



Subject: Fwd: DPCAAC comments on Crestview - 2022/4190/P



I am forwarding the **full** response which DPCAAC submitted in Objection to the above planning application.

Under the Consultation Response for DPCAAC it appears to show only a **small part** of the **full submission**.

Please will you correct this by posting what was submitted in the email below by Nick Bradfield on behalf of the DPCAAC.

Best wishes,
Amanda Evans



Begin forwarded message:



Subject: DPCAAC comments on Crestview

Comments submitted on behalf of DPCAAC.

Best regards

Nick Bradfield



Subject: CAAC Comments Form Submission

Dear Sir / Madam

Thank you for submitting your comments. Below are the details you provided on the CAAC comments form:

Planning Application Detail:

Pin: 606221

Advisory committee:

Application ref.: 2022/4190/P

Site Address: Crestview 47 Dartmouth Park Hill London NW5 1JB

Development Description: Installation of telecommunications equipment (6 x antenna apertures, 1 x transmission dish, and 7 x equipment cabinets) to the roof of existing building and ancillary development thereto.

Planning officer: Sam Fitzpatrick

Please send your comments by:: 2022-12-29T00:00:00.000

About your observation:

Please choose one: Objection

Do you have any comments or consider that the proposal is harmful to or does not preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area?: Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Advisory Committee comments on 2022/4190/P Crestview Installation of telecommunications equipment on roof.

What is proposed is thoroughly objectionable. Its approval would be inconsistent with the duty to preserve and enhance both the Conservation Area and the neighbouring listed building. Crestview is an unfortunate bulky and tall building built, which, as its name suggests, on the crest of a steep hill which looms above conservation areas on both sides of Dartmouth Park Hill. Its substantial flat roof sits just about level with and is a dominant feature on the skyline immediately adjacent to the equally significant and important but attractive listed roof of St Mary's Brookfield, which, at street level, is across Dartmouth Park Road. Both roofs are particularly visible from the Parliament Hill/Heath side of the Conservation Area. From here anything on the Crestview roof is clearly visible and stands out against the skyline. However Crestview and its roof are visible from pretty much anywhere in this part of the Conservation Area. Most significantly, in terms of the character of the Conservation Area, the characteristic view looking up the hill from anywhere on Dartmouth Park Road. The roof is, in short, sensitive and highly visible and any development on it would be necessarily intrusive.

We have seen and endorse the objection from the Dartmouth Park Road Residents Association. Crestview's flat roof is thin, minimally insulated against heat loss, and not insulated against expansion and is thus prone to leaking. The roof isn't trafficable and has a minimal access point. The visible structure on the roof is a modest cover to the lift shaft the impact of which could easily be attenuated as matters stand.

The key structures proposed would double or treble the height of the and would be bolted to the existing structure probably implying reinforcement. At the very least undermining impact attenuation of the lift shaft cover and the anyway not visible water tanks can now be removed. This is inconsistent with what the drawings suggest would be skeletal structures. In the unwelcome event of approval this would have to be ensured by condition.

Beyond that substantial cabinets etc are inexplicably inexcusably dotted about the roof where they would be clearly visible in views and against the skyline. No evidence is provided as to why these must be on the roof. No information is provided as to the location of cables to ground level but plainly can't be on the face of the brickwork nor to what these would be connected or where.

Final key element of the application is to enclose the whole roof with railings. It is not explained what the purpose of these railings which the most obvious feature from the ground in the immediate vicinity are or how they are related to the main purpose of the application. They alone would preclude a grant of permission. There is no conceivable way the existence of the railings can be tied exclusively to the proposed other structures or to enforce removal later if those were removed. If agreed there would be nothing to prevent the residents from subsequently making the

roof which as the application drawings imply would be made trafficable and enjoying the whole roof as a massive roof terrace which would be an asset and afford magnificent views. This possibility again would preclude approval unless this later use was approvable and that would at least require consideration of such matters as the fact that such a terrace would overlook many neighbouring properties.

This is an extra-ordinary 'planning application'. No mention even of the site being within a Conservation Area or within the context (across the road from) of a listed building of some importance and nothing remotely resembling a heritage impact statement. Not even any attempt to defend the visual or other impact of the of the proposed 'development. No reference even to the applicability or otherwise of policies and guidance it must be known will guide the Planning Authority's decision. The author plainly hasn't even read these documents. No reference to the huge sensitivity of this already unsatisfactory roof which sits on the skyline towering above this part of the Conservation area and is visible for miles around.

We note there is no evidence of a referral to Islington Planning necessary given its potential impact on one of its Conservation areas.

There is, moreover, no detail of the installation. No survey providing confidence that what is proposed is remotely possible. In the unlikely event of an approval we would then have a series of amendment applications. It is in effect an application for outline permission in a situation in which such applications are not permitted. One suspects that missing detail might include cabling attached to the face of the building which would have in any event to be precluded by condition. What is proposed would at least impede publicly encouraged works. We are here dealing with an insubstantial thin single skin flat roof which isn't significantly insulated either for heat retention purposes or for climate resilience purposes to protect the flat roof from expansion movement and consequent leaks. The frustration of both matters at the heart of public policy would militate against any overriding public benefit claim, however, since no such claim is made in the application this need not trouble anyone now.

Finally, the present designation of the building as negative isn't an invitation to make it hugely worse, the contrary Its designation is a consequence of Crestview's excessive dominance in views. Far from its designation making it open season it should have warned any applicant that anything which made it even more intrusive would be unwelcome. The very attribute which attracts this developer is the reason why it is wholly unsuitable for such a development. Finally a trivial confirmation that the applicants haven't paid any attention to conservation area considerations, there drawing seeks to rely on the alleged presence of a Satellite dish and TV aerial. Any reader of the Statement would if these do exist on the roof their existence is frowned upon and would know that the proposed giant equivalents would be too.

Should this application not be promptly rejected we would consider attempting or commissioning a phot montage in order to ensure a more effective public consultation.

Patrick Lefevre
for DPCAAC
11/12/2022.