

Appendix 4 Consultation Responses from internal and external agencies

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
INTERNAL		
LBH Conservation	<p>The proposed works for installation of street furniture including pairs of poles 5,5 meters high and 76mm in diameter linked with 1.6mm clear nylon filament will impact several locations across the Highgate Conservation Area and Stroud Green Conservation Area.</p> <p>The map of proposed locations and related existing and proposed views submitted with this application show that the 'eruv' structures would inoffensively blend into their heritage setting due to the minimal bulk and slender dimensions of the poles which are generously spaced away from one another and will be erected in discreet locations often characterised by a vertical backdrop which can be respectively constituted by dense vegetation and mature trees, or railings or existing lamp posts or street signage.</p> <p>The proposed poles will appear as secondary elements in street views of the relevant stretches of the Conservation Areas and will have a very modest impact on their character and appearance. Also, this impact can be further mitigated through design refinements by finishing the slender poles with the most appropriate colour for each location so that these slender elements blend in with the prevailing vertical features of each heritage location thus eliminating any undesirable visual distraction.</p> <p>Due to the carefully chosen locations and sensitive design of the 'eruv' structures intended both as a designed group and a set of individual poles, this proposal will cause no harm to the significance of the Highgate and Stroud Green Conservation Areas and the proposed works are supported from the conservation perspective.</p> <p>The exact design and colour palette of each 'eruv' structure and individual pole should be detailed and approved by the local authority through planning condition so to ensure that the impact of these structures is effectively mitigated and that the character and appearance of the conservation areas are preserved.</p>	Noted.
LBH Highways	The changes are acceptable.	Notes. Condition added.

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>I believe that the application to erect the ERUV poles is made (or will be) under Section 50 and 105 of the New Road and Streetworks Act 1991 (permitting a person to place, or to retain apparatus in the street, and thereafter to inspect, maintain, adjust, repair, alter or renew the apparatus, change its position or remove it. The Licence does not dispense the licensee from obtaining any other permission like planning which may be required (especially in conservation areas).</p> <p>I have walked through the proposed locations with the applicant to discuss the application to carry out the physical works (Qualifications of Operatives and Supervisors), the locations of the apparatuses with particular regards to the needs of disabled people and the records of the apparatuses and their owners.</p> <p>I did not think that this operation necessitates a formal safety audit but agree that it is better to have one. We can certainly ask the applicants to appoint an independent contractor to produce the safety audit. This request can be part of the planning application and/or the Section 50 application.</p> <p>19/10/2022 I am satisfied with the proposed locations. More importantly, I am not in favour of an agreement like the Camden. Section 7.1 (b) where it stipulates that the local authority will carry out repairs on the poles/wires. We certainly do not want to do that. We do not repair any apparatuses that belongs to third parties (like Thames Water, Virgin Media). We can make safe if need be and we report any defects to them. Please note my earlier email where the Met is requesting a safety audit before any agreement is made.</p>	
LBH Transportation	No objections.	Noted.
LBH Parks & Nature Conservation	<p>Location 33 (Tunnel Gardens)- 'For location 33, it would be preferable at this time to relocate the eruv notional boundary locally, using a pair of poles similar to other locations.'</p> <p>And-</p>	Noted and revised accordingly.

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>'I have no objection to the revised pole and wire construction for location 33.'</p> <p>Location 22 (Parkland Walk)- 'In addition, I would have no objection to the suggestion of a pre-commencement condition to address our concerns about bats, allowing a survey to take place when they are likely to be active.</p> <p>Regards</p> <p>Alex Fraser Tree & Nature Conservation Manager</p> <p>The proposed addition of beads to the wire would appear appropriate, in terms of making the wire more visible, if this has been adopted in similar protected locations elsewhere.'</p> <p>27/3/2023</p> <p>Please could you also add wording to the condition where the applicant must provide a specification on the proposed addition of beads to the wire and that this is reviewed by an ecologist. This must then be agreed between the owners of the site and the Local Planning Authority and all works must be completed in accordance with that scheme.</p> <p>Kind regards</p> <p>Annabel</p>	
LBH Residential Care	No comment.	
LBH Environmental Health/ Lighting	From the lighting aspect we have no objections for this request	Noted.
LBH Arboricultural Officer		Noted.

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>I hold, from an arboricultural point of view, no objections.</p> <p>The proposal uses existing boundaries and barriers. From the submitted details, plans, now and then photographs, no tree root protection areas (RPAs) seem affected.</p> <p>However, we will require an Arboricultural Method Statement for any poles being erected adjacent to significant mature trees and within their RPAs. Hand installation will be required.</p>	
<p>LBH Communities and Inequalities/ Multi-Faith Forum</p>	<p>This application is a positive proposal for Haringey, enabling one of our significant groups of minority residents to participate more fully in the use of their borough. The Eruv will be an important facilitator for our Jewish community observing the Sabbath, and would support Haringey's commitment to equity in supporting our diverse residents and communities.</p> <p>I would be keen to see ongoing dialogue with relevant colleagues in Community Safety, and the local police, to ensure we are sensitive to any tensions that may arise. Sadly we know some of our Jewish residents have been targeted in both hate crimes and incidents, and an increase visibility over the Sabbath may result in a rise in such targeting – it's important we're able to monitor this and respond accordingly across the partnership to support residents through preventative action, and support following any crimes or incidents.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>LBH Communities/ Community Safety – Hate Crime & Offender Management-Strategic Lead</p>	<p>.</p> <p>Thank you for your response. Just to be clear from the Community safety and Hate Crime perspective, regardless of any negative knock-on effects from the Eruv, we fully support the scheme. The positive impact of the Eruv, in our view,</p>	<p>Noted and addressed in EqIA</p>

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>outweigh the negative, in the fact that the Eruv will enhance Jewish communal life and give our community the freedoms to enjoy the borough on the Sabbath while not impacting on anyone else.</p> <p>I outlined our plans for mitigation in my previous email attached. I am confident that our strong relationships with the community and organisations such as CST, along with the police will be sufficient to support and protect the community if an incident should occur.</p> <p>Hope this helps to give an understanding on our position.</p> <p>Best wishes,</p> <p>Heather</p> <p>Heather Hutchings (she/her) Strategic Lead for Community Safety – Hate Crime</p> <p>Strategic Lead Hate Crime: Objections to the Eruv may have the potential to tip into targeted and non-targeted acts of antisemitism. With the installation of the Eruv, one of the potential risks to highlight would be an influx or growth of sentiment relating to Jewish conspiratorial ideology. In the past, we have had reports of conspiratorial graffiti/stickering/malicious communications in relation to the New World Order in connection to Covid-19 and the Israel/Palestine conflict, the Eruv may feed the appetite for those who wish to propagate these messages. The CST (community Security Trust) have highlighted that Eruv's in other parts of the country had attracted this kind of hatred towards the Jewish community, as an example - https://www.jewishnews.co.uk/busheys-new-eruv-due-to-powerful-jewish-lobby/.</p> <p>Strategic Lead Community Safety: Whilst fully acknowledging the comments from the Strategic Lead Hate Crime around the potential for targeted Community Tension risks linked to the installation of the Eruv, Community Safety would fully support this application and would not have any objections. The Eruv would</p>	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>enhance community cohesion and allow for the Jewish community to practice their religious observances and customs with greater freedoms.</p> <p>Head of CCTV: From a CCTV perspective, I have no objections. We do not currently have any CCTV cameras at the proposed locations. The poles are located at the backline of the footpath and I'm currently unaware of any reason why the wire or pole would impede CCTV transmissions should cameras be installed at the locations.</p>	
<p>Councillor Adam Jogee Cabinet Member for Economic Development, Jobs and Community Cohesion</p>	<p>I write to in relation to the application for the implementation of an Eruv here in the London Borough of Haringey.</p> <p>As the Cabinet Member responsible for Faith and Community Cohesion here in Haringey, I welcome these proposals and support the installation of an Eruv. This is an important way of ensuring that Haringey's Jewish communities are empowered to live their lives as freely as possible whilst continuing to observe and embrace their religious beliefs and customs.</p> <p>The infrastructure requested and required, which has already been in place in South Tottenham since 2020, is discreet and minimal. Moreover, and despite the simplicity of it, this proposal will have a profound impact on the lives of more than 2,000 Jewish residents who call Haringey and neighbouring boroughs home. It will speak loudly about our community being safe, accessible, and open to, and for, everyone.</p> <p>Restrictions on transport and the movement of objects from private into any other domain during Shabbat – as dictated by some interpretations of Jewish law – present significant barriers to mobility for some disabled people in the Jewish community during Shabbat. This, for example, means, wheelchair users cannot leave home with the help of family members. At the same time, parents are prohibited from carrying their children during the Shabbat.</p> <p>The installation of an Eruv is about equality and understanding. These proposals further enhance the diversity and togetherness that makes Haringey a great place to live, learn and work - in this city and across our country.</p> <p>For this, and for the simple rule that nobody should ever walk by on the other side, I wish to clearly express my support for this proposal.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>Best wishes, Councillor Adam Jogee Cabinet Member for Economic Development, Jobs and Community Cohesion</p>	
EXTERNAL		
Network Rail	<p>Asset Protection Informatives for works in close proximity to Network Rail's infrastructure The developer must ensure that their proposal, both during construction and after completion does not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • encroach onto Network Rail land • affect the safety, operation or integrity of the company's railway and its infrastructure • undermine its support zone • damage the company's infrastructure • place additional load on cuttings • adversely affect any railway land or structure • over-sail or encroach upon the air-space of any Network Rail land • cause to obstruct or interfere with any works or proposed works or Network Rail development both now and in the future <p>Network Rail strongly recommends the developer complies with the following comments and requirements to maintain the safe operation of the railway and protect Network Rail's infrastructure.</p> <p>Future maintenance The applicant must ensure that any construction and subsequent maintenance can be carried out to any proposed buildings or structures without adversely affecting the safety of/or encroaching upon Network Rail's adjacent land and air-space. Therefore, any buildings are required to be situated at least 2 metres (3m for overhead lines and third rail) from Network Rail's boundary. This requirement will allow for the construction and future maintenance of a building without the need to access the operational railway environment. Any less than 2m (3m for overhead lines and third rail) and there is a strong possibility that the applicant (and any future resident) will need to utilise Network Rail land and air-space to facilitate works as well as adversely impact upon</p>	Noted. Informatives added.

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>Network Rail's maintenance teams' ability to maintain our boundary fencing and boundary treatments. Access to Network Rail's land may not always be granted and if granted may be subject to railway site safety requirements and special provisions with all associated railway costs charged to the applicant.</p> <p>As mentioned above, any works within Network Rail's land would need approval from the Network Rail Asset Protection Engineer. This request should be submitted at least 20 weeks before any works are due to commence on site and the applicant is liable for all associated costs (e.g. all possession, site safety, asset protection presence costs). However, Network Rail is not required to grant permission for any third party access to its land.</p> <p>Plant & Materials</p> <p>All operations, including the use of cranes or other mechanical plant working adjacent to Network Rail's property, must at all times be carried out in a "fail safe" manner such that in the event of mishandling, collapse or failure, no plant or materials are capable of falling within 3.0m of the boundary with Network Rail.</p> <p>Drainage</p> <p>Storm/surface water must not be discharged onto Network Rail's property or into Network Rail's culverts or drains except by agreement with Network Rail. Suitable drainage or other works must be provided and maintained by the Developer to prevent surface water flows or run-off onto Network Rail's property. Proper provision must be made to accept and continue drainage discharging from Network Rail's property; full details to be submitted for approval to the Network Rail Asset Protection Engineer. Suitable foul drainage must be provided separate from Network Rail's existing drainage. Soakaways, as a means of storm/surface water disposal must not be constructed within 20 metres of Network Rail's boundary or at any point which could adversely affect the stability of Network Rail's property. After the completion and occupation of the development, any new or exacerbated problems attributable to the new development shall be investigated and remedied at the applicants' expense.</p> <p>Scaffolding</p> <p>Any scaffold which is to be constructed within 10 metres of the railway boundary fence must be erected in such a manner that at no time will any poles over-sail</p>	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>the railway and protective netting around such scaffold must be installed. The applicant/applicant's contractor must consider if they can undertake the works and associated scaffold/access for working at height within the footprint of their property boundary.</p> <p>Piling Where vibro-compaction/displacement piling plant is to be used in development, details of the use of such machinery and a method statement should be submitted for the approval of the Network Rail's Asset Protection Engineer prior to the commencement of works and the works shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved method statement.</p> <p>Fencing In view of the nature of the development, it is essential that the developer provide (at their own expense) and thereafter maintain a substantial, trespass proof fence along the development side of the existing boundary fence, to a minimum height of 1.8 metres. The 1.8m fencing should be adjacent to the railway boundary and the developer/applicant should make provision for its future maintenance and renewal without encroachment upon Network Rail land. Network Rail's existing fencing / wall must not be removed or damaged and at no point during or post construction should the foundations of the fencing or wall or any embankment therein, be damaged, undermined or compromised in any way. Any vegetation within Network Rail's land boundary must not be disturbed. Any fencing installed by the applicant must not prevent Network Rail from maintaining its own fencing/ boundary treatment.</p> <p>Lighting Any lighting associated with the development (including vehicle lights) must not interfere with the sighting of signalling apparatus and/or train drivers' vision on approaching trains. The location and colour of lights must not give rise to the potential for confusion with the signalling arrangements on the railway. The developers should obtain Network Rail's Asset Protection Engineer's approval of their detailed proposals regarding lighting.</p> <p>Noise and Vibration</p>	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>The potential for any noise/vibration impacts caused by the proximity between the proposed development and any existing railway must be assessed in the context of the National Planning Policy Framework which hold relevant national guidance information. The current level of usage may be subject to change at any time without notification including increased frequency of trains, night time train running and heavy freight trains.</p> <p>Vehicle Incursion Where a proposal calls for hard standing area/parking of vehicles area near the boundary with the operational railway, Network Rail would recommend the installation of a highways approved vehicle incursion barrier or high kerbs to prevent vehicles accidentally driving or rolling onto the railway or damaging lineside fencing.</p> <p>Landscaping Any trees/shrubs to be planted adjacent to the railway boundary these shrubs should be positioned at a minimum distance greater than their predicted mature height from the boundary. Certain broad leaf deciduous species should not be planted adjacent to the railway boundary as the species will contribute to leaf fall which will have a detrimental effect on the safety and operation of the railway. Network Rail wish to be involved in the approval of any landscaping scheme adjacent to the railway. Any hedge planted adjacent to Network Rail's boundary fencing for screening purposes should be so placed that when fully grown it does not damage the fencing or provide a means of scaling it. No hedge should prevent Network Rail from maintaining its boundary fencing. If required, Network Rail's Asset Protection team are able to provide more details on which trees/shrubs are permitted within close proximity to the railway.</p> <p>Existing Rights The applicant must identify and comply with all existing rights on the land. Network Rail request all existing rights, covenants and easements are retained unless agreed otherwise with Network Rail.</p>	
Met Police/ Traffic Management	Please note that although my colleague has no concerns with these from a crime point of view, it is very unusual for apparatus to be placed on the public	Noted. Condition added.

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>highway without going through the appropriate channels ie the relevant Highway Authority. This way it can be subject to scrutiny, mainly from a public safety perspective, by qualified person(s) who may also subsequently request an independent audit from a qualified Road Safety Auditor.</p> <p>As these appear not to have gone through this procedure then it is not something the MPS would support from a road safety point of view. It is clear that changes are being made to the public highway and, as such, the appropriate legislation within the Road Traffic Regulation Act should be used.</p>	
Met Police/ Designing Out Crime Officer	<p>, I have consulted internally within the MPS including the local policing teams and fellow designing out crime officers from other areas within London. I would like to confirm that we have no concerns or comments to make in relation to this application, at this time.</p> <p>I am aware that the MPS Roads and Transport Policing team are able to offer further guidance focused on safety, but they first require an application made under the Road Traffic Regulation Act before this can be provided.</p>	Noted.
Transport for London	<p>, TfL has the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - TfL has investigated specific poles (21B, 24A&B, 25A&B, 26A, 28A&B, 29A&B) and consulted with several areas within TfL. - TfL is satisfied poles do not pose engineering problems and does not object to them being discharged. - TfL services operate on land leased by network rail. TfL has previously consulted with Network rail regarding pole infrastructure which lie adjacent or directly on their land. Network Rail strongly recommends the following: <p>The developer must ensure that their proposal, both during construction and after completion does not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - encroach onto Network Rail land - affect the safety, operation or integrity of the company's railway and its infrastructure - undermine its support zone 	Noted. Informative/s added.

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - damage the company's infrastructure - place additional load on cuttings - adversely affect any railway land or structure - over-sail or encroach upon the airspace of any Network Rail land - cause to obstruct or interfere with any works or proposed works or Network Rail development both now and in the future <p>Future maintenance: The applicant must ensure that any construction and subsequent maintenance can be carried out to any proposed buildings or structures without adversely affecting the safety of/ or encroaching upon Network Rail's adjacent land and airspace. Therefore, any buildings are required to be situated at least 2 metres (3m for overhead lines and third rail) from Network Rail's boundary. This requirement will allow for the construction and future maintenance of a building without the need to access the operational railway environment. Any less than 2m (3m for overhead lines and third rail) and there is a strong possibility that the applicant (and any future resident) will need to utilise Network Rail land and airspace to facilitate works as well as adversely impact upon Network Rail's maintenance teams' ability to maintain our boundary fencing and boundary treatments. Access to Network Rail's land may not always be granted and if granted may be subject to railway site safety requirements and special provisions with all associated railway costs charged to the applicant. Any works within Network Rail's land would need approval from the Network Rail Asset Protection Engineer. This request should be submitted at least 20 weeks before any works are due to commence on site and the applicant is liable for all associated costs (e.g., a l l possession, site safety, asset protection presence costs). However, Network Rail is not required to grant permission for any third-party access to its land.</p> <p>Scaffolding Any scaffold which is to be constructed within 10 metres of the railway boundary fence must be erected in such a manner that at no time will any poles over-sail the railway and protective netting around such scaffold must be installed. The applicant/applicant's contractor must consider if they can undertake the works and associated scaffold/access for working at height within the footprint of their property boundary.</p>	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>Please note any questions regarding the above information should be raised with Network Rail first.</p>	
<p>Friends of Parkland Walk</p>	<p>Submission: Objection Comments: At present, while I consult with my colleagues on the committee of the Friends of the Parkland Walk, I am lodging an objection on the grounds that key stakeholders such as our group have not been consulted. The deadline for comments/objections must be extended to allow time for proper consideration of the implications to wildlife of these structures so close to a recognized Local Nature Reserve.</p> <p>Comments: I am submitting a further objection to this scheme with specific reference to the locations 21, 22, and 23 close to the Parkland Walk Local Nature Reserve. There is a serious concern that the wires that are an essential element of this scheme present a risk to birds and bats (a protected species) that populate this green space. A ruling on a previous eruv application in Manchester, 2020, said this: "In many of the sites, proposals involve provision of posts either side of an opening (such as a street) and attaching very fine gauge translucent wire (fishing line) high between the posts to form a barrier. Fishing line is proposed to minimise the visual impact of the Eruv, however the wire would likely not be visible to birds and would also be too fine for bats to detect through echolocation and therefore there is a risk of wildlife colliding with the fishing line and also becoming entangled if it breaks. Harp traps for example are used to catch bats for monitoring purposes and these use fishing line as typically this is too thin for bats to detect through echolocation. This is of particular concern where the proposed fishing line is placed near/within areas of suitable bat and bird habitat " The application contains no appreciation that the area is adjacent a nature reserve and contains no reference to measures to mitigate the risk to wildlife. Protection of wildlife and biodiversity are a top priority for Haringey and planning decisions should reflect this. The Parkland Walk is owned by Haringey. Landowners are under no obligation to permit construction by third parties on their land. Whatever the outcome of the planning process, it would be expected</p>	<p>Noted. Revisions sought to relevant locations.</p>

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	that Haringey Parks Department would refuse permission for such infrastructure on this nature reserve.	
LB Camden	<p>Reasons for no objection- Three of the sites are on Hampstead Lane and Hampstead Lane forms the boundary between LB Haringey and LB Camden. A pair of 5.5m high 76mm diameter poles with wire between is proposed off Hampstead Lane to the east of Park Flats; two separate 5.5m high 76mm diameter poles with wires crossing Hampstead Lane are proposed at and to the right of the junction with Stormont Road; a 5.5m high 76mm diameter pole with wire connected to two lamp posts is proposed at the junction with Bishopswood Road.</p> <p>A similar application in LB Camden (2021/3105/P), for the installation of poles with clear wire between, in 10 different locations on the highway in N6 and NW5 postcodes in Camden, was granted planning permission subject to a legal agreement in April this year. On balance it was considered that the poles and connections would not harm the townscape and heritage assets of Camden, the amenity of any residents or any biodiversity and transport conditions. The LB Haringey proposals would similarly not have any adverse effects on the Highgate Village Conservation Area, the Listed Kenwood House, the amenity of any local residents or any biodiversity or transport conditions in Camden. Thus no objection is raised to the proposals as far as they relate to the Camden borough.</p>	Noted.
LB Islington	No comments.	Noted.
OTHER		
Catherine West MP	<p>Support. Comments: Haringey's strength is its diversity. We are a proud multicultural community with residents from all faiths and none, and as MP I wish to ensure that everyone in our diverse community can fully participate in everything our borough can offer. The eruv will ensure that all members of our Jewish community, including wheelchair users and those with small children in push chairs, can participate more fully in activities on the Shabbat, and as such I believe it supports inclusion.</p>	Noted.

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
NEIGHBOURING PROPERTIES		
Various addresses	<p>Design & Appearance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Street clutter • Visual eyesore • Harringay Station proposed arch too prominent (location 25) • Poles height is imposing • Railway arch harmful to CA 	<p>The additional street furniture resulting from this development is acknowledged and discussed in the 'design' section of the report above. Each location is assessed on its own merits in relation to appearance and impact on the CA.</p>
Various addresses	<p>Amenity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Location 21A located near narrow pavement • Loss of privacy during pole inspections • Reducing pavement width for wheelchair users 	<p>Location 21A is revised as detailed in the body of the report, section 3.1.1. The pole would not reduce the pavement width.</p> <p>The maintenance aspect of the poles is explained in section 3.1.8 and concludes that no loss of privacy will occur.</p> <p>The Transport and Highways Team have raised no objections to the locations. A Road Safety Audit is recommended by condition.</p>
Various addresses	<p>Land use</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encroachment on public land • Should use existing public furniture • Location 23 is unclear; leads to no houses 	<p>The additional street furniture resulting from this development is acknowledged and discussed in the 'design' section of the report above. Existing street</p>

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>furniture is used where possible, such as 2B and 3.2. Location 23 does not include Lancaster Road. This has been considered by the applicant as the most suitable boundary for the eruv at this location.</p>
Various addresses	<p>Trees/ Nature conservation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Threat to wildlife • Harm to community garden (near Mount Pleasant Villas; at Bridgemount Mews) 	<p>Locations 21A has been revised to be set away from the garden entrance. The submission includes remedial work to any damage caused during installation.</p> <p>An ecological report was submitted to address location 22 and with subsequent amendments made. Location 33 was revised.</p>
Various addresses	<p>Community relations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eruv interfering with civil law and creating physical religious presence • Creating religious symbol in public domain • Religious zoning • Proposal could harm community relations • Benefit to small minority • Extreme religious communities should not be supported in this manner • Harm to multi-culturalism and diverse relations in borough 	<p>Concern has been raised by some residents that this would set a precedent for other religious groups to apply for similar developments. Should any other religious groups require a similar structure, this would likely be subject to planning permission which would be assessed on its own merits.</p> <p>Whilst the eruv itself does not require planning permission,</p>

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>the installation of the street furniture, does.</p> <p>An EqIA is prepared to analyse the impact of the proposal on community relations.</p> <p>The impact of the Eruv on 'zoning' is discussed in the EqIA and assessment section of report.</p> <p>House price is not a material planning consideration and as such has no impact on the determination of the application.</p>
Various addresses	<p>Climate Change/ Other</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other demarcation should be used, such as at the Stamford Hill area • Eruv users should use a digital app instead • Who will bear the upkeep costs? • Waste of public resources • No location 31 – how does location 30 link to no. 32 (across Scout Park) • Proposal encourages steel production and thereby global warming • Plastic wire unfriendly to the environment • Weekly maintenance by car to encourage global warming • Front gardens should be replanted to mitigate global warming 	<p>The method of demarcation proposed is similar to that in other boroughs and to existing highway street furniture.</p> <p>All poles etc. are funded by the applicant.</p> <p>A digital app cannot be used as this would require carrying a device, which is not allowed under Jewish Law on the Shabbat.</p>

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>There is no location 31, as detailed in the body of the report.</p> <p>The materials used for the poles and associated furniture is produced similarly to other street furniture in the borough.</p> <p>A weekly car drive for maintenance is not considered significant in the context of other road maintenance for signage etc.</p> <p>The council has no powers to require front gardens to be replanted as a result of this application.</p>
Various addresses	<p>Consultation/ Other</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient consultation time • consultation period extended • Site notice displayed wrongly • Fly tipping near proposed sites • Consultation not wide enough • Sites should have been consulted on separately • Consultation during school holidays • Site notice too small and badly located (location 21A) • Application hard to find online 	<p>Site notices were displayed near all proposed locations when the application was originally registered in mid-2022.</p> <p>Representations are received and considered until determination date.</p>