

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/4190/P	Katrina Silver	09/12/2022 22:47:57	OBJ	I object to telecoms personnel having 24/7 access to the Crestview building which I believe a threat to privacy, feeling safe in our homes and a potential threat to security. St Mary Brookfield church right next to Crestview is a grade 2 Star listed building and a distinctive local landmark on the skyline which would be ruined by the proximity of the ugly mobile phone antennae. I fully support all other objections by others in this locality.
2022/4190/P	Colin Green	11/12/2022 19:26:10	OBJ	I would like to object to these plans. They were, and remain in their second iteration, a bulky ugly highly visual protrusion into a skyline in a conservation area.
2022/4190/P	Tom Basden	13/12/2022 12:14:49	OBJ	I strongly object to this proposal, for all the same reasons that I objected last time. Dartmouth Park is a historic and important conservation area and this application would make an already tall building far taller and considerably more unsightly - with huge industrial equipment visible throughout the area, including from many places on Hampstead Heath. The added height from the additions to the roof would mean that the building would tower over the Grade II listed church directly opposite, and these 6 antennae (seemingly even taller than the last application!) would dominate an otherwise residential London skyline. The alteration to this latest application, clustering the aerials around the lift housing, in no way changes the fundamental problems with this proposal which the council rightly rejected last time. If anything, the overall scheme would be bulkier and even more noticeable. Essentially, the proposed work would be a completely incongruous and unwanted eyesore in an otherwise very well preserved residential area.
2022/4190/P	DPCAAC	09/12/2022 14:18:21	OBJ	DPCAAC strongly objects to this revised application to install six antenna apertures and ancillary equipment on the rooftop of Crestview, a six storey 1960s block of flats. Crestview lies on the crest of the Highgate Ridge and together with St Mary's Brookfield is widely visible on the skyline from areas within and outside the DPCA. It can be seen from Parliament Hill, Hampstead Heath, Holly Lodge CA, Camden, Tufnell Park and beyond. This application moves the antenna and other equipment from the edges of the building to surround the white lift shaft housing which had been a recognisable feature of views of this building. The full height of this cluster of installations would be in excess of two and half storeys of the building itself. The clean lines of the lift housing would be lost thus adding to the fundamental harm inflicted on the building by this installation and to the character and appearance of our CA. The setting of the St Johns CA which abuts the site on the Islington side would also be harmed. Opposite Crestview with an equal height of roofline, lies the superb Grade 11* listed St Mary's Brookfield by Butterfield. The proposed installation would devastate the setting of this significant listed building. Other listed buildings that lie in the vicinity are Grove Terrace and Holly Village. This application introduces serious harm to the character and appearance of our CA and should be refused.
2022/4190/P	Helena Shanks	12/12/2022 18:57:34	OBJ	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:
2022/4190P	Colin Green	11/12/2022 20:37:18	OBJ	I would like to object to these plans. They were, and remain in their second iteration, a bulky ugly highly visual protrusion into a skyline in a conservation area.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/4190/P	Sally Fanning	10/12/2022 17:15:53	OBJ	<p>I strongly object to the proposed development of the siting (and operation) of telecommunications equipment on (and around if subsequently relevant) the Crestview block of flats. My objections are based on the issues mentioned below.</p> <p>Environmental Issues</p> <p>It is understood that the government is keen to promote such installations as here proposed to improve the mobile phone communications benefits of local inhabitants. However, it is also understood that such benefits can very simply be outweighed by the resulting interference to terrestrial communications systems. In these situations, the sector of residents, such as the elderly or those of a low income, for whom these are the predominantly important communications links, will also be those who are least able to take their own remedial action. I would suggest that it should be Camden's desire to protect these residents; not only is a change to cable or satellite reception expensive, it can also lead to a proliferation of unsightly receiving equipment within the whole community. As this is a Conservation Area, the latter may not, in some circumstances, even be permitted, resulting in a substantial (and life-changing) loss of benefit.</p> <p>There is also concern about noise pollution. It is understood that such installations can cause appreciable noise output. This could be experienced by those walking adjacent to the building but predominantly by residents in the building. Noise vibration within the building, which, due to its method of construction (un-dampened load-bearing structure with a lightweight roof), would be almost impossible to modify to counteract this expected phenomenon.</p> <p>Visual Amenity</p> <p>The visual amenity of the immediate, surrounding, and neighboring areas will be severely and detrimentally affected by such an installation:</p> <p>The proposed installation is so prominent, both in size and scale (not necessarily made clear, or indeed evident by poorly constructed drawings) that it will be able to be seen as an overpowering mass, by anyone adjacent to the building.</p> <p>It will offer a distracting and invasive industrial-styled street-view focus when moving around the building while driving, cycling, and walking on the surrounding streets. This would be particularly evident (and indeed dramatic) when approaching the building, being on the crest of a hill, from 3 directions (Dartmouth Park Hill, Dartmouth Park Road, and Laurier Road). See also below reference to the adjacent building of particular architectural merit.</p> <p>The view of the roof from adjacent and surrounding properties will be greatly detrimental to their owners' enjoyment of the immediate tree and skylines (a particularly appreciated and valued aspect of living in this location by residents of flats and houses of differing architectural provenance and residential occupation and local residents walking eg. in Dartmouth Park)</p> <p>The delightful view of the skyline of this section of Dartmouth Park Hill from Hampstead Heath, particularly descending from Parliament Hill towards the east, would be severely and horrendously spoilt for anyone's enjoyment, both locals and visitors alike. In addition, the view from any building (predominantly housing) within the same eye-line would be similarly affected.</p> <p>St Mark's Church</p> <p>The different but individual styles of Crestview and St Mark's Church seen in juxtaposition from various aspects are a familiar and appreciated feature of the local street scene. The addition of a jagged and industrial forest of aerials projecting from a height very similar to that of the church would completely destroy the appreciation of any vista of the church, a Grade II* listed building, in which it was seen together with</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/4190/P	William Shanks	11/12/2022 15:14:40	OBJ	I agree with previous comments that this will damage the visual appeal of the local area. In addition I believe the siting of the antennae on a residential building is a poor choice and will disturb residents of the block both during construction and if any maintenance access is required. I also believe that phone masts on the roof will reduce the resale value of the flats within the block because of 1.) Their ugly appearance and 2.) Public perception, right or wrong, that living so close to a high power microwave transmitter is potentially harmful to health. Please find somewhere else to site the transmitters, not on a residential building.
2022/4190/P	Anne Skinner	11/12/2022 13:52:33	COMMNT	I strongly object to this proposal. The appearance of all that equipment on top of Crestview will be detrimental to the nature of the conservation area. It will also detract from the lovely St Mary's Church. This location is highly visible from Hampstead Heath and would have a negative effect on the view of the existing roof lines.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/4190/P	Neil Fanning	10/12/2022 16:00:55	OBJ	<p>I strongly object to the proposed development of the siting of telecommunications equipment on and around the Crestview block of flats. My objections are based on the issues below.</p> <p>Due to their siting and appearance the proposed antennas, dishes and supporting structure would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ¶ Appear as dominant and discordant additions to the roof of the building within this location, and would therefore cause harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the setting of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area ¶ Be visible on the skyline for a considerable distance and would impact on the visual amenity of Hampstead Heath and the surrounding areas. ¶ The application does not demonstrate that there is a greater good that might be gained from implementing the proposals. ¶ The application is ill considered and silent on the potential impact on terrestrial reception for residents in the neighbourhood. The impact of 3G and 4G installations on terrestrial television reception is already recognised, the impact of 5G installations is known to be greater. If the applicant's proposals are permitted many local residents may be forced to incur the cost of changing to satellite reception. A proliferation of satellite dishes would be of further detriment to the Conservation Area and its surrounds. ¶ The greater communications benefit that the proposals claim to provide can be provided via other means which are not detrimental to the Conservation Area and surrounding areas ¶ The application's proposals are contrary to the policies of the London Plan and the London Borough of Camden <p>Furthermore, Crestview was built many years ago and was not constructed in accordance with the current Building Regulations and does not incorporate any measures to mitigate noise and vibration transfer through the building. Currently domestically generated noise is readily transmitted and heard throughout the building. The addition of continuous commercially generated noise and vibration might result in the acoustic environment in some or all of the homes in Crestview becoming intolerable.</p> <p>Finally, there is no meaningful difference between this application and that submitted in 2021 (ref 2021/0598/P) when permission was refused. The reasons for refusal of the previous application have in no way been addressed and the current application is just harassment of the residents of Crestview and the Conservation Area. Having to deal with such an application is also a waste of LB Camden's resources. I would therefore urge the Council to again refuse permission.</p>
2022/4190/P	Anne Skinner	11/12/2022 13:52:05	COMMNT	<p>I strongly object to this proposal. The appearance of all that equipment on top of Crestview will be detrimental to the nature of the conservation area. It will also detract from the lovely St Mary's Church. This location is highly visible from Hampstead Heath and would have a negative effect on the view of the existing roof lines.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/4190/P	Maya de Souza, Chair, DPNE	11/12/2022 23:41:21	OBJ	<p>On behalf of the neighbourhood forum, DPNE, I am writing to oppose this application on the basis that it does not protect or enhance the conservation area for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) the size and scale of this equipment (a whole storey in height and in appearance a white block) is such as to make this highly visible from the Heath. Views from the Heath are much valued views and recognised in the neighbourhood plan as of importance.b) the building is across the road from St Mary's Brookfield (Grade II listed) which can be seen from many locations and is an imposing and impressive structure. Having this huge block on top of Crestfield will damage these important views. <p>There are alternative sites including in the Archway area, and we are aware of plans to install antennae on the Ingestre Rd estate.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/4190/P	Crestview Flats (Freehold) Ltd	10/12/2022 18:30:27	OBJ	Crestview Flats (Freehold) Ltd wishes to strongly oppose this second Application on the following grounds:

Technical specification and inaccuracies:

It is difficult to put any reliance on the plans which have been submitted, despite our having commented on the inaccuracies in the plans submitted in the previous application. These continue to show our building, Crestview, as having a total of 9 garages beneath the ground floor where there should be 8. The effect of this on the plans is to make Crestview appear larger than it is. Their Site Plan -Existing, plus all their Proposed Site plans and Elevations still show 'existing' satellite dishes and antennae in place although these had already been removed before the previous Application was submitted and have not been re-installed. In their new submission they state the following, in relation to the previous application:

There would be a slight increase in the overall antenna height. The refused scheme had a height to the top of the antennas of 25.15 meters, and the current scheme the antennas are 23.13 above ground level.

There seems to be some confusion in the above statement. Moreover, we fail to see how this increase in height can possibly reduce the impact as is claimed in their submission, particularly when all 6 antennae are clustered together to form a large, ugly block.

Waldon again state in this application that the building has previously housed telecommunications apparatus. As we pointed out before, a much smaller telecoms installation was already in place when this Company took over the Freehold in 1995. This Company had it removed as soon as it was legally possible to do so. A [REDACTED] Application submitted by Commpro Telecommunications in 2000 to expand the existing development was withdrawn by Camden Council on 22 January 2001. In a letter to Commpro in December 2000 the then Planning Officer said:

"You are probably aware that the installation of telecommunications equipment has recently become very contentious, and that there is a lot of opposition to it from residents."

Siting

Crestview is located within the eastern border of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area. As its name implies, it is on a crest in Dartmouth Park Hill and is therefore widely visible within this area, as well as within the St Johns Grove Conservation area in Islington (opposite). We are already a relatively tall building for the area, and the development would add significantly to our height and visibility. The Waldon submission states that the masts will add over 6 metres to the height of the building making it almost a third as high again! The Camden Local Plan 2017 requires any developments to take into account the wider historic environment and buildings, spaces and features of local historic value. We believe that the development, by reason of the location, number of pieces of equipment, height and design, would result in visual clutter which would cause significant harm to local views, in particular to the views of the Grade II* listed St M [REDACTED] to the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area.

We understand that any development within a conservation area should preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the area and should not cause harm to the significance of a listed building through an effect on its setting. The Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Plan 2020 places great emphasis on maintaining

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

and enhancing the character of the area. It states (2.10): 1...the people of Dartmouth Park wish to ensure that the areas village character, rich architectural heritage, attractive green streets, open spaces and natural environment are not only maintained but enhanced. We firmly believe that the proposals put forward in the Planning Application would contravene every aspect of the above policy statement.

Crestview, by virtue of its location high up on Dartmouth Park Hill, 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.

Crestview is also located immediately adjacent to the Grade II* listed St Mary Brookfield Church, a building of more than special interest and of significant architectural heritage. This is of a similar height to Crestview and from many locations the proposed development would severely impact on the views of the church itself.

We are also immediately adjacent to the St Johns Grove Conservation Area and the development would have a negative visual impact on this area, too. We are diagonally opposite the green open space of Dartmouth Park.

Our current roof covering is insubstantial, and wholly unsuited to what is being proposed. Because of the specific nature of our buildings construction, the humming/buzzing noises and vibrations associated with the telecoms cabinets (x7) would likely transmit through our entire building structure, making the acoustic environment in Crestview homes intolerable. Actions normally taken to mitigate this are likely to have little impact. Noise from wind around the antennae(x6) may be audible not only to us but also to our immediate neighbours.

Appearance

In view of the size and scope of the proposed installation, it is considered overly dominant, and entirely inappropriate for a small compact block of 18 flats. The height, bulk and massing of the structures would be disproportionate to the size of the building itself, and are likely to have an extremely negative impact on Crestviews visual appearance. Other items of equipment including a cluster of 7 cabinets, a transmission dish on a free-standing frame and a one metre high railing round a substantial part of the roof would maximise the impact of roof top clutter. We believe that much of the proposed equipment would be visible from street level. The exposed position of the building means that there would be no screening from surrounding trees or other buildings and would have a significant detrimental effect on the skyline. Since a Company Management Meeting in May 2016 we have effected a complete de-cluttering of the roof area to improve its appearance and present the simple, horizontal lines of the building.

The Camden Local Plan 2017 requires developments to take into account the character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings as well as the character and proportions of the existing building, where alterations and extensions are proposed. We believe this development would impact severely on the appearance of the building, as well as being visible from many points in the conservation area, including Laurier Road, Dartmouth Park Hill, Dartmouth Park Road, and further afield. The height of the masts would significantly increase the visibility throughout the area.

Health and Safety:

It appears that health concerns carry little weight in planning decisions, but it is nevertheless considered worth mentioning as several of our residents/ Leaseholders have expressed concerns on this issue.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>We are aware that a recent Briefing document from the European Parliamentary Research Service has stated the following in relation to 5G (March 2020).</p> <p>‘This raises the question as to whether there is a negative impact on human health and environment from higher frequencies and billions of additional connections, which, according to research, will mean constant exposure for the whole population, including children. Whereas researchers generally consider such radio waves not to constitute a threat to the population, research to date has not addressed the constant exposure that 5G would introduce. Accordingly, a section of the scientific community considers that more research on the potential negative biological effects of electromagnetic fields (EMF) and 5G is needed, notably on the incidence of some serious human diseases. A further consideration is the need to bring together researchers from different disciplines, in particular medicine and physics or engineering, to conduct further research into the effects of 5G.’</p> <p>We are also aware that at the instigation of a group Action Against 5G, a full-day Judicial Review Court Hearing will take place at The Royal Courts of Justice on 13th December 2022. The Group is challenging the UK government's failure to take sufficient notice of clearly identified health and safety risks of wireless radiation and the increased exposure from the deployment of 5G.</p> <p>We are concerned that the proposed development would be immediately above residents living in their homes, with what we know to be only a thin roof covering between the roof and the top floor flats.</p> <p>In summary, we firmly believe that this proposal would result in significant harm to the local heritage assets, their settings and the setting of the Conservation Area. This should outweigh any potential benefits from the development, and the Waldon submission fails adequately to address this issue. This matter is of grave concern to the Company and its constituent Leaseholders.</p> <p>Terry Mckie Amanda Richardson Hamish Birchall Directors, Crestview Flats (Freehold) Ltd</p>
2022/4190/P	Megan Walsh	13/12/2022 15:12:06	OBJ	<p>I strongly object to these ugly structures being put on the top of a residential block - they will look terrible on the building itself, they will be a looming, unavoidable eyesore in the surrounding conservation area and will ruin the skyline from further away (not to mention the view of the grade II style-listed church next door). The amendments provided don't change the fact that these large, highly visible industrial antenna are not appropriate for a residential conservation area.</p>