

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3861/P	John Gooch	30/11/2023 16:47:30	OBJ	Please don't close off the Hill in this way. Primrose Hill is unique and you risk turning it into just another London park
2023/3861/P	Svetlana Basovsky	30/11/2023 17:03:18	COMMNT	<p>I would like to register an Objection to this planning application.</p> <p>The reasoning behind the application relies on managing problems of anti-social behaviour. However, local crime statistics don't support the claims of crime and anti-social behaviour. In our own experience, we often walk our dog late in the evening, and have only encountered people calmly and quietly enjoying the park.</p> <p>The Application suggests that the gates will not reduce the public's use of the open space. However, we have already lost use of the park three nights out of every week for many months now, and that use - for dog walks, strolls after a long day's work, looking out at the beautiful view of London, watching a super moon rise - has been dearly missed by our family and neighbours. These experiences are no longer possible for nearly 50% of the week due to closures.</p> <p>Primrose Hill is a beloved resource to our area, for exercise, mental health, family bonding, dog walking; an important part of its uniqueness is that it welcomes us always. Installing gates will change the nature of the park and significantly impact our community.</p>
2023/3861/P	Alexander Hewitt	30/11/2023 14:57:26	INT	As a local resident, I strongly object to the proposed gates as gating will reduce the utility and beauty of the park.
2023/3861/P	Eleanor Trunkfield	30/11/2023 17:43:13	NOBJ	<p>I fully support the proposed designs for the new permanent gates in Primrose Hill. The current temporary ones are not suitable or in keeping with the conservation area.</p> <p>Kind Regards, Eleanor Trunkfield</p> <p>(please redact my personal data)</p>
2023/3861/P	Mrs P F Hunt	30/11/2023 17:44:12	COMMNT	I have lived close to Primrose Hill for 50 years and enjoy its freedom and popularity with the young. It is a huge social benefit. I regret and oppose the proposal to Install gates which can then be locked to exclude use of the park. It has always been open and I think people should be free to enjoy the park on summer evenings after 10 pm. Many young people congregate there and it offers a free meeting place.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3861/P	Marlene Levoy	30/11/2023 09:49:06	OBJ	<p>I am against the closure of Primrose Hill at night.</p> <p>I work full time and late. this is the only place where you can get peace. There are also wildlife to observe at night such as bats and listening to owls.</p> <p>Closing primrose hill at weekend will not stop people still attending during the week.</p> <p>we need a place to relax in summer nights, more especially for those with no outdoors space in tower blocks like Taplow</p> <p>I attend Primrose Hill twice a day with my dog, alone or relatives.</p> <p>Placing permanent Gates only for weekends is only an excuse to close the park every every evenings on the long run. As is Hyde Park and Regents Park.</p> <p>Residents around Primrose Hill knew, when buying a property, about this iconic Park.</p> <p>Residents in favour of closure of this park are NIMBY, and probably do not use the park themselves.</p> <p>This is deprivation of liberties</p>
2023/3861/P	Marlene Levoy	30/11/2023 09:49:08	OBJ	<p>I am against the closure of Primrose Hill at night.</p> <p>I work full time and late. this is the only place where you can get peace. There are also wildlife to observe at night such as bats and listening to owls.</p> <p>Closing primrose hill at weekend will not stop people still attending during the week.</p> <p>we need a place to relax in summer nights, more especially for those with no outdoors space in tower blocks like Taplow</p> <p>I attend Primrose Hill twice a day with my dog, alone or relatives.</p> <p>Placing permanent Gates only for weekends is only an excuse to close the park every every evenings on the long run. As is Hyde Park and Regents Park.</p> <p>Residents around Primrose Hill knew, when buying a property, about this iconic Park.</p> <p>Residents in favour of closure of this park are NIMBY, and probably do not use the park themselves.</p> <p>This is deprivation of liberties</p>
2023/3861/P	Neha	30/11/2023 20:13:34	OBJ	<p>Completely oppose this as it's the only place nearby to take dogs for a walk at any time. It's restricting people in the area to have access to a green space for fresh air. Especially for people that finish work late and have always used the park to walk through. The cost to add the gates is not warranted. You'd be better spending that money on things that actually make a difference in a good way to the community. The gates will not stop people jumping over as they already do.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3861/P	Claudia Scherman	01/12/2023 00:00:27	OBJ	<p>I have read some of the local and national press articles that have been written about the proposal to install gates over the past months and have been left bemused as to how we've got to the point that it is now under serious consideration. The arguments in favour rest entirely on crime and anti-social behaviour yet by all accounts crime statistics for Primrose Hill Park are among some of the lowest for anywhere in the borough. As a long time Camden resident i know all too well how trying it can be to come face to face with crime and anti social behaviour as a facet of daily life but the only sensible response to this comes through proactive policing and community engagement. Our street, with its proximity yet relative quiet in relation to camden high street, becomes overrun with drug use, drug dealing and public urination Thursday through Sunday every week but the residents have successfully worked with each other and the police to mitigate the effects of this behaviour as best we can and accept that some continued disruption is the price we pay for the privilege of living in such a popular, public part of the city. Not once has it ever been suggested that we try and shut parts of Camden down, campaign against bars and music venues and generally try and restrict access to the majority who come here to enjoy the area with the best of intentions. An overreaction like this would be grossly unfair- causing a majority to suffer to protect the interests of a minority i surely not the way to go about addressing the problems. Yet this is exactly what has been happening on Primrose Hill with the use of temporary gates- a blunt tool that has excluded a majority of park users in order to address marginal anti-social behaviour concerns of residents that could and should have been dealt with through better policing and community engagement. Any decision to turn this blunt tool into a permanent new reality for the park would instigate a terrible change to this wonderful resource and one that should not be hidden away through a planning application process that most residents will never have a chance to object to.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3861/P	alice gray	30/11/2023 23:58:58	INT	<p>Gates are an eyesore; once installed they will be used to exclude the local community from the only open space most of them have access to. They are not in keeping with the history of the area, or the history of the park. Once installed, excuses will be found to shut them more and more often, until they are shut every day, year round, and whenever it's dark. This was proposed in the past and vigorously opposed by the local community. Nothing has changed. We do not need gates. We do not want gates. We want to keep our right to roam over the Hill. This is not a solution to any problems which have arisen over recent years, it is a sneaky attempt to steal our open access to the free natural public space on our doorstep.</p> <p>We need this space for young people to hang out with friends. We need to let those young people who don't make too much noise have the opportunity to enjoy the Hill - and its views - just as we always have, day and night, sunrise and sunset. We need better policing of the Hill to deal with nuisance and anti-social behaviour, and we need the drug dealing to be effectively dealt with, not shifted to elsewhere in the immediate vicinity. The Planning Application suggests that gates are necessary to manage 'the problem of anti-social behaviour'. This claim is problematic because, according to the Primrose Hill Park Manager, the problem doesn't exist to any serious extent.</p> <p>Local crime statistics don't support claims of crime and anti-social behaviour. Nor do Camden Council's records, and even local councillors have been unable to verify the claims made by a few repeat callers complaining about noise.</p> <p>Regents Park is a dead area which just has empty roads around it, it has become a commercial space for much of the year which excludes those who cannot pay to access it when events are organised there. Primrose Hill, on the other hand, is a vibrant square park which has always allowed us to cross it diagonally: it connects the mixed residential areas around it, and local people have always fought for the right to cross it at night/in the dark. It connects us to the history and traditions of our area.</p> <p>What works for Regents Park and the rich isolated residents living in mansions and expensive flats in and around it, will not work for the diverse and vibrant community around Primrose Hill.</p> <p>This proposal is the thin edge of the wedge for Royal Parks administrators, with no understanding of the local community, to take the power to exclude us from a space we love. If it is necessary to control/reduce numbers on certain holidays, then these days should be properly policed, but we should not throw the baby out with the bath water. You don't close a shop or exclude all customers because there are occasional shoplifters, or exclude all cars from the roads because there are occasional road traffic accidents.</p> <p>The Planning Application is misleading: it doesn't mention that Royal Parks have announced publicly their intention to close Primrose Hill Park at 10pm on Friday, Saturday, and Sunday nights from March to October i.e. in British Summer Time. This would be 90 nights a year.</p> <p>What about The Camden Plan Open Spaces Policy? This Planning Application is situated in Camden and is impacted by policies in the Camden Local Plan (July 2017). This includes policies around the use of open space.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.8 from the Royal Park's Planning Application proposes that:</p> <p>"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."</p> <p>However, the Planning Application falls outside the conditions that must be met by the Camden Local Plan: emptying and closing the park three nights a week for seven months of the year will reduce public use of an open space.</p> <p>It also 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.</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

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 doesn't meet the conditions needed by The London Plan. Emptying and closing the park on a weekly basis for seven months of the year will clearly prejudice the public’s use of an open space and devalue it, so it doesn't comply.

We live close to Primrose Hill park and although 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’

no-one has asked us what we think. So this statement is just not true. The Royal Parks haven't consulted local residents or the local community adequately, as is required for such a change in use of a public resource of this importance.

The Planning Application relies on the evidence of the Royal Park’s ‘Engagement Survey.’

This failed to ensure a wide and balanced sample, but also framed key questions badly. This was not an adequate Public Consultation for such a major decision.

The survey did not engage with the less privileged and least resourced sections of the 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. Canvassing on the Hill took place during daylight hours, so it excluded all those night time users who would be most severely affected by night closures. The Royal Parks have relied on a survey that does not properly represent the local community.

Access to open green space is important for the physical and mental health of residents in this area, including those who need to access it after dark. It is an essential part of living here that we have access to the park, day and night. That is what freedom is: watching the sunrise or sunset, looking out over the city and its twinkling lights.

Young people will be the worst affected by the locking of the park. They often live in flats, and need to use this open space for their physical and mental health. This was proved by the number of complaints received from local Councillors about the Royal Park’s gating policy. Though the Royal Parks state the survey reflects the views of the local neighbourhood, 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 gating and closure of Primrose Hill during the ‘temporary circuit breaker’ has shown that there's an impact on other parts of Camden when people are shifted in large numbers from a large, open space into side streets and other spaces. Local Councillors received complaints from places, such as the bridge over the railway line, and in Swiss Cottage, where people leaving the park later congregated. The park’s closure will have an effect in all nearby areas.

There will be a negative effect on policing: park gating and closure will need continuous monitoring and will waste police resources. Andrew Scattergood, CEO of the Royal Parks said:

“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	Plumelia Tarrant	30/11/2023 19:42:45	OBJ	<p>This is not a good idea. It is an over-reaction to a minor problem which would only be displaced onto the streets around the Hill. The cure being proposed here will kill the patient, and the businesses and community that rely on Primrose Hill for their economic survival and mental and physical health. Please don't do this.</p>
2023/3861/P	James Broomfield	30/11/2023 17:54:25	OBJ	<p>I object to fitting gates to Primrose Hill park. This application for gates is based on past events which I believe could have been managed much better at the time rather than using barricades (there never were gates - they were barricades). Temporary barricades are one thing - permanent gates are another. Gates are not necessary and will cause more problems and solve none. People intent on anti-social behaviour will get in anyway if they want. Law abiding residents probably wouldn't try. I realise that during Lockdown the situation got way out of control (could have been avoided if properly policed from the start) but now the people who used the hill in that way go to other places now they are open. To lock the park at evenings and nights is a terrible idea, it robs us of our opportunities to climb the hill to watch astronomical events and other wonders.</p>
2023/3861/P	Aidan Grounds	30/11/2023 17:52:22	NOBJ	<p>Fully support this application in order for Primrose Hill to stay safe.</p>
2023/3861/P	Peter Wood	30/11/2023 20:53:10	SUPPRT	<p>As a resident who lives next to Primrose Hill I fully support this proposal. I do this on two grounds. First, I support the closing of the park. It has greatly reduced anti-social behaviour, noise, and crime. Prior to the introduction of the temporary gates this had become a significant problem for us at night. Second, while the temporary gates have been reasonably effective they are unsightly and are often vandalised by people who then enter the park. They should be replaced by robust permanent gates. There is no reason for Primrose Hill to be managed differently from other Royal Parks.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3861/P	Caroline Prothero	30/11/2023 13:25:10	OBJ	<p>I own a property adjoining the entrance to Primrose Hill on Elsworthy Terrace, 8A. My garden wall is the perimeter wall to the park. I enjoy the security of having people walk through freely and have never experienced any problems- apart from throwing out time during the weekends when the keepers loud-hailer disturb the peace and push people on mass to the streets.</p> <p>I object to the fixed gates and the closing of park access vehemently. People should be free to walk safely through and enjoy the green spaces. Many people don't have gardens and this is respite. Shift workers (inc Drs, nurses & carers) and to help promote good mental health.</p> <p>There were understandably some noise issues during the first Covid lockdown but levels have returned to pre pandemic levels or laughter, chitchat and dogs.</p>
2023/3861/P	Bernard Hunt	30/11/2023 17:05:49	OBJ	<p>It has come to my notice that advice which I believe is seriously misleading has been circulating amongst local residents. Residents who object to the installation of gates and the closing of Primrose Hill have been told on local social media that comments on, and objections to, the planning application can only relate to the aesthetic design of the gates.</p> <p>As a retired architect my understanding is that planning permission is required for a change of use. And in my opinion planning permission to instal gates at the entrance to an open space which is currently, and I believe always has been, publicly accessible constitutes permission to change the use of the land. The nature of Primrose Hill, which has always been open at night and is famous for its paths and lampposts, is completely different from that of a gated park. What is proposed in the application is in my opinion surely a change of use. I request that the relevant planning officer provides the planning committee with clear guidance on this issue. I likewise request the committee to note that many people who oppose the installation of gates have been influenced by what I believe is misleading and incorrect advice to confine their comments to the aesthetics.</p> <p>I strongly oppose the attempt of 'the authorities' to restrict historic freedoms which contribute to the quality of a city for everyone. I have in mind particularly the young and the less privileged who lack other opportunities to enjoy socialising on a summer evening and who don't need to be in bed by 10.30 on a Saturday night.</p> <p>I sympathise with those of my Primrose Hill neighbours, many elderly and privileged like me, who object to antisocial behaviour on the Hill. It is the job of the police to control such behaviour, just as it is in any other public space. I am struck by the abundant police presence during daylight hours on Primrose Hill and in Regents Park at times when I have never noticed any antisocial behaviour. Maybe some of these resources could be redirected to nighttime when their occasional presence would discourage any anti social behaviour? (I haven't personally participated in late night revelries on Primrose Hill but I'm betting that the behaviour of the vast majority is responsible and that anti social behaviour has only ever been displayed by a small minority.)</p> <p>Live and let live.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3861/P	Jeff	30/11/2023 13:42:37	COMMNT	<p>I completely and unequivocally without any reservation object fully to the installation of any gates upon any entrance to Primrose Hill. I have lived in this neighborhood for 30 years and was never even contacted as to my view regarding this proposal.</p> <p>Aside from the fact that it is not a just and fair assessment of the opinions of all the residents that make use of the park, let alone the general public, I believe it also contravenes both Camden's and London's open space policy.</p> <p>I believe that the brief and unusual aberration of any extra noisy behavior during the period of Covid was used as a wedge by people who have been trying to close the park for a long time for completely selfish reasons.</p> <p>I also find it punitive and draconian to close the gates before it is even fully dark on summer nights let alone the fact that late night strolls for the public and residents and pet owners are part and parcel of the joy of this beautiful space.</p> <p>In summation I wholly object to this proposed installation.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3861/P	Jonny Bucknell	30/11/2023 16:21:59	OBJ	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed gates on Primrose Hill. The reason is that they will 'have a negative impact on the environment'.</p> <p>It should always be remembered that Royal Parks have had a hidden agenda of closing Primrose Hill at night to bring it in line with other parks.</p> <p>In the 70's gates were installed; however, when it came to the first closure a group of residents did a sit in and the closure was abandoned.</p> <p>The current hype has been blown out of all proportion. During lockdown there is evidence that there were about three groups of young people who organised parties and danced.</p> <p>This was hyped up to be non stop raves.</p> <p>The cars that park on the roads around the Hill are supposed to be drug dealers. Most of the cars have lights on and are canoodling couples. Drugs dealers do not leave their lights on, they make the deal and drive off.</p> <p>The levels of anti-social behavior are statistically insignificant.</p> <p>Gaiting the Hill actually makes things worse. Instead of slowly getting cold and going home, anyone who might create mischief is herded into the side streets where they run amok.</p> <p>Gaiting sends out a message that the area is unsafe and actually attracts anti social people into the area.</p> <p>The proposed gates are not spiked so will be easy to climb over.</p> <p>There is an old Chinese proberb. 'Don't listen to what other say, go and see for yourself'.</p> <p>Stand on Primrose Hill late on a sunny evening in the Summer when hundreds of young people are having a picnic and you will wonder what all the fuss is about.</p> <p>Then watch these innocent young people being herded off the Hill and have their enjoyment terminated.</p> <p>Given that the crowd is ethnically diverse and young there is a hint of prejudice in the proposal.</p> <p>The Hill also provides solace for people late at night and is quite heavily used by the lonely, isolated and elderly.</p> <p>In an area that prides itself with its tolerance, gating the Hill is truly shocking.</p> <p>The alternative is the occasional police patrol through the park. 'One cop on the top and all the anti social behavior will stop'.</p> <p>If the police are so overstretched, the resources of private security guards being used to clear the Hill should be put into occasional patrols.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				Please reject this proposal.
2023/3861/P	Andrew	30/11/2023 16:33:19	COMMNT	<p>As a lifetime resident of Primrose Hil, I strongly object to the installation of gates to Primrose Hill.</p> <p>Primrose Hill has always been open 24/7. I believe this is a great asset for London. Some antisocial behaviour during Coovid times was used as a pretext for a campaign to close PH Sat and Sun nights after 10.</p> <p>Along with many other residents, I think that is mean minded selfishness by probably mainly elderly locals depriving particularly young people of a wonderful place to socialise without having to pay as they would anywhere else. It would be terrible if Primrose Hill became like other gated parks in posh postcodes, let's allow it keep its soul.</p>
2023/3861/P	Andrew Hayman	30/11/2023 16:22:46	SUPPRT	The proposed gates are much better than the current temporary gates. I use a work space in Primrose Hill and the gates are necessary to tackle the anti-social behaviour that has become an issue in the park.
2023/3861/P	Bridget Errington	30/11/2023 23:33:58	COMMNT	<p>As a particularly beautiful London enclave - and one that both Camden Council & residents have cared for assiduously for decades - it is good sense that the new park gates be simultaneously sturdy and aesthetically sensitive to Primrose Hill Park.</p> <p>The temporary style used to date is not only unattractive & with a relatively short shelf life, but also tempts vandalism due to the lightweight aspect.</p> <p>The cost to purchase and install the proposed gates is an investment that will be significantly more effective than repetitive replacement of cheaper options - and will protect the aesthetic appreciated by residents and visitors.</p> <p>The positive value of attractive physical surroundings to the human being has been repeatedly proven during recent years.</p> <p>I support the proposed gates.</p> <p>With thanks</p>
2023/3861/P	Ronald Hooberman	30/11/2023 10:49:17	SUPPRT	My wife and I support the application. I have lived at this address close to the main Hill entrance since 1977. In recent years, with the increasing popularity of the area and number of visitors from many countries, the Hill and immediately surrounding area has become increasingly busy and until the installation of temporary gates, rowdiness at all hours of the night has frequently disturbed our sleep. The temporary gates have largely alleviated this nuisance although a greater police presence - which has not so far been evident - would help.
2023/3861/P	Arthur Withers	30/11/2023 22:20:32	OBJ	I oppose the installation of gates as we need to retain our freedom to roam on public natural spaces in the ever encroaching city.
2023/3861/P	Robert Edgar	30/11/2023 22:21:12	SUPPRT	<p>The proposed gates are a great improvement over the previous eyesores.</p> <p>I have been visiting the park for many years, I'm a single father and used to work in the area. I've had to stop going with my son because of the amount of open drug taking on display, and certainly wouldn't wish to find myself there after dark</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3861/P	kathryn Marstron	30/11/2023 22:24:33	OBJ	<p>1. The Planning Application is Misleading and Disingenuous 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>2. Crime Statistics and Anti-Social Behaviour 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.</p> <p>3. Discrimination and Privatization 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 privilege.</p> <p>4. 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.</p> <p>5. 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 open space.</p> <p>6 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." 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.</p>

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

There will be an ongoing impact on local Camden policing resource closing and clearing the park and keeping people out of the open space. This is not addressed in the Planning Application.
