

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/4190/P	Hakim boudjemai	28/12/2022 09:09:47	OBJ	I wish to object to this addition to the roof of Crestview. I believe it will spoil the skyline of the conservation area. The developers have not attempted to blend the installation in with the building, instead just plonking it on the roof with no regard for aesthetics.
2022/4190/P	Richard Hermer	27/12/2022 14:48:20	COMMNT	I object to the adverse visual impact and also to the decision to place commercial interests over those of all residents of Crest View and surrounding properties.
2022/4190/P	Marina Kurkchiyan	27/12/2022 21:39:34	COMMNT	I object. This development is inconsistent with the values and purpose of the Conservation Area.
2022/4190/P	Yesica Reynoso	27/12/2022 15:40:52	OBJ	I object. Please don't destroy this lovely view of the church up on the hill which we can all see from Parliament Hill and beyond. I understand that the church is also Grade II* listed, so surely its surroundings need to be respected too.
2022/4190/P	Simon Mohun	28/12/2022 00:15:31	COMMNT	This equipment is visually intrusive and quite out of keeping with the conservation area guidelines as I understand them. I cannot imagine how it will blend with the Victorian church opposite and with the surrounding houses. I urge that planning permission for this proposed development be withheld.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/4190/P	Monika Beutel	27/12/2022 23:06:29	OBJ	<p>Camden 2022/4190/P</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 'Crestview' is a single building on Dartmouth Park Hill built in the 1960s and comprising 18 flats on 6 levels. The freehold rests with the 18 leaseholders, and each flat is occupied by either the leaseholder or a relative of a leaseholder. The building is managed by Dillons Property Management who are accountable to the leaseholders. 2. Crestview lies within the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area and stands opposite the important Grade 2* Church of St. Mary Brookfield. St. Mary's Church and the Crestview building rise to almost the same roof level. To put masts on top of Crestview would obscure the present view of the Church, as currently seen, prominently across the surrounding area within and beyond the Conservation area. 3. I am not aware that any resident of Crestview or any of our neighbours feel a need for large aerials/masts, as most local people's present mobile use is quite adequate. And if additional or better mobile coverage is required, it should not be installed on a residential building that houses families and elderly people some of whom are frail and have no interest in increasing the mobile reception. 4. Mobile phone masts have apparently been shown to have adverse health effects on some wildlife and on the health of humans. Prominent scientists have shown that some individuals have particular sensitivities to 5G vibrations, which can lead to DNA effects such as reduced fertility, neurology and cancer. Although I cannot speak as a scientist, one cannot ignore the work that has been done by established scientists on this issue. 5. Waldon Telephone Company had at an earlier stage a contract for audio or similar purposes at Hill House in Bickerton Road; Waldon had also considered the other Hill House at Archway. These two are examples of buildings that can provide accommodation for a range of small companies, some of which have client visitors during the day, but during the night these buildings tend to be empty. Such buildings would be suitable for masts and other equipment, while a residential block such as Crestview is less suitable for masts and heavy equipment, as residents would have to live with the noise of the masts etc. both during the day and at night. 6. Waldon's earlier unsuccessful application to place masts on Crestview's roof was turned down in April 2021. But Waldons' renewed application now proposes that the masts are to be put on the elevator housing on the roof, which itself is not very sturdy. Any work which could interfere with the operation of the lift even temporarily would be wholly unacceptable to leaseholders (particularly to those that are elderly, less mobile or wheelchair or pram users). 7. As in their previous proposal, Crestview's roof would need to be strengthened. But installing a new roof would greatly disturb some residents who live at or near the upper levels of the building. 8. Some of Crestview's residents have serious health problems and may find it impossible to tolerate the noise of building work and the ongoing disturbance by Waldons' equipment and by the necessary continuing maintenance of the masts. 9. Waldons' proposal is unwelcome to Crestview residents because of the serious disturbance as well as the loss of the leaseholders own proposals, such as the possibility of a roof garden which would increase the number of birds and bees in this area of north London .

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>10. In summary, Waldons' proposal is not welcome, it would disturb the existing structure of the Crestview building and would lead to substantial access problems to the roof during the building works and on a continuing basis. It would mean that operatives could come at any time of day or night to check on the functioning of their equipment. All of this would seriously compromise the residents' right to the quiet enjoyment of the property that they jointly own, and for works in which they have no interest.</p> <p>Monika Beutel 27/12/22</p>
2022/4190/P	Ms Rachel Hermer	27/12/2022 15:50:49	OBJ	<p>I object to this application - as I did previously. As a local resident I object on the grounds that this is a conservation area and the proposals to place such a number of masts, would severely dominate the local skyline to the detriment of the local environment. It would be an eyesore from a multitude of perspectives. It is also very unfair that the private residents who live in Crestview would potentially have this foisted upon them - when there is still uncertainty over any long term health issues of this equipment on residential properties and when it could potentially impact the value of the properties.</p>
2022/4190/P	Colin	28/12/2022 09:03:56	OBJ	<p>This project will be an eyesore on the horizon. The area is a conservation area with beautiful buildings either side of the development. I strongly oppose the towers.</p>
2022/4190/P	Lee Rankin	27/12/2022 15:32:54	OBJ	<p>I object to this proposal.</p> <p>This is prominent building in a conservation area with a "Grade II*" listed church just opposite. The roof and church can be seen clearly from Hampstead Heath and the surrounding areas. This view and Grade II* setting should be preserved and protected, not turned into an eyesore. Surely there are more subtle/suitable locations for this.</p>