Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3861/P	Antony Ellis	06/11/2023 14:20:29	SUPPRT	In favour, more in keeping with the park aesthetic, safer and more fit for purpose.
2023/3861/P	Timothy Dobbs	06/11/2023 21:33:18	OBJ	Primrose Hill is a public open space and viewpoint for all of London. For the last half a century it has stayed that way, day and night. Gating it denies the city and its visitors a precious freedom and a fantastic resource: these green spaces are a vital outlet; and the principle of shared, democratic space is a fundamental part of community life. The Royal Parks - thanks to a vocal minority - have divided the community, permanently excluding everyone and enraging many. The Councillors campaigning for gates, having enjoyed the freedom to enjoy the Hill in their own youth, seem in the main to object to today's 'young people' being out after 10pm. Except it's not just the young who might want to be out after 10pm or before 6am. It's the old, and the middle aged; it's dog walkers, and new parents, and tourists; it's anyone who likes the view, or the night sky, or cleaner air and green space. And what happens when everyone has equal access? Antisocial behaviour is actually reduced, because the whole community is there to help deter and police it. Now the Parks - bolstered by a heavily skewed consultation - intend to build a permanent reminder of exclusion and a flashpoint for problems. Denying us access isn't just wrong and poorly judged: it's counterproductive. The clue's in the name: Royal Parks. We've always had to fight for spaces we can share as citizens. Previous generations fought - first for access, then to remove gates. Why do we have to repeat history's mistake?
2023/3861/P	Roheet Shah	06/11/2023 15:46:00	OBJ	I am a resident in the Primrose Hill neighbourhood. I strongly object to this application. Gates should not be put on Primrose Hill and it should be open to the public 24-7.
2023/3861/P	Lucy Cottrell	08/11/2023 05:58:05	SUPPRT	I support the application for gates The temporary gates, while essential to manage the park, were not in character, were flimsy, and totally inappropriate for a Royal Park. "Ugly" was the word most often used in conversations I have heard. Of course gates were essential as, like so many in Primrose Hill, I have been severely impacted by anti-social behaviour, noise disruption and threatening behaviour, over a four year period. The installation of appropriate gates are long overdue. Visually, the proposed design looks inoffensive and in keeping with the railings, but hopefully what will be produced will be sufficiently robust in construction.
2023/3861/P	Katie Green	06/11/2023 14:10:27	SUPPRT	I am in favour of fitting more permanent gates as the flimsy temporary gates often have bits of metal sticking out that are highly dangerous for my two young sons as they are face height. I think that permanent gates would also be much more in keeping with the park and much more robust and fit for purpose.