

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Karen McGovern	27 Compayne Gardens London NW6 3DD	01/08/2014 10:01:52	OBJ	The proposals are a grossly excessive response to the preceived danger, and have been based on an incorrect interpretation of the law. I believe the proposed works pose a serious threat to the wild and natural state of the heath and would permanently blight and disfigure the heath contrary to the Hampstead Heath Act 1871. I strongly oppose the planning application.
2014/4332/P	Anita Colloms	6 Archibald Road Tufnell Park	01/08/2014 11:58:40	PETITNOBJ E	I am opposed to the extremity of this proposed project. As an elderly 2 or 3 times/weekly user of the pond side of the Heath, it affords me the possibility of trying to maintain mobility and access to a natural setting. Proposed dams and spillways will create long term disruption, destroy the natural environment and seems to be ENTIRELY UNNECESSARY. You have not provided adequate justification to proceed.
2014/4332/P	S. Gailey	37 South Hill Park London NW3 2ST	01/08/2014 11:46:43	OBJNOT	<p>Objections:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.The massive scale of engineering works proposed has not been proven to be required by the Reservoirs Act 1975.</li> <li>2.The destruction of the Heath on this scale is not necessary and will destroy the landscape. The massive excavation at the catchpit and model boating pond and concrete walls at the mens and Highgate no. 1 pond will destroy the Heath landscape.</li> <li>3.The modelling used is unrealistic: 1 in 4000,000 probability and assumes their is no warning.</li> <li>4.This will cause over 2 years of huge works, heavy plant machinery, HGV's, closure of the Heath and swimming ponds.</li> <li>5.The works will lead to the loss of 160 trees, and the City of London has already just felled 60 at Kenwood.</li> <li>6.This will cause unestimable damage to wildlife.</li> </ol> <p>Destroying the Heath on this massive scale should not be acceptable and has not been proven to be necessary. Please refuse,</p>
2014/4332/P	Frank Wintle	31 York Rise Dartmouth Park London NW5 1SR	01/08/2014 14:24:40	OBJ	I object to this expensive, disruptive and potentially disfiguring scheme. The case for the engineering works has not been convincingly made out, and that being so, the principle to apply is that if there are doubts, the plan should not proceed.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Grahame Andrew	45 Granville Road Stroud Green N4 4EJ	01/08/2014 15:10:03	OBJ	<p>This work is completely unnecessary. The legal requirement it seems can be met by much lesser measures. I've read that it's a one in 3,000 year ( or longer! ) event that it might be protecting against. I'm unsure if you realise quite how long 3,000 years is. I'm sure the residents of Gospel Oak etc will have greater challenges ahead in the next 3,000 years.</p> <p>I'm not sure who will be benefitting from these works, but certainly not pond and heath users. The ponds are fine, just as they are. They don't need messing with. There has been some torrential rain recently and the ponds have coped without even a trace of problem. Surely there are better things to spend this money on. It seems to be a question of the Corporation wanting to spend money on these kind of projects to "parkify" the Heath.</p> <p>I have used these ponds for the last 25 years. I've also been a regular winter swimmer for the last 11 years. It's a special place.</p> <p>Please do not proceed with these works.</p>
2014/4332/P	ashling tanner	58 springcroft avenue n2 9JE	01/08/2014 09:06:20	OBJ	In my 30 years as a resident of highgate and east finchley I have never known any flooding to occur in the two places you mention you are to build a damn . The proposed works will destroy one of the most beautiful of Londons landscapes.
2014/4332/P	j.meacher.	n6 5st	01/08/2014 14:28:06	AMEND	I object to these proposals.
2014/4332/P	j.meacher.	n6 5st	01/08/2014 14:28:28	AMEND	
2014/4332/P	Chris Green	flat 15 nightingale court	01/08/2014 11:26:30	PETITNOBJ E	This will wreck an absolutely invaluable refuge for Londoners, an incredible haven of peace in an otherwise very stressful city.
2014/4332/P	Kate Young	13 Stratford Villas	01/08/2014 11:11:42	OBJ	There are better ways to upgrade the water retention capacity of the ponds without massive construction works. This is a completely unacceptable destruction of the heath and the natural environment of the ponds. Refuse permission.
2014/4332/P	Alison Jefferies	16 Summerlee Gardens East Finchley London N29QN	01/08/2014 14:49:32	OBJ	I along with hundreds of other people who live near the Heath and use it very regularly for leisure purposes, am very very unhappy about the proposed dam works. There have been very clear studies done which demonstrate beyond any doubt that the whole exercise is costly and unnecessary and therefore appears to be a completely cynical exercise in money-making for the interested parties. I hope we will be able to protect The Heath for future generations as the previous generations have done for us.
2014/4332/P	Robert Cassen	Flat 4 Merlin House Oak Hill Park London NW3 7LJ	01/08/2014 14:38:33	PETITNOBJ E	I am strongly opposed to this application. The work proposed will be damaging to Hampstead Heath's natural beauty and its public, shared amenities. It is out of all proportion to any conceivable risk.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Sally Taylor	18A Mackeson Road London NW3 2LT	01/08/2014 14:27:19	OBJ	I object strenuously to the proposed engineering works to the Hampstead and Highgate chains of ponds as described above. I was in the original meeting that introduced the public to this idea; it was a PR exercise, run by a PR firm, short on information, long on lunch and busy activities. In fact, even at that early date, I felt misinformed. When "Professor" Andy Hughes stood up and described his immense power to make decisions regarding the Hampstead Ponds, I knew the Heath was in dire trouble. And so it has played out. I would refer to what seems to me to be a conflict of interest on the part of Andy Hughes. He is the City of London's consultant, a consultant for DEFRA and the Atkinds engineer who will build the dams for the ponds. We know that the "computer modelled" catastrophic rain event that is justification for these monstrously intrusive dams describes an event that has NEVER taken place on the Heath, and at once every 400,000 years, will never take place on the Heath. But even if it were to occur (impossible) there is no evidence beyond Andy Hughes's research to indicate the areas of Gospel oak, Dartmouth Park, etc. would be flooded with his estimated loss of 400 lives. This is an exercise in business-getting to my way of thinking, using a law that hasn't been passed. In the meantime, the Heath as we know it will cease to exist. It will be for two years run over by construction vehicles traveling daily from the four entrances to the Heath, causing a threat to the lives, safety and peace of all heath users, and yes, a 90-tonne crane. Surely Hughes has got this project mixed up with the Olympics. The resultant defacement of the Heath contravenes the 1874 Act that insures the nonviability of the Heath as a haven for users who live in the busy City of London. Camden MUST STOP this absurd project, which is based on the City's fear of liability and not any actual danger.
2014/4332/P	Anne McGrath	177 Makepeace Mansions	01/08/2014 11:31:32	COMMNT	I am absolutely opposed to this dam building project. It is not necessary and is a waste of time and money. Keep the ponds as they are.
2014/4332/P	j.meacher.	n6 5st	01/08/2014 14:28:28	AMEND	I object to these proposals.