From: STEPHEN AINGER [redacted]
Sent: 09 August 2016 15:05
To: Planning
Subject: ERUV 2016/2892/P as record of objection not shown on web site

Sir
Looking at you web site it seems that none of the objections to the ERUV including my own objection (S D Ainger) made in June or that of the Heath and Hampstead society are listed. I know of others that are also not included

Is this an oversight or a deliberate ploy.

Once again my objection are based on the following

1. - Despite the small-diameter poles and the thin fishing-line links selected, the installation would be obtrusive in many, if not most, of the locations identified, and add to the already unsightly clutter that defaces our streets and pavements. Much of this clutter is unfortunately necessary: lampposts, seats, at least some traffic signs, main service junction boxes etc etc,, but we don't have to tolerate more. Their cumulative impact is considerable, and harmful to the character of our Conservation Areas.

SSome of the more obtrusive examples proposed are in Judges Walk, Lower Terrace, Cannon Place and Well Walk. Several would damage the really historic areas of Hampstead such as Willow Road, Keats Grove and Downshire Hill. They all would impact on the area in a most unwelcome way. This is just the kind of development that Conservation Areas were designed to discourage or prevent.

2. Several of the poles would be located virtually on Hampstead Heath, including those planned for Nassington Road and Judges Walk. This would be quite unacceptable.

3.

4. This proposal is such that it is significantly and demonstrably the case that the adverse impact of this proposal outweighs any public benefit. Please refuse".

It It should be noted that the location of several BT fibre street cabinets were refused planning on Heritage grounds by Camden a few years ago even though this was to the detriment of internet service in many streets including Downshire Hill.

Y Please ensure my and other objections are loaded on web site accordingly

YYours

SS D Ainger