

---

**From:** Sian Berry London [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 19 February 2023 15:29  
**To:** Planning Planning; Sam FitzPatrick  
**Subject:** Objection to application 2022/4190/P

Dear planning team,

Many apologies for this but I don't think my comments copied below on the Crest View application made it through from my council address so I am resubmitting them from my personal email.

I hope they can still be considered and very best wishes,

Sian Berry  
Councillor, Highgate Ward

Comments on 2022/4190/P  
Installation of telecommunications equipment at Crestview, 47 Dartmouth Park Hill London NW5 1JB

As ward councillor, I am very disappointed to see yet another application for a very inappropriately designed telecommunications installation on another of our valuable 20th century residential buildings.

In response to contact from the applicants in September 2022, I made the following comments copied below and offered a meeting to discuss more appropriate locations and ideas, and though a meeting was offered by the applicants, and a reply sent by me, no dates were forthcoming.

I have studied the new proposals in detail since then. It is clear from the drawings and details of the equipment provided that the proposals are in breach of Camden Local Plan policies D1 (Design), D2 (Heritage) and A2 (Open space) as well as design and local character policies in the adopted Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Plan.

The fact that the proposals are again so intrusive and inappropriately designed - with the height even more significant and the same unshielded antennae being proposed, means that I have to strongly object to these proposals and urge that they are rejected.

I also support the views of residents within the building as set out here:

"Although the plans have been 'revised' (by clustering the original 6 antennae around our lift-housing unit, reducing the dishes from four to one and the cabinets from 8 to 7) the objections remain the same. The total height once installed is fractionally more than Waldon's last proposal.

"It would still protrude and harm the skyline as well as the setting and view of the Grade II \* church of St Mary Brookfield which is adjacent to Crestview.  
Such an installation is quite unsuitable within the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area, which is primarily residential and which is bordered by other conservation areas of Holly Lodge, Camden Highgate and St John's Islington, opposite.

The skyline at this point is particularly vulnerable as it is highly visible from considerable distances including many points on Hampstead Heath. Parliament Hill Fields offers a view of both Crestview and St Mary Brookfield together. Anything which were to disturb or add to the simple, flat lines of Crestview would inevitably draw attention from St Mary Brookfield and diminish its setting.

"The proportion of the proposed telecoms equipment would totally dominate and outweigh the 6-storeys of the dwelling below. The total height from our rooftop to the uppermost point of the antennae is in excess of two-and-a-half floors of our dwellings - more than a third and nearer to a half of the height of our dwellings."

Very best wishes,

Sian Berry  
Councillor, Highgate Ward

**From:** Sian Berry (Cllr) <[Sian.Berry@camden.gov.uk](mailto:Sian.Berry@camden.gov.uk)>  
**Sent:** Sunday, September 25, 2022 4:38:26 PM  
**To:** Georgia Palanga <[REDACTED]>; Camron Aref-Adib (Cllr) <[Camron.Aref-Adib@camden.gov.uk](mailto:Camron.Aref-Adib@camden.gov.uk)>; Anna Wright (Cllr) <[Anna.Wright@camden.gov.uk](mailto:Anna.Wright@camden.gov.uk)>  
**Cc:** Maya De Souza <[REDACTED]>  
**Subject:** Re: Proposed telecoms development at - CRESTVIEW, 47 DARTMOUTH PARK HILL, NW5 1JB [Our ref: CA/MBNL/55599]

Dear Georgia,

Thanks for getting in touch. This is my response to the consultation with councillors.

I am afraid I will strongly object to these plans if they are proposed, as I have done to previous proposals in the area. Reviewing the drawings, the plans remain out of proportion to the building, will be very disruptive to the roofline and local views, and would harm the positive contribution this building makes to the area, and I am disappointed that such proposals have been brought forward again.

I attach my objection to the similar proposals at Haddo House, which outlines in more detail why these large installations on our valuable 20<sup>th</sup> Century residential buildings would not be appropriate, and copied below are the objections to the last proposals at Crestview from the Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Forum.

I would, however, like to ask for a meeting with you/your company to discuss how you might more constructively seek to place more infrastructure in locations other than these two valuable buildings, including the constraints you face in achieving signal coverage and finding locations (height, topography etc), how your equipment could be made more adaptable so as to be more unobtrusive/disguised or hidden from view, and how you might be able to work proactively with people making plans for new developments in the area to incorporate your equipment more sensitively within new structures or buildings rather than harming existing local assets.

Please let me know if this would be possible.

I am also copying in the chair of the Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Forum, which I think would also like to be involved in any such discussions.

Very best wishes,

Sian

**DPNF objection to the 2021 application which was refused:**

The Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Forum OBJECTS to the application to install telecommunications equipment to the rooftop of Crestview, on the basis that it would violate Policy DC2 in the Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Plan, which states as follows:

'Policy DC2 Heritage assets: Preserve or enhance the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area, historic buildings and buildings of architectural merit and their settings, by:

(a) in the case of developments within the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area, including alterations or extensions to existing buildings, ensuring that the development preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Conservation Area;

(b) in the case of Listed Buildings, only permitting development where the design of the development is demonstrated to be of a high standard led by the character, appearance and scale of the Listed Buildings themselves;

(c) in the case of development affecting any of the buildings (or the setting of any such buildings) that make a positive contribution to the character or appearance of the conservation area, as identified in the Conservation Area Appraisal (Appraisal Appendix 2), only permitting development that is designed to a high standard, or preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the conservation area and makes a positive contribution to local distinctiveness;'

Crestview is located within the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area and is adjacent to the St Johns Conservation Area, Islington. As the name suggests, Crestview sits at the top of Dartmouth Park Hill, and is already visible from a considerable distance. The equipment which it is proposed to add to the rooftop would add height equivalent to more than two storeys. The equipment would not be screened by any natural features, by any other buildings or by any existing rooftop features on the building. The equipment would protrude into the skyline with a cluttered, ragged profile, would be highly visible and would dominate views from throughout the DP Conservation Area. It would also be widely visible from Hampstead Heath. The application would therefore seriously detract from the character and appearance of the DP Conservation Area.

In addition, Crestview is on the other side of the road from St Mary's Brookfield, a Grade II\* listed building which currently is roughly the same height as Crestview. The additional height from the equipment would make Crestview tower over and dominate St Mary's, seriously detracting from the setting of this important heritage asset.

In short, the placement of telecommunications equipment on the rooftop of Crestview would create substantial harm to the character and appearance of the DP Conservation Area and to the setting of St Mary Brookfield, in violation of Policy DC2 of the DP Neighbourhood Plan.