

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3105/P	Suzanne Barber	22/11/2021 08:52:38	OBJ	This application must be rejected - not on religious or similar grounds but because it is discriminatory and hugely damaging to the environment.
2021/3105/P	Stephen Barber	22/11/2021 08:49:43	COMMIT	<p>I did not receive any notification of this application from Camden despite the fact that it would have a massive impact on the area and I am writing to object in the strongest possible terms.</p> <p>It is, to me, [REDACTED] can try to impose such a structure on the rest of the population.</p> <p>The environmental impact would be horrible - as seen in the pictures with 5 metre high poles and wires.</p> <p>In any event, where I live, the proposal is to erect the poles on private land but no permission has been granted by the owners of the land.</p> <p>This application must be rejected.</p>
2021/3105/P	Andrew	22/11/2021 16:43:54	OBJ	<p>In fact I am quite neutral towards idea of eruv as a religious feature of a minority in the area but find its proposed position undesirable given that it will look very prominent at the entry points to Fitzroy Park, continuation of Millfield Lane and entrance to the Heath all the time visited by large number of public of different faith. It will be very visible and will not blend with the Conservation area.</p> <p>There are already quite a signage at the entry to Fitzroy Park and additional pole would just add clutter. Also, an initially translucent wire could potentially later collect the dust, dirt and debris and thus to become visible. It would be helpful if pole's position could be moved further down Millfield Lane (its part leading towards Kenwood House) thus to be hidden from the plain view.</p>

Printed on: 24/11/2021 09:10:05

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3105/P	Swains Lane Residents & neighbourhood Watch AssociationNeighbourhood Watch	23/11/2021 12:23:30	OBJNOT	<p>1. The Swains Lane Residents and Neighbourhood Watch Association objects to this application.</p> <p>2. This has proved a difficult application for residents of Swains Lane. The origin of ERUVs is clearly complex. There have been widespread discussions within the Lane including with members of the Jewish Community and within the wider community. This, and basic research, has revealed that there are considerable differences of interpretation of the laws relating to ERUVs, even within the Jewish Community.</p> <p>3. In response to a newsletter seeking views on this current application, only 2 residents (one household), out of the 132 residents or households on the SLR&amp;NWA mailing list for Swains Lane and Holly Village, have indicated support for this application.</p> <p>3. Despite advice on how to respond, it proved difficult for those wishing to respond to submit their comments despite extensions to the consultation period. Issues relating to these problems will be submitted to the Planning Officer.</p> <p>4. It has become clear from discussions that those in the wider, and less directly affected, community are having similar difficulties with this application. It is understandable that many Jewish residents would not wish to create schisms within their community by commenting adversely. Many residents have also expressed the view that, in the light of historic events relating to previous applications, their objections will just be dismissed and it is not worth submitting their comments. Indeed, many feel that they are effectively being disenfranchised by the planning process. This results from the decision of the Secretary of State to allow an Appeal in 1994. As a result, small applications for ERUVs have come at regular intervals but local Councils have been unwilling to risk the high costs of an Appeal by refusing an application.</p> <p>5. Increasingly, residents within local Conservation areas are concerned at the increase in clutter, particularly from road signage, etc. There are partic</p>
2021/3105/P	Armorer	19/11/2021 10:18:31	COMMTNT	<p>I'm uncomfortable with this. I have Jewish background and am enraged by anti-semitism, but I worry that this isn't right in a secular society. I could be persuaded otherwise by pictures of how it will look, and if I were assured that it didn't affect what is the entrance to the Heath, visually, but there has been no public discussion and no diagrams to show how it will look.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3105/P	Stephen & Karen Stephens	19/11/2021 10:57:13	OBJ	<p>My wife and I object to the Development proposed by planning application 2021/3105/P for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Allowing this significant infrastructure to be erected in one of the most protected and historically intact parts of London to accommodate the wishes of a fractional part of the wider Highgate and Muswell Hill communities would not be proportionate or indeed aid community cohesion and does not offer any justification to go against Camden Council current policy. (e.g. Policy to improve pedestrian access)</li> <li>2 Hazards to the prolific local flying wildlife of the stretched invisible nylon line.</li> <li>3 Hazards to pedestrians including blind and partially sighted people from the extra poles to be erected on the footpaths which are already very narrow in a number of places.</li> <li>4 The poles will add clutter to an already excessively cluttered street environment and decrease available footpath space for wheelchairs, pushchairs and other mobility devices.</li> <li>5 The proposed development is unsightly and modern street furniture is detrimental to this conservation area.</li> <li>6 Despite being small, public land should not be given to one minority group to use, religious or otherwise to the detriment of the wider public.</li> <li>7 The Development would encourage more motor vehicle traffic which is contrary to Council policy.</li> <li>8 The Development would mean the conservation area is cluttered up by unsightly street furniture in order to satisfy a religious rule that the vast majority of the millions of visitors, who come to the area to enjoy its natural beauty and history, do not believe in or abide by.</li> <li>9 While fully accepting the right to worship and the sanctity of places of worship, the Council should not impose upon the wider community in a conservation area this unsightly street furniture solely for the purpose of reducing the inconvenience imposed on a small minority by their own rules and beliefs.</li> </ol>
2021/3105/P	Elizabeth Dore	19/11/2021 12:24:40	OBJ	<p>I am Jewish. I am totally opposed to erection of an ERUV in Highgate. I live on Millfield Lane and I do not think any religious group should be allowed to put up obstacles in public areas.</p>