
From: Sam FitzPatrick
Sent: 08 December 2022 18:33
To: Planning Planning
Subject: FW: Objection to Planning Application 2022/4190/P

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Sam FitzPatrick
Planning Officer
Pronouns: He/Him/His

London Borough of Camden

Web: [camden.gov.uk](https://www.camden.gov.uk)

5 Pancras Square
London N1C 4AG



From: Amanda Evans [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 November 2022 18:38
To: Sam FitzPatrick <Sam.FitzPatrick@camden.gov.uk>
Subject: Objection to Planning Application 2022/4190/P

[REDACTED]

This is submitted by:

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

I strongly object to the proposals to place telecoms equipment on the roof of Crestview.

Inaccuracies and inconsistencies in the plans / visual representation:

- there are STILL no existing satellite dishes and aerial antennas on the roof;
- Elevation A persists in showing 9 garages instead of 8;
- Elevation D shows the adjoining terrace to be lower than it is, a mysterious white box overlaps Crestview on the left and pushes that line of flats so far to the right that they have excluded the rear entrance and six lobby balconies altogether. The impression suggests a tall, thin building, dissociated from its neighbours;
- Portrayal of the proposed handrails is not consistent between the site plan and the elevations.
- The site plan has moved the (right) balcony immediately below the proposed dish away from its location;
- ‘Supplementary Information’ (p6) illustrates the previous plans alongside the revised plans:

The Previous plan looks very cluttered largely because they show (incorrectly) 7 floors and 14 balconies, whereas the Revised plan has been de-cluttered by the removal of one floor and all the balconies.

This is very misleading.

As is the wording below which claims the overall height has increased from 25.15 metres to 23.13 metres.

‘This is a minimal increase’.

Site Search:

This ‘revised’ and supposedly ‘more robust’ search, after more than a year to complete, consists of an exact copy of the previous ‘8’ (all discounted before) with 3 new additions:

- Bacton Tower (suggested by a resident);
- Holloway Bus Garage (discounted as too low and too close to an existing installation); and
- The Towers (described as ‘a flat-roofed residential building’. The introductory sentence implies that this particular roof-top could accommodate the required equipment but it is discounted because of the adjacent trees and because it is lower in height than Crestview.) It does not appear that anyone actually looked at this site. It is comprised of 4 residential blocks, all of which clearly have traditional pitched roofs. Evidenced very simply by a glance at Google maps.

The method of searching sites appears thin, flawed and unsubstantiated.

The arguments are tailored to discount anywhere other than Crestview.

The justifications given for selecting and discounting sites appear to lack depth.

We do not have available to us the technical information and expertise to verify or refute some of Waldon’s claims.

They can make claims without any evidence of in-depth investigation and without culpability.

However, the indications from misleading plans (aforementioned) and blatant mis-information (The Towers) must raise questions about the integrity of their whole presentation.

Appearance and Siting:

Crestview is a building typical of its era. It is made up of simple, vertical and horizontal lines which are echoed in the design of the lift-housing unit above.

It is a relatively small, residential block of 6 floors comprising 18 flats. The proposed installation of telecoms apparatus is quite disproportionate in size to the block itself - the height from our main roof to the top of the antennas is between one third and one half the total height of our dwellings below.

The revised plans:

- clustering 6 antennae (substantially bolted to our simple lift-housing unit),
- placing 7 large telecom units (some of a similar height to the lift-housing) on the flat roof,
- erecting a dish supported on a free-standing metal frame positioned over a resident's balcony at the front of the building,
- plus additional railings, trays and cables ... are all insensitive and incompatible to the residential environment.

The visual clutter remains. It would also compromise and disfigure the simplicity of the host building.

The thin asphalt roof of the building is not designed to support any weight or traffic. The concrete core of the structure transmits sound and vibrations throughout the block like a megaphone. Parts of the proposed installation create a constant humming / buzzing sound which cannot be entirely silenced and which would affect our quality of life.

Regardless of Waldon's persistent repetition of their opinion that the effects would be 'less than substantial', this proposal is an ugly, insensitive addition which should not be placed on such an exposed building, adjacent to a heritage asset and in a conservation area.

Crestview has no parapet as such, merely a few courses of brick rising .3 of a metre which drops at each of the top floor balconies.

Because of its exposed position there is no natural or architectural screening and any attempts to disguise the installation with panelling or similar would aggravate the appearance and add to its bulk.

Location:

Because of its position on the ridge Crestview forms a significant part of the skyline, particularly as seen from Hampstead Heath. It shares this position with a heritage building of significance. Any addition to the roof of Crestview would severely protrude and harm the skyline as well as negatively impair the setting of St Mary Brookfield, the height of which is similar to that of Crestview.

Waldon appear to have no regard for the appearance, the enveloping conservation areas, the skyline or the effect on the setting of the adjacent Grade II * listed church.

It is important to retain a semblance of non-industrialised calm close to the rural amenity of Hampstead Heath. This is our heritage. It should be protected.

This proposal should be rejected for the same reasons it was before and the same arguments are still valid:

- we are in Conservation Area,
- Highly visible on the skyline, and
- Adjacent to a Grade II * listed building

The previous refusal states:

The proposed electronic communication equipment located at roof level, by reason of its design, size, height, number and location, would result in visual clutter which would detract from the character and appearance of the host property and the Dartmouth Park Conservation and Neighbourhood Areas, and would cause harm to the openness and character of the nearby public parks, as well as, the settings of neighbouring conservation areas and the adjacent Grade II* Listed church building (St. Mary Brookfield) contrary to policies D1 (Design), D2 (Heritage) and A2 (Open space) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017, and policies DC1 (Enhancing the sense of place), DC2 (Heritage assets), DC3 (Requirement for good design) and ES1 (Green and open spaces) of the Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Plan 2020.

Photo below - Proposed equipment on Crestview roof:

Photo below - View from Hampstead Heath (Parliament Hill Fields) illustrating height of proposed antennae installation (horizontal black line):

Sent from my iPad