

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2023/3861/P	D Bruce	29/11/2023 19:54:42	COMMNT	I am very supportive of the intention to put in these gates. Thank you.
2023/3861/P	HMA	29/11/2023 20:16:58	SUPPRT	we live close to the park and are aware of trespassers causing havoc including fireworks throughout the night. We support adding permanent gates for the welfare of the community.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3861/P	Cllr Matthew Kirk	29/11/2023 12:34:47	OBJ	<p>I write to object to the application for planning permission for permanent gates to Primrose Hill (2023/3861/P).</p> <p>I do so as a Councillor for Belsize ward, reflecting conversations with residents, and in a personal capacity as I have enjoyed late night visits and picnics on Primrose Hill with my young family, to watch a lunar eclipse or meteor showers or simply the view across London at night.</p> <p>Essentially, I object to the installation of permanent gates as it will result in a continuation and increase in the night-time closure of the park. That will reduce people's ability to enjoy the open space. The closure of the park cannot be justified on the grounds of prevention of crime and anti-social behaviour and if anything the closure of the gates is likely to increase the number of serious incidents.</p> <p>I have seen and strongly endorse the comments of the Open Spaces Society. It is hugely important that the rights of people to enjoy London's open spaces is fiercely protected. Primrose Hill offers one of the best if not the best London panorama. The view on late summer evenings or at night gives pleasure to many. The particular and distinct view of London at night should be protected just as much as that by day. I have already noted that it is one of the very nicest places in London to watch astronomical events (given the levels of background light anywhere in London).</p> <p>The argument for the current closure with temporary gates Friday to Sunday during British Summer Time and the argument for the installation of permanent gates rests on the prevention of crime and anti-social behaviour. It is simply not made out. At the height of the pandemic there were significant difficulties - but they no longer exist. Since the pandemic instances of crime are remarkably low. As the figures make clear and as was confirmed by police when I asked about this at the Culture and Environment Scrutiny Committee meeting on 10th July 2023, the park at night is a very safe place – significantly safer than many nearby streets! There are few complaints of anti-social behaviour – in fact simply noise - and those come from a small number of people and are recognised by the police to be logged as a campaign tool (confirmed at the same meeting).</p> <p>The application comes very close to accepting what is abundantly clear - that the gates respond to a historic situation rather than a current one. See for instance paragraph 1.4.</p> <p>It is notable that in the recent months of weekend closures there have been serious incidents – including a knife point robbery - during hours of closure. People still climb into the park and with no policing and no natural surveillance from others passing they are at a high level of risk. It is my firm view that gates increase overall levels of serious criminality.</p> <p>It is argued that the permanent gates are a positive improvement on the temporary gates that have stood for some time. The simple answer is that the temporary gates should be removed. If there is a particular and ad hoc public order concern, such as on bonfire night, hallowe'en or new year's eve, as suggested in the application, and that cannot be met by an ad hoc police or community safety presence, then it can be met by temporary gates being put up for those one or two nights. I note that none of the occasions referred to has consistently been closed over recent years – in fact last new year's eve the park was left open as an exception to the "temporary circuit-breaker"!</p> <p>The Royal Parks have confirmed (including at the meeting noted above) that they will keep closure of the park under ongoing review and abandon their current policy if it is not required. As argued above, it is my very firm</p>

**Application No:**    **Consultees Name:**    **Received:****Comment:**    **Response:**

belief that it is not required and should be abandoned. But importantly in this context, the installation of permanent gates will have the effect of setting the policy in stone.

As was accepted by The Royal Parks at the same C&E meeting, the survey results from their public engagement have a very dramatic demographic skew. They are not reflective of the local population let alone the London wide population who enjoy and benefit from access to the park. The figures show only slight preference for gating the park – and even that is likely to significantly overstate support because of the demographic distortion. What is clear is that the local community is divided with strong views on both sides. That is a bad context and a bad foundation for a temporary policy and a horrendous one for what is in effect a permanent policy.

I make a couple of final remarks. I am aware that the brightly-lit central path is well used by pedestrian traffic between St John's Wood and Primrose Hill – to the benefit of residents and Primrose Hill businesses. I am also aware that the loud-hailer used by police to clear the park and the rapid efflux of people at closure time are themselves sources of nuisance.

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3861/P	catherine usiskin	28/11/2023 16:51:38	OBJ	<p>Objection To Planning Permission Number - 2023/3861/P</p> <p>Royal Parks - Installation of gates to existing entrances to Primrose Hill open space at: Elsworthy Terrace, Primrose Hill and Oppidans Road, Primrose Hill Road and Ainger Road, Primrose Hill Road and Regent's Park Road, Regent's Park Road and Fitzroy Road, Regent's Park Road and Albert Terrace, Prince Albert Road and Albert Terrace, Prince Albert Road and Ormonde Terrace, Ormonde Terrace and St. Edmund's Terrace.</p> <p>I object to Planning Permission (2023/3861/P) for the installation of gates around Primrose Hill.</p> <p>1. The Planning Application is Misleading and Disingenuous</p> <p>At no point in the application does the application mention the Royal Parks have announced publicly their intention to close the Park at 10pm on Friday, Saturday, and Sunday nights from March to October i.e., within British Summer Time. This amounts to 90 nights a year.</p> <p>Keeping this 'under review' - in their language - means mission creep: further and longer closure will be instigated later down the line. There is and never has been a process for review that would enable a lighter touch. The gates were installed as a "temporary" measure due to increased footfall during lockdown, but no real-time review of the need to lock the park has ever been conducted and no resources exist for conducting one.</p> <p>The application presents a misleading view. It only mentions potentially closing the park at certain times (Bonfire Night, Hallowe'en and New Year's Eve) leading an uninformed reader to assume closure would be a few nights a year for specific reasons, not a weekly pattern of closure for 7 months of the year.</p> <p>The application form states that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the proposed development will not result in the loss, gain or change of use of an open space.</li> <li>• While the Royal Parks acknowledge elsewhere in their application that Primrose Hill is a site protected with a nature designation (a SNIC), they claim there will be no loss, gain or change of use of a site protected with a nature designation.</li> <li>• The proposed plan will not affect the 'Hours of Opening' of the park.</li> <li>• These statements are false. To close Primrose Hill Park overnight at weekends for 7 months of the year: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- will result in the Loss and Change of use of an open space.</li> <li>- will result in the Loss and Change of use protected with a nature designation. - will affect opening hours. A park that has been free of gates for over 50 years will regularly be closed for public use.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>After lockdown, in the Royal Park's own Annual Report 2022 Primrose Hill Park Manager, Nick Biddle states that levels of usage and reports of anti-social behaviour returned to normal levels after the pandemic: "On Primrose Hill, we saw an increase in anti-social behaviour over the spring and summer months while Covid restrictions were still in place [2021], including groups gathering, playing loud music, and leaving litter. However, this declined for the remainder of the year, and visitor numbers and behaviour have now returned to pre-pandemic levels."</p> <p>Despite this change, the gates have never been removed, and as the Planning Committee will understand that it has given rise to legitimate feelings among many local residents and park users of anger and betrayal.</p> <p>2. Crime Statistics and Anti-Social Behaviour</p> <p>The Planning Permission Application suggests gates are necessary to manage 'the problem of anti-social behaviour'.</p> <p>This 'dog-whistle' claim is problematic because (as mentioned above and according to the Primrose Hill Park manager himself) the problem does not exist to any serious extent.</p> <p>The police officially and in person reported to a recent Camden Council Culture and Environment Scrutiny Committee meeting Primrose Hill on crime and anti-social behaviour. Their comments included:</p>

Application No:    Consultees Name:    Received:

Comment:    Response:

Nick McLaughlin - Inspector Royal Parks Operational Unit

"The actual crime statistics across all Royal Parks are remarkably low". "My advice to anyone is that if you suffer a crime near a Royal Park is to go inside the park and phone the police because the response will be much quicker."

Stevie Bull – Royal Parks Police

"The statistics from 1st January to 30th June this year. We counted that there were 131 calls relating to the park itself, but only 28 related to ASB and crime specifically. About half of these were phone theft related." This is a very low rate of crime to be clearing and closing a park. These statistics are very low and do not even indicate they happened at night:

Even the CEO of the Royal Parks, Andrew Scattergood, stated at that meeting that this is a noise issue, not an ASB problem.

"In the main, the issues that have faced us have primarily been noise.

It should be noted, the Royal Parks have chosen not to make that clear in their Planning Application: The crime statistics show that there is no ASB or crime problem.

Nick McLaughlin - Inspector Royal Parks Operational Unit replied when asked specifically about whether he thought there was an issue with ASB on Primrose Hill:

"We do have a number of callers, or repeat callers... But my instincts with this is that this is largely a noise issue as opposed to a crime issue... It is not a crime hotspot, but it will be a place that generates noise and I suppose one of the questions that people have to consider is, is it reasonable to expect a large open space, near a very popular iconic location to be sterile at night and for it to be completely quiet? I suspect London as a whole is never quiet."

Local crime statistics don't substantiate the claims of crime and anti-social behaviour. Nor do Camden Council's own records, and despite the efforts of the Ward's local councillors, they too have been unable to verify the claims made by a few repeat callers complaining about noise.

The overly dominant influence of a few wealthy local homeowners

Local complainants, mostly home-owners on the perimeter of the park, have made numerous claims on social media, but have locked their Twitter [X] accounts against public replies so nobody can correct or challenge the claims made in these posts.

The laws against public nuisance, public order offences and ASB exist to protect people against false accusations as much as it is to prosecute them. There was a real problem with one individual who was successfully prosecuted using due process that first had to demonstrate he had a case to answer. Wild accusations on social media are no substitute.

How can gates be an answer to a problem that the police, the Royal Parks, Camden's Community Safety Team, the ward councillor and those who have for 3 years opposed the imposition of gates all agree, does not significantly exist?

3. The Application Contradicts The Camden Plan Open Spaces Policy

The Planning Application sits within Camden and is impacted by policies within the Camden Local Plan (July 2017). This includes policies around the use of open space.

Paragraph 6.8 from the Royal Park's Planning Application suggests:

"Rather than reducing the public's use of the open space, it is considered that the proposed gates will ensure that it remains a safe and high-quality space, in accordance with Camden Local Plan Policy, thereby improving it as an asset for the local community and for visitors from further afield, rather than compromising it as such."

In point of fact, the Planning Application falls outside the conditions that must be met by the Camden Local Plan: Emptying and closing the park 3 nights a week for 7 months of the year will reduce the public's use of an

Application No:    Consultees Name:    Received:

Comment:    Response:

open space.

To claim black is white more than stretches the truth.

#### 4. The Application contradicts The London Plan Open Spaces Policy

The Planning Application sits within London and is impacted by policies within The London Plan (July 2017).

This includes policies around the use of open space.

Paragraph 6.12 from the Planning Application states:

“For the majority of time within any given day, the proposed gates would be open and would not restrict access. Their provision is intended to allow The Royal Parks to effectively manage the open space in order to reduce anti- social behaviour and protect the public during other events, such as extreme weather. They would therefore not be considered to significantly prejudice the public’s use of the space or de-value it in any way.”

The Planning Application falls outside the conditions that need to be met by The London Plan. Emptying and closing the park on a weekly basis for 7 months of the year will prejudice the public’s use of an open space and devalue it. This application does not comply.

#### 5. Lack of Community Engagement by The Royal Parks

The Planning Application states that there has been a ‘full and extensive process of public engagement in order to gather the views of local residents and park visitors.’ This is simply not true. The Royal Parks have not, as should be required for the change in use of a public resource of this magnitude, consulted with local stakeholders or the community adequately.

- The Royal Parks have consistently refused to engage with local community groups or stakeholders, turning down meeting invites and not answering emails. This includes attending local meetings with Councillors or Community Engagement groups.

- The Royal Parks declined an invitation to attend key Camden Council meetings where they could be held accountable. This includes a deliberate failure to attend the Camden Culture and Environment Scrutiny Committee on the eve of their announcement of installing permanent gates. A move called a ‘grotesque snub’ by the committee.

- The Royal Parks have only engaged with Councillors from one ward (those known to favour gates). The park covers two wards. Other Councillors have been ignored.

David McLaren, Chief of Staff of the Royal Parks acknowledges the lack of Councillor engagement through this process stating:

“We repeatedly sought the views of the council throughout the engagement process. On many, many occasions we sought the council’s view. Their view on the Royal Park’s handling of the situation on Primrose Hill. We failed to get a response from the council to our engagement exercises.”

Other stakeholders have also acknowledged their lack of engagement participation. Patrick Coulson from the Camden Community Safety Service states:

“I am not going to speak for the entire council, but as a community safety service the conversation about gating is something that we’re not part of.”

#### 6. The ‘Engagement Survey’

The Planning Application relies of the evidence of the Royal Park’s ‘Engagement Survey.’ This was fundamentally biased, both in its failure to ensure a wide and fairly-weighted sample, but also in its framing of key questions. This was in no manner an adequate Public Consultation for such a major decision.

Discrimination: this survey failed to engage the most underprivileged and under resourced segments of our local population. The ‘Engagement Survey’ on which this application relies was not completed by them. An online study devoid of demographic quotas or panel recruitment excludes all harder to reach park users.

Application No:    Consultees Name:    Received:

Comment:    Response:

Canvassing on the hill took place during daylight hours, thereby excluding those (night time users) set to be most directly affected by the closures.

By their own admission, The Royal Parks have relied on a survey that does not represent the local community. The demographic most affected by the locking of the park are young people, often living in flats, who rely on use of an open space for health and mental health, as evidenced by the number of complaints received from local Councillors about the Royal Park's gating policy. Though the Royal Parks state the survey accurately reflects the views of the local neighborhood, 62% of the survey respondents were homeowners, and ~76% of the respondents were white. In contrast, according to the 2021 census data, only ~30% of Camden residents are homeowners and only ~60% are white.

The survey presented with an inaccurate picture of the issues at stake. The wording 'led the witness' by presupposing an ASB problem in Primrose Hill park without offering any evidence, and then presenting gates as the only solution. No alternative solutions were canvassed. Despite this, the two most commonly chosen answers were a) to never gate the park or b) only occasionally on specific holidays.

The Royal Parks, and their CEO, have acknowledge their 'Engagement Survey' was flawed but still continue to rely on it as a key part of their Planning Permission Application. When challenged about the 'Engagement Survey's' flaws and obvious biases, the CEO of the Royal Parks, Andrew Scattergood, stated publicly:

"We have tried to seek a balanced view through the engagement strategy but in effect, I don't think I would disagree with the assessments that have been made in the main."

A further problem with the so-called engagement survey is the completion rate. The Royal Parks at first concealed but then were forced to acknowledge the low response rate (3.5%). They then had to concede that the demographics of those who did complete the survey were very different to those from the demographics of Camden (as described below).

No robust public consultation has been done,

There has been no effective engagement with the key stakeholders affected by the decision.

It may surprise the Planning Committee to learn that the Primrose Hill Keeper's group was a joint initiative between those who favoured closing the park at weekends in the 2020 and 2021 lockdown years, and those opposed. It was an attempt to address problems of common concern, not including the gates issue which had polarised the two constituencies. Those in favour of gating the park stopped attending in 2020 and now contribute nothing except their persistent public demand for gates. The Royal Parks never attended. Nor did any pro-gate Councillor despite weekly invitations.

The Keepers group still meets weekly with an open invitation to the whole community and its representatives to work together, to arrive at a compromise.

#### 7. Impact of Closure on Other Areas of Camden

Gating and closure of Primrose Hill during the 'temporary circuit breaker' has shown that the impact on other areas of Camden as people are displaced, en masse, from a large, open space into the side streets and other areas.

Local Councillors are noting complaints made from other nearby open spaces, such as the bridge over the railway line, and in Swiss Cottage, where people leaving the park later congregate. The park's closure impacts all Camden.

#### 8 Long Term Impact on Camden Policing and Safety in The Park

Park gating and closure will require the consistent and wasteful use of police resource. As Andrew Scattergood, CEO of the Royal Parks admitted:

"The police have been absolutely fantastic in their support because in reality, I don't think two gate lockets would be able to clear the park of a thousand people, while the police have been able to do that for us."

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3861/P	Philip Magnus	29/11/2023 11:36:42	OBJ	<p>An unpoliced, closed park will lead to more police call outs about people who have climbed the gates. The fastest growing crime statistic in the area is people in the closed park. In demonstration at the perceived unfairness of locking people out of a public resource, the gates have constantly been destroyed. These acts of targeted protest are characterised by the Royal Parks as simple vandalism. This is a gross error of judgment. There will be an ongoing impact on local Camden policing resource closing and clearing the park and keeping people out of the open space. There is not addressed in the Planning Application.</p> <p>The application also fails to provide a long-term park management plan for safety or policing. The costs of manufacturing and installing gates, policing the clearance of the hill, employing gate-lockers at night and in the mornings to reopen the park, and repairing them will be a gross waste of money. These funds would be better used on initiatives that can unite the community, not divide it. For example, supporting low-key policing of the hill is a much better strategy than the collective punishment of all hill users. Or the Royal Parks investing resource in private security or wardens rather than in gates.</p> <p>One serious issue is that there is currently no adequate police presence in Primrose Hill during busy day times or at night. Police resource has been affected by budget cuts across Camden but it is simply not acceptable to resign responsibility. Cumbria Police recently showed that the presence of just one officer regularly walking the beat reduced its anti-social behaviour crimes problem by 47 per cent. Visible regular patrols would negate the need to gate the park and would make the community safer and calmer.</p> <p>What is needed is increased, consistent and visible police patrols across Primrose Hill and in neighbouring areas. Closing the park would require more police resource than a regular patrol.</p> <p>9. Impact on Local Primrose Hill Business and the Local Economy Local hospitality businesses in Primrose Hill are already being affected by the temporary summer closure. Residents from St John's Wood and other areas across the park are choosing not to frequent Primrose Hill restaurants and pubs as they can't walk back across the park after 10pm. Closure is already impacting the local Primrose Hill economy.</p> <p>10. Discrimination and Privatisation Gating and closing the park will lead to unfair access for the residents of Elsworthy Road (and others) who have private gates in their back gardens that lead directly into the park. Gating the park has in effect privatised a public resource. Public access is restricted to some whilst these wealthy residents can access the park freely. The people living on the perimeter who are the persistent callers the police talk about, want to turn a public park into their private garden. They must be allowed to alienate all other residents of Camden purely for their personal convenience and priviledge.</p> <hr/> <p>I object to this proposal.</p> <p>This has been an open space for decades. It needs to remain that way. There may be some anti-social behaviour at night, but that does not mean you should close the gates and deny law-abiding folk this important facility. Please don't do this.</p>



Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3861/P	Crecia Cipriano	29/11/2023 20:05:24	COMMNT	<p>The Planning Permission Application suggests gates are necessary to manage 'the problem of anti-social behaviour'.</p> <p>This 'dog-whistle' claim is problematic because the problem does not exist to any serious extent.</p> <p>The police officially and in person reported to a recent Camden Council Culture and Environment Scrutiny Committee meeting Primrose Hill on crime and anti-social behaviour. Their comments included:</p> <p>Nick McLaughlin - Inspector Royal Parks Operational Unit:</p> <p>"The actual crime statistics across all Royal Parks are remarkably low".</p> <p>"My advice to anyone is that if you suffer a crime near a Royal Park is to go inside the park and phone the police because the response will be much quicker."</p> <p>Stevie Bull – Royal Parks Police:</p> <p>"The statistics from 1st January to 30th June this year. We counted that there were 131 calls relating to the park itself, but only 28 related to ASB and crime specifically. About half of these were phone theft related."</p> <p>This is a very low rate of crime to be clearing and closing a park. These statistics are very low and do not even indicate they happened at night.</p> <p>Even the CEO of the Royal Parks, Andrew Scattergood, stated at that meeting that this is a noise issue, not an ASB problem.</p> <p>"In the main, the issues that have faced us have primarily been noise." It should be noted, the Royal Parks have chosen not to make that clear in their Planning Application: The crime statistics show that there is no ASB or crime problem.</p> <p>Nick McLaughlin - Inspector Royal Parks Operational Unit replied when asked specifically about whether he thought there was an issue with ASB on Primrose Hill:</p> <p>"We do have a number of callers, or repeat callers... But my instincts with this is that this is largely a noise issue as opposed to a crime issue... It is not a crime hotspot, but it will be a place that generates noise and I suppose one of the questions that people have to consider is, is it reasonable to expect a large open space, near a very popular iconic location to be sterile at night and for it to be completely quiet? I suspect London as a whole is never quiet."</p> <p>Local crime statistics don't substantiate the claims of crime and antisocial behaviour. Nor do Camden Council's own records, and despite the efforts of the Ward's local councillors, they too have been unable to verify the claims made by a few repeat callers complaining about noise.</p> <p>This also represents the overly dominant influence of a few wealthy local homeowners.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>Local complainants, mostly home-owners on the perimeter of the park, have made numerous claims on social media, but have locked their Twitter [X] accounts against public replies so nobody can correct or challenge the claims made in these posts.</p> <p>The laws against public nuisance, public order offences and ASB exist to protect people against false accusations as much as it is to prosecute them.</p> <p>There was a real problem with one individual who was successfully prosecuted using due process that first had to demonstrate he had a case to answer. Wild accusations on social media are no substitute.</p> <p>How can gates be an answer to a problem that the police, the Royal Parks, Camden's Community Safety Team, the ward councillor and those who have for 3 years opposed the imposition of gates all agree, does not significantly exist?</p>
2023/3861/P	Me S Mecchin	29/11/2023 17:29:54	SUPPRT	<p>Dear sir or Madam,</p> <p>I would like to give my support for this application to install new gates for the park to stop the anti social behaviour we endure during winter and summer and this gates will enhance more safety around the area ,as a resident next to the park I support this application.</p>
2023/3861/P	Bernard Caplan	27/11/2023 18:52:09	SUPPRT	<p>I feel strongly that permanent gates must be installed. Primrose Hill park is not a safe space at night . The anti social behaviour in and around is totally unacceptable and is disrupting what has always been a very quiet safe area . I no longer feel I can walk alone at night . Most disruption coming from the park .</p>
2023/3861/P	Steven Hurwitz	30/11/2023 00:38:16	SUPPRT	<p>Happy to support this application.</p> <p>Permanent gates similar to those in Regent Park would be far preferable to the existing arrangement.</p> <p>A permanent arrangement to close the park at night whenever the authorities see fit is to be welcomed.</p>
2023/3861/P	Olya Borissova	29/11/2023 22:46:08	COMMNT	<p>An extreme change occurred during COVID. Locking the park at night is essential. Permanent gates would be a great improvement.</p>
2023/3861/P	Caroline Strachan	29/11/2023 05:17:57	SUPPRT	<p>Both John Strachan and I fully support the planning application for the more permanent gates at the entrances to Primrose Hill. They would be a huge improvement.</p>
2023/3861/P	Julia Smith	29/11/2023 12:35:45	SUPPRT	<p>As a person working locally in Primrose Hill, I fully support the installation of the new permanent gates. The plans of the gates look very impressive and will enhance the look of the Park. Also, importantly it will preserve the safety of those residents who live in the area as the Park at night can be very dangerous with gangs and with some individuals showing abusive behaviour when the gates were open. It is without question this Park should be governed by all to use safely and the new gates will provide this.</p>
2023/3861/P	Kelly Benriassa	29/11/2023 18:05:41	SUPPRT	<p>It will be nice to see proper gates on the park and hopefully they will help deal with anti-social behaviour.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3861/P	Jamie Giles	29/11/2023 17:34:29	OBJ	<p>I am writing to express my strong objection to the proposed installation of gates at the entrances to Primrose Hill open space. This Grade II listed park, opened in 1842, is not just a recreational area but a vital part of London's heritage, offering panoramic views and significant historical events, such as the first meeting of the "Gorsedd of the Bards of the Isles of Britain" in 1792.</p> <p>The installation of gates would severely impact this historic site:</p> <p>Restricted Access: Limiting free and open access will affect those who use the park for early morning or late evening walks and exercises.</p> <p>Impact on Community Character: Primrose Hill is known for its welcoming and inclusive atmosphere. Gates could create a sense of exclusivity and division, counter to the community spirit.</p> <p>Environmental Concerns: Construction and maintenance of these gates may disrupt local wildlife habitats and the natural landscape.</p> <p>Safety and Security: While security is important, gate closures could lead to overcrowding at other entrances or limited escape routes in emergencies.</p> <p>Lack of Consultation: Insufficient consultation with the local community on this significant change is concerning.</p> <p>Considering the cultural, historical, and practical implications, I urge a reconsideration of the gate installations. Primrose Hill should remain freely accessible, preserving its heritage and role as a cherished community space.</p>
2023/3861/P	David sterland	29/11/2023 11:02:56	COMMNT	I object to this, as a local resident for 20 years. The park is a public space for all to enjoy.
2023/3861/P	Roxy Wilding	29/11/2023 17:34:18	COMMNT	I totally support this proposal. Living near the park I know only too well how disruptive and upsetting the rowdy and unseemly behaviour of certain people has been over the last 3 years or so. This seems a good way of reducing the outrageous behaviour.
2023/3861/P	Tom Hollingsworth	29/11/2023 16:43:24	SUPPRT	The planning application asks for permission to replace those ghastly barriers with normal park gates. Frankly, it is a no brainer. So I support the application. As a regular visitor to Primrose Hill, I find it is a real pity that the park, which should be a source of relaxation, has also become a persistent worry for many, so use of gates is needed.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3861/P	Joanna Reeves	29/11/2023 14:25:43	SUPPRT	<p>I am greatly in favour of the gates.</p> <p>Sadly, the park has become, in recent years, a magnet for drug-dealers and crime - often violent crime, at that.</p> <p>People wishing to take drugs and engage in other anti-social behaviour, such as playing loud and amplified music for raves, have created a dangerous and unpleasant situation for local people.</p> <p>We love our little patch of green space and are pleased that it offers a wonderful amenity for people from near and far, but it has become debased, due to being used as an unofficial outdoor party venue, which is thoroughly inappropriate. The park is bordered by densely populated housing - private and local authority alike - and residents' lives are made a misery when the all-night buzz of activity, and often loud music, prevent them from sleeping and simply enjoying their homes.</p> <p>The area has become less safe - there have been violent muggings, theft and vandalism - and also unhygienic, as drug paraphernalia gets left behind and the park gets used as a toilet. Early morning users, such as families with small children and dog-walkers, make foul or dangerous discoveries that no one should have to endure.</p> <p>It is simply not possible to use the park for quiet nocturnal contemplation, as some claim, because it it now a hive of often dangerous activity.</p> <p>Please give us permanent gates that look smart and are robust enough to stand up to vandals.</p>
2023/3861/P	K. Lowe	29/11/2023 22:44:01	SUPPRT	<p>Proper gates are necessary to stop noise nuisance and enhance safety and security both in the park and to surrounding areas. At the moment the temporary 'gates' have been vandalised, indicating that there is a problem. There is also a minimal police presence in the park at the best of times. Why does Regents Park have gates and this is not deemed to be contentious? The alternative is a pro-active police presence but this is not going to happen,</p>
2023/3861/P	Alice	29/11/2023 22:42:36	APP	<p>Closing the gates has the reverse effect as it results in people all leaving the park at once and then being very loud and messy late at night which is very disruptive. Please leave them open.</p>
2023/3861/P	Olya Donneky	29/11/2023 22:41:28	COMMNT	<p>Huge increase in anti social behaviour, please lock the park at night!</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3861/P	Pauline Benavides	29/11/2023 22:06:31	COMMNT	<p>Pauline Benavides</p> <p>I have lived in Ainger Road close to the park for over thirty years. I think the permanant gates should be reinstated. The park became a magnet for young people and the anti-social behaviour impacted on nearby resident. The electric bikes at the top of our road are always knock over and damaged every weekend. The rubbish and graffiti on neighbours walls has increased significantly over the last year. Even this year young people were gathering as early at five p.m. in large groups in the park. I don't feel safe there anymore, I walk to Regents Park and sit and read a book in Queen Mary's Gardens. I spent many happy years with my boys in the park, but you do not see many children there except in the new swing park which is not great after the money that was spent on it. I take my grandchildren to the swing park in Regents Park now.</p>
2023/3861/P	Wilf Prigmore	29/11/2023 16:14:43	SUPPRT	<p>As a regular visitor to Primrose Hill, sometimes staying overnight with friends, I have noticed an alarming change in atmosphere around the park. There is a feeling of foreboding as the evening sets in and many residents wonder what the night will bring. The drug taking, antisocial behaviour, threats of violence, loud music and fireworks have been well documented in previous comments. The assault with a machete on a German tourist can only spread word of the potential dangers of visiting the park further afield. The large number of redacted comments surely emphasises the trepidation felt by residents - something not often associated with this sort of planning application.</p> <p>In short: The sooner these gates are fitted the better!</p>
2023/3861/P	Christian Mahnke	29/11/2023 22:23:55	COMMNT	<p>I hereby object to the proposal as it is misleading. Royal Parks close the park each week, but in the proposal the defined objective are a handful days per year.</p> <p>The unlimited access is important for mental and physical well-being. Shift workers enjoy the laste access to unwind, and it is a safe space for everybody at any time. This should not be changed via the installation of gates.</p>
2023/3861/P	A Kemp	29/11/2023 17:11:45	SUPPRT	<p>I support the application as the design of the gates is acceptable and the gates may be needed for various reasons and particularly to control access at night for use as a noisy party venue.</p>
2023/3861/P	Benais	29/11/2023 17:16:45	SUPPRT	<p>Support</p>