depicted. The correct number of garages is eight.

These are the same inaccuracies as those in the first application. They are misleading, thereby making our building look larger.

In the new application, as regards Elevation drawings, it is stated “There would be a slight increase in the overall antenna heigh. [sic] The refused scheme had a height to the top of the antennas of 25.15 metres, and the current scheme the antennas are 23.13 metres above ground level. This is considered a minimal increase and is required to ensure ICNIRP compliance.”

How can the applicant justify that 23.13 metres is a ‘minimal increase’ on 25.15 metres? Simple arithmetic dictates the impossibility of these numbers.

These inaccuracies are unacceptable.

As regards ICNIRP compliance, the applicant states “All EE and H3G base stations are designed to be fully compliant with ICNIRP guidelines, and a certificate of compliance is included with the application.” However, as at 29 November 2022, no such certificate appears on the website.

Code of Practice for Wireless Networks in England

A template of the certificate is available in the Code of Practice for Wireless Networks in England which was published on 7 March 2022.

In accordance with the said Code, the applicant provides Confirmation that submitted drawings have been

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

checked for accuracy, signed by Waldon Telecom (Agent) - whose position is also Planner - on behalf of EE Ltd & H3G Ltd on 30/09/2021.

The applicant refers to ICNIRP's 2020 updated guidelines and names Eric van Rongen as Chair. However, at <https://www.icnirp.org/en/about-icnirp/commission/index.htm> it is stated "He was the ICNIRP Chair from 2016 until 2020 and is now serving as the ICNIRP Vice Chair since May 2020." Rodney Croft became Chair in May 2020.

Given the inaccuracies mentioned above, there is clearly a lack of thoroughness in this application. This raises doubts about the extent of the credence which can be lent to the applicant's arguments.

As the ICNIRP carries such weight internationally, the following is relevant:

<https://www.icnirp.org/en/rf-faq/index.html>

Under the question: What do you recommend for countries that have the ICNIRP (1998) RF EMF guidelines in place?

"The ICNIRP (1998) guidelines are protective for current commercial applications of F EMFs. However, the new guidelines have incorporated a number of important additions and changes, particularly for EMF frequencies above 6 GHz where future 5G technologies will operate, which have the result of reducing the maximum magnitude of localized exposure that a person can receive. This is particularly important given that we do not know how 5G technologies will develop in the future, and so a more robust system is required to ensure that harm cannot occur.

As the ICNIRP (2020) guidelines now provide protection for whole body exposures above 6 GHz, ensure that brief exposures are not sufficient to cause harm, and, by reducing the averaging area for local exposures above 6 GHz, reduce the maximum local exposure, the new guidelines provide a far more complete and precise system of protection. Accordingly, and particularly in relation to current and future technological development such as 5G, it is strongly recommended that countries update to the new ICNIRP (2020) guidelines."

While planning applications for telecoms do not include health matters within their remit, it would probably be reasonable to accept ICNIRP's view "that we do not know how 5G technologies will develop in the future."

Conservation Area

The current application introduces some changes to the apparatus, partly by its relocation from the edge of the roof to the "plant room", also called the "central plant room". However, as Crestview is within the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area, even with such relocation of apparatus, the change to the roof-form by the telecoms installations would still 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, which is 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 Crestview's. The impact of telecoms equipment on our roof would, therefore, cause visual harm.

Given their design and siting, their scale and height, the proposed incongruous antennae and accompanying

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>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.</p> <p>As stated in Paragraph 7.1.1 of The London Plan of March 2021, "London's heritage assets and historic environment are irreplaceable".</p> <p>Security</p> <p>If this planning application were approved, it would entail providing total access to our building by giving keys to the telecoms maintenance/repair personnel to come and go at any time 24/7. This would cause great disturbance to all in Crestview, not only for installation works during the anticipated month starting on 2023-05 and completion on 2023-06, but also thereafter. Apart from the fact that the noise of the lift being used to the fifth floor, further noise would be created by lowering the metal ladder to access the roof space via a small hatch and then exit to the roof itself. It is difficult to imagine how small the personnel with their necessary repair equipment would have to be in order to gain access via the small hatch to get outside onto the roof. In short, I do not believe that this application is viable. Nor do I believe that this is in the spirit of Boris Johnson's aim at 'connectivity'.</p>
2022/4190/P	Ben Ackland	29/11/2022 22:13:54	OBJ	I strongly object. The claim that this will not impact the aesthetic environment of this protected area is risible. The proposed masts would be a blot on the landscape from every direction.
2022/4190/P	Duncan Frost	01/12/2022 19:45:28	OBJ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Crest View is in a conservation area and visible across Hampstead Heath and a lot of London skyline. - Crest View is right next to the Grade II* listed building, St Mary Brookfield. This plan takes away from the look and feel of this heritage building.
2022/4190/P	Dr Chris Curtis	29/11/2022 18:34:25	OBJ	<p>OBJECTION:</p> <p>Crestview is located on a high point which is highly visible from the surrounding area and from protected viewpoints on Hampstead Heath. It is close to three local schools and adjacent to the Grade II* listed St Mary Brookfield Church with which it currently shares a similar roofline and is close to the Grade II listed Victorian Gothic Holly Lodge Village and Grove Terrace. There is no natural screening afforded by mature trees, nor any other screening from similar height buildings in the area. The installation of proposed telecommunications equipment would by virtue of their number, location, height, scale, size and prominence result in excessive and unacceptable visual clutter. Not only would it harm the character and appearance of the building, but also that of the surrounding Dartmouth Park conservation area and views.</p> <p>I would strongly urge the application be refused as it is in breach of the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework to protect heritage assets and conservation areas from significant harm as set out above.</p>
2022/4190/P	Anna Zawilska	01/12/2022 19:42:41	OBJ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Crest View is in a conservation area - highly visible from Hampstead Heath and beyond. The block is prominent across the skyline. - Crest View is adjacent to the Grade II* listed building, St Mary Brookfield (architect William Butterfield). Anything on the roof negatively impacts its setting. - There have been inaccuracies in the elevation and site plans.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/4190/P	Frances Singer	30/11/2022 18:00:59	OBJ	We absolutely & wholeheartedly object as we have done several times before There is a significant health risk Camden Council should analyse the research data with meticulous scrutiny There is so much reliable evidence out there that challenges the safety of this technology
2022/4190/P	Marianna Trezza	30/11/2022 14:19:33	OBJ	Marianna trezza
2022/4190/P	Marianna Trezza	30/11/2022 14:20:04	OBJ	Marianna trezza
2022/4190/P	Rejane padron	30/11/2022 16:29:16	OBJ	This is not a minor change and will significantly pollute the visual of the preservation area of Dartmouth Park. There is also abundance of evidence that such telecommunications equipment disrupt individual health so we strongly object
2022/4190/P	Frances Singer	30/11/2022 18:01:02	OBJ	We absolutely & wholeheartedly object as we have done several times before There is a significant health risk Camden Council should analyse the research data with meticulous scrutiny There is so much reliable evidence out there that challenges the safety of this technology
2022/4190/P	Frances Singer	30/11/2022 18:01:04	OBJ	We absolutely & wholeheartedly object as we have done several times before There is a significant health risk Camden Council should analyse the research data with meticulous scrutiny There is so much reliable evidence out there that challenges the safety of this technology
2022/4190/P	Frances Singer	30/11/2022 18:01:07	OBJ	We absolutely & wholeheartedly object as we have done several times before There is a significant health risk Camden Council should analyse the research data with meticulous scrutiny There is so much reliable evidence out there that challenges the safety of this technology
2022/4190/P	Frances Singer	30/11/2022 18:01:10	OBJ	We absolutely & wholeheartedly object as we have done several times before There is a significant health risk Camden Council should analyse the research data with meticulous scrutiny There is so much reliable evidence out there that challenges the safety of this technology
2022/4190/P	Frances Singer	30/11/2022 18:01:25	OBJ	We absolutely & wholeheartedly object as we have done several times before There is a significant health risk Camden Council should analyse the research data with meticulous scrutiny There is so much reliable evidence out there that challenges the safety of this technology
2022/4190/P	Frances Singer	30/11/2022 18:01:22	OBJ	We absolutely & wholeheartedly object as we have done several times before There is a significant health risk Camden Council should analyse the research data with meticulous scrutiny There is so much reliable evidence out there that challenges the safety of this technology

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/4190/P	Frances Singer	30/11/2022 18:01:19	OBJ	We absolutely & wholeheartedly object as we have done several times before There is a significant health risk Camden Council should analyse the research data with meticulous scrutiny There is so much reliable evidence out there that challenges the safety of this technology
2022/4190/P	Frances Singer	30/11/2022 18:01:16	OBJ	We absolutely & wholeheartedly object as we have done several times before There is a significant health risk Camden Council should analyse the research data with meticulous scrutiny There is so much reliable evidence out there that challenges the safety of this technology
2022/4190/P	Stephanie Zonca	30/11/2022 10:38:00	OBJ	I reject this proposal