

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	lara king	13 palace court gardens n10 2lb	05/08/2014 10:34:47	OBJ	Please don't ruin our heath. These ponds are a very special place for many many people, they are a source of peace and well being, The dams and related building work are a totally unnecessary intrusion into our space and will create so much anger, sadness and bad health. Not to mention a poor environment and general bad feeling. Stop now and do something useful and positive.
2014/4332/P	amara procter	34 Brecknock Road nN7 0DD	06/08/2014 18:53:53	COMMNT	I feel that these plans are excessive, that the possible 'biblical' flood event is less probable than is anticipated in this application. The effects of all the trees to be taken out, the heightening of the various dams is in excess of what is appropriate. I feel that this application should be rejected and that more modest proposals be sought.
2014/4332/P	Deliya Meylanova	Flat 2 268-270 Seven Sisters Road London N4 2HY	06/08/2014 15:55:44	OBJ	<p>I am a regular user of the Hampstead Ladies' Pond. There is no need whatsoever to make any changes to the changing rooms, they are fine as they are.</p> <p>I would be very strongly against any engineering work that in any way affects the ponds, or that necessitates the felling of any trees or other interference with Hampstead Heath.</p> <p>Best regards</p> <p>Deliya Meylanova</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Jill Hughes	28 Danvers RD London	06/08/2014 14:05:06	OBJ	<p>I object to this application on the grounds that it is contrary to the intention of Hampstead Heath being a wild nature park for the use of all Londoners.</p> <p>I further object on the following grounds.</p> <p>Hampstead Heath is world famous, freely available to all Londoners and visitors and is used regularly by a wide variety of people; walkers, runners, swimmers, families with children.</p> <p>These works would take at least 2 years, massive disruption to the Heath, that in my opinion could lead to permanent disfigurement. Wildlife will be disrupted and the environment damaged by traffic and heavy machinery.</p> <p>Scale of Works:</p> <p>The proposal to fell at least 160 mature trees as part of these works, is totally irresponsible and will be a terrible loss to the much needed oxygen levels that the trees can provide.</p> <p>I can see no reason for these dams.....the walls will change the face of the Heath and its ponds forever. It is such a special place....how can you think of changing it?</p> <p>In addition, the works would cost £17million, which is money which could be better spent elsewhere.</p> <p>Risk model/Flooding:</p> <p>I consider that the City of London has failed to consider alternatives e.g. Stephen Myers' proposals reported in the Camden New Journal on 4 July 2014 (greater use of the Heath's natural capacity to absorb flood water requiring much smaller modifications to the existing dams).</p> <p>The idea that there is a risk of 1 in 400,000 years, is totally unrealistic. The scientific reasons behind this proposal are seriously questionable.</p> <p>This work is not a requirement of the 1975 Reservoirs Act.</p> <p>It also takes no account of the responsibilities of other bodies like Camden Council and Thames Water to reduce the impact of flooding, nor procedures that Camden Council is required to have in place.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · In over 300 years' existence the ponds on Heath have not collapsed or caused any major flooding. We have just had the wettest winter on record with no ill-effects to the ponds. · Money would be better used advising local residents of potential flooding risks and supporting access to suitable insurance.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>Consultation:</p> <p>· The City of London has ignored the results of its own limited consultation exercise (November 2013 – February 2014) where two thirds of respondents were very dissatisfied with all of the dam proposals. We were given limited options to comment on in first place.</p>
2014/4332/P	Luke aan de Wiel	2 Stonenest street	06/08/2014 12:07:33	OBJ	It would seem the slight risk this project is designed to avert in no way warrants the cost, upheaval and damage to a most treasured part of London. I must object wholeheartedly to these proposals.
2014/4332/P	Helen Mansfield	25 Ridgeway Gardens London N6 5XR	06/08/2014 15:49:30	COMMNT	I strongly object to the proposed engineering works which I think are completely out of proportion to the infinitesimally small risk of a major life-threatening flood. I am a regular user of the ladies' bathing pond and greatly appreciate the rural feel of the facility. Please keep it this way. Thank you.
2014/4332/P	Lizza Charlaff	74 Cromwell Avenue Highgate N6 5HQ	04/08/2014 11:16:27	OBJ	This proposed scheme is based on flawed research for an eventuality which is unlikely ever to occur. The enormous cost of the project is a waste of public funds which could better be spent elsewhere. The plans involve massive damage to a beautiful natural environment, loss of trees, destruction of wild areas. Plans to improve access to the Ladies Pond, which I use regularly will instead cause congestion at the site, will cause disruption to wildlife and regular users are dismayed that works mean that it is closed for many months. The impact of these works is detrimental in every way.
2014/4332/P	Ian Crofton	38 Park Avenue North London N8 7RT	04/08/2014 11:12:29	COMMNT	The proposed works are a complete over-reaction to the 1:400000 chance of serious flooding, and would irrevocably damage the wild character of the Heath and its wildlife.
2014/4332/P	Helen Mansfield	25 Ridgeway Gardens London N6 5XR	06/08/2014 15:49:51	OBJ	I strongly object to the proposed engineering works which I think are completely out of proportion to the infinitesimally small risk of a major life-threatening flood. I am a regular user of the ladies' bathing pond and greatly appreciate the rural feel of the facility. Please keep it this way. Thank you.
2014/4332/P	Ella Risbridger	Flat 10 200 Mile End Road London E1 4LD	04/08/2014 10:18:37	OBJ	<p>To whom it may concern:</p> <p>This plan is ill-thought out, and frankly speaking, obscene: the Heath is a place of great national beauty, and it matters that it stays this way. It matters that the wildlife there can flourish; it matters that you do not dam the ponds, throw the whole thing into concrete under some poorly-advised plan. Please don't do this. It will permanently- forever and irrevocably- disfigure the Heath, and it will not solve the problems you hope it will solve. It is also a rather dubious interpretation of the law. This is simultaneously almost-illegal, and definitely-immoral, and absolutely-definitely-outrageous. Please, think again.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Ikram Arif	46 Mansfield Road London NW3 2HT	04/08/2014 14:50:46	OBJ	The ponds are great as they are, any work that will take place will have a big impact on them. So please reconsider.
2014/4332/P	Antony Elvin	88 Camden Mews	04/08/2014 15:53:02	OBJ	Please use common sense and let the Heath be. There is no real evidence to corroborate the Council's plan or suggest a need to raise the ponds' 'breakwaters. The Heath blots up millions of gallons of water each winter and the last mishap pertaining to run off was decades ago. . Spare the only bit of real, ancient green space in North London, and allow us common access to the swimming ponds all years-round. The heavy machinery that this kind of work demands will upset the atmosphere of the Heath and the and cause new roads and vehicle access points to be established. The raised banks will preclude visual access to the lovely ponds, surely the jewel in the Heath's crown and ruin the water for some time to come with regards debris. i want things to be sustained. Sometimes that's all we need. All the best, Antony Elvin
2014/4332/P	Bronwen Jackson	15 Talbot Road Highgate N6 4QS	04/08/2014 15:21:35	COMMNT	I object to the proposed engineering works for the ponds on Hampstead Heath (as detailed above) and support The Heath and Hampstead Society's opposition to it. My daughter and I frequently use the Ladies' pond in the summer and my sons often fish and have picnics by the boating bond. I am not convinced that the proposed dams would be effective in preventing any flooding from storms and the disruption and environmental devastation from their construction would be very harmful to the community. Yours sincerely, Bronwen Jackson.
2014/4332/P	Chaitanya Joshi	8 Middleton Road London NW11 7NS	04/08/2014 16:38:49	OBJ	I strongly object to this needless planning application on the following grounds: 1. This constitutes an unacceptable over-development of the involving a catastrophic loss of the open and pleasant aspect of the ponds areas. 2. The development will have a deleterious effect on the character of the neighbourhood, from being a pleasant and enjoyable open vista to a hemmed in and closed set of hidden ponds 3. adverse effect on the character of a conservation area 4. massive disruption to the amenity of the users of the ponds (I am a daily user of the Mens Ponds) 5. The disruption and disfigurement will impact the physical and mental health of the myriad users of the heath for its health promoting recreational activities
2014/4332/P	Judy Townley	3 North Square London NW11 7AA	05/08/2014 18:16:14	OBJ	I have carefully examined all of the available information and wish to object to the application on the grounds that: 1) The works are not proven to be necessary. 2) The changes to the appearance of the Heath will be detrimental. 3) The construction period will cause unnecessary disturbance to Heath users for a long period of time. I therefore urge you to refuse the application. Judy Townley

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Alexanxder Fyjis-Walker	2 Birch Close Hargrave Park n19 5xd	04/08/2014 23:34:49	OBJ	The project as proposed does not pay sufficient attention to the amenities of the heath and its importance to surrounding communities. Nothing about the Corporation's presentation at Parliament Hill School suggested that they or their contractors appreciated the importance and value of the heath in natural, historical or amenity terms. Construction will be invasive and restoration, to judge by the pictures shown us, slapdash. In addition, the case for carrying out the works at all seems seriously flawed. I urge the Council to reject this application.
2014/4332/P	Matt Mahon	28 Burghley Road NW5 1UE	04/08/2014 09:23:02	OBJ	This work is unnecessary and incredibly intrusive; it will ruin the character of the ponds and the wildlife in the area, and will not serve its stated purpose. Pointless.
2014/4332/P	Bronwen Jackson	15 Talbot Road Highgate N6 4QS	04/08/2014 15:21:26	COMMNT	I object to the proposed engineering works for the ponds on Hampstead Heath (as detailed above) and support The Heath and Hampstead Society's opposition to it. My daughter and I frequently use the Ladies' pond in the summer and my sons often fish and have picnics by the boating bond. I am not convinced that the proposed dams would be effective in preventing any flooding from storms and the disruption and environmental devastation from their construction would be very harmful to the community. Yours sincerely, Bronwen Jackson.
2014/4332/P	Bronwen Jackson	15 Talbot Road Highgate N6 4QS	04/08/2014 15:21:14	COMMNT	
2014/4332/P	Bronwen Jackson	15 Talbot Road Highgate N6 4QS	04/08/2014 15:21:14	COMMNT	
2014/4332/P	Anne Pages	56 Eton avenue London NW33HN	03/08/2014 23:37:25	OBJ	I want to object to this planning application
2014/4332/P	Tamara Eisenschitz	41A Aberdeen Rd London N5 2UG	03/08/2014 20:51:43	COMMNT	I object to this as Hampstead Heath should be left as wild as possible for all users to enjoy. Dams sound like a good idea, but have knock on effects on the wildlife and on the capacity of the solid to absorb water - not a good idea to upset the balance.
2014/4332/P	Adam Leys	55 Willes Road London NW5 3DN	02/08/2014 18:24:10	INT	I object to this application, and ask that it be rejected. The works described are overbearing, and distort the atmosphere of the parts of the Heath where they are to be placed. The flood risk is exaggerated. No calculation has been made, it seems of the flood risk from the theoretical massive rainfall on other parts of the Heath which do not drain into any of these ponds, but which would just as easily overwhelm the drainage system. The dam works will require huge disruption on Camden's road system over a long period of time, adding traffic danger and noise and air pollution to the lives of residents in a damaging way. There are other solutions which seem not to have been considered. I hope this application will be rejected.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Deborah Norton	3 Upper Terrace NW3 6RH	06/08/2014 17:32:37	COMMNT	I strongly object to this proposal. It will disfigure world famous Hampstead Heath and put portions out of use for years. The problem is not that the ponds could flood. The problem is that the sewer system in Hampstead is inadequate. Fix the sewers. Do not destroy the ponds.
2014/4332/P	Peter Wakefield	14 Tanza Road London NW3 2UB	03/08/2014 21:07:44	OBJ	<p>The scale of the works proposed is unprecedented on the Heath or in any other part of the local area. Works of this scale and duration need exceptional justification, as the loss of amenity to both the local and wider Heath-visiting population would be substantial, both during the works and after. The need for strong justification is reinforced when, as in this case, the Heath has statutory protection, and the Corporation of London has a duty to preserve it.</p> <p>The case supporting the proposed works is in my view poor, based as it is on outlandish projections that fail to take into account multiple mitigating factors regarding the risks identified. Any projection based on a 1 in 400,000 year analysis must by definition be highly speculative - 400,000 years is a multiple of the number of years humans have lived on the planet, and in that time it is surely more likely that we be hit by a meteor than that the Heath ponds would flood?</p> <p>Even if we accept a 400,000-year modelling exercise, the failure to take account of any early warning arrangements (which the Corporation and Camden Council are, as i understand it, in the process of developing) looks like a wilful failure to consider reality and a wilful insistence on the implausible. There is no such thing as 'zero risk', whatever the Corporation and its advisers may like to believe, and the possibility that the Heath and its thousands of users may have to endure these works and suffer the consequences of them based upon pseudo-scientific projections of a wholly unknowable distant future, together with deliberate disregard of any mitigating factors, is an outrage.</p> <p>I urge the Planning Committee in the strongest possible terms to reject the Corporation's proposals.</p>
2014/4332/P	Kate Higginbottom	Willes Road	06/08/2014 12:27:47	OBJ	I object. Pointless, unnecessary, and will ruin a vital London resource, essential to the health and well-being of London and Camden residents.
2014/4332/P	Paul Hodges	51 St George's Avenue	03/08/2014 21:02:51	COMMNT	<p>I write to object to this proposal. I would particularly call the attention of the Council's legal team to the potential implications of accepting its necessity on the basis of its notional 1 in 400,000 year risk assessment. As someone who has worked with risk assessments for many years, I find this figure completely arbitrary. We have no possible basis for estimating risk over this period. It was, after all only 400,000 years ago that archaic homo sapiens, the forerunner of homo sapiens, first appeared. The current HSE standard is 1:10,000 per annum as an individual safety risk for members of the public who have a safety risk imposed on them 'in the wider interests of society'.</p> <p>www.dft.gov.uk/ha/standards/dmr/vol0/section2/gd0412.pdf If the Council accepted this new risk calculation for the dams, then it would clearly be at risk of legal action being taken against it to bring all the areas under its control – such as roads, schools, buildings etc – up to this notional standard. I would therefore request the Council to reject the application on the basis that the risk assessment is clearly out of line with current UK practice. Accepting the application could therefore open the door for the Council to be forced to upgrade a large number of its current facilities at a cost which is clearly unaffordable in the current climate, and which would not represent value for money. Failure to upgrade might in turn lay the Council open to the risk of legal claims from those who believe it should operate to the standard set out in the dam application.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	rosy martin	31 Grimthorpe house	02/08/2014 15:32:48	OBJ	I object to the planning application to construct a massive dam that will obliterate catchpit valley above the mixed pond, the 2.5 m dam above the men's pond, concrete wall below it, reconstruction of the model boating pond and the felling of 160 trees, many of these will be mature, even ancient ones. I have used and continue to use the women's pond for swimming over the last 40 years and I used to live in Kentish Town. This was when I first understood what a key part of London and its environment the Heath represents. Its continuation as a semi-wild environment that offers a lung and a place of relaxation and harmony for so very many Londoners must be preserved at all costs. The need to contain any possible flooding would be better met by using and expanding the Heath's natural capacity to absorb water, and not by heavy construction. I urge you to throw out these destructive plans.
2014/4332/P	Craig Stobart	18a Campdale Road	06/08/2014 06:46:34	OBJ	Please don't spoil the unique character of these ponds. I have used them for many years and hate the thought of them unnecessarily altered. Many thanks Craig.
2014/4332/P	Antony Melville	20 Battledean Rd London N5 1UZ	04/08/2014 18:17:39	OBJ	The drastic "flood protection" works proposed by the City of London are both damaging and unnecessary. It is unacceptable to cause 2 years of disruption to the Heath with the use of heavy machinery which will cause irreversible damage to the soil and therefore the ecology of the Heath, for the sake of total protection from a maximum flood risk at 1 in 400,000 years. There is no business in the world which would operate on such a risk assessment level. The City of London is required under the Hampstead Heath Act of 1871 to preserve it in its "natural state and aspect". That means it is the custodian of an ecosystem, and not a piece of urban infrastructure. The City has been custodian since 1989, but if it is not able to fulfil this role, then perhaps it should not continue. To undertake this disruption and disfigurement is against the interests of all Londoners, and of the interests of London as a world city, given the world wide reputation of Hampstead Heath and its value in endowing London with a beauty spot not matched by any other major world city. It is very hard to discern whose interests are served by this misguided proposal, as it fails to take account of the many other ways of protecting the lives of the 300 extra people considered to be at risk in the maximum flood scenario. In these cash-strapped times there are a host of better ways to spend £17 million. I call on Camden Council therefore to refuse permission for this work on Hampstead Heath.
2014/4332/P	Deborah Lewis	14 Cantelowes Road	04/08/2014 18:13:52	OBJ	I object to the proposed works on the grounds that from what I understand, they are not necessary and will cause huge destruction at great cost.
2014/4332/P	Dr John Mackrell	18 Wentworth Mansions Keats Grove Hampstead London NW3 2RL	04/08/2014 00:08:21	COMMNT	I am totally opposed to the damn dam project, which is completely unnecessary ' would cause destruction of trees and wild life, while subtracting from the appearance and amenities of the Heath.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Sara Smith	16 Cascade Avenue N10 3PU	03/08/2014 19:10:24	OBJ	It's not acceptable to destroy so much of the flora and probably fauna and create such a terrible mess, along with the destruction of so much of our beautiful Heath, on the basis of such a scientifically unproven and improbable flood scenario.
2014/4332/P	david jenkins	3 Leiston Hall Leiston IP16 4UZ	05/08/2014 07:47:33	OBJ	All my formative years some 60 years ago the joy of occasionally walking to school from NW3 to Highgate was the ponds. Their blending into the natural setting is unique and must NOT be destroyed for such spurious reasons as set out in the application. The impact on the surrounding properties is incalculable. My late father who was so active in the days of the Hampstead Festival etc would surely be turning in his grave.
2014/4332/P	jane	1 Hillway Highgate N6 6QB	03/08/2014 18:49:58	COMMNT	The risks identified are low. The works proposed are disproportionate and will be very unpleasant for some many Heath users. To allow them would demonstrate planning gone paranoid. If the committee believe that the law requires something to be done it should take advice on (i) applying for a change of the law/exemption (ii) different ways of complying
2014/4332/P	jane	1 Hillway Highgate N6 6QB	03/08/2014 18:49:36	COMMNT	
2014/4332/P	Ralph Gibson	33 Moray Road London N4 3LD	03/08/2014 09:50:35	OBJ	As a regular user of the Heath over many years I wish to strongly object to the proposals to undertake major construction works supposedly to prevent flooding. The City of London Corporation have not demonstrated that they have properly explored all the other so-called "softer" options that would fulfil its legal obligations without closing off and devastating a large part of the Heath for at least a year. The works will permanently change the character of this particular part of the Heath's landscape enjoyed by me and 1000s of others every year.
2014/4332/P	Virginia MacFadyen	65 Parliament Hill London NW3 2TB	02/08/2014 19:22:23	COMNOT	No necessity for such a drastic measure. Its legitimacy is unproven. All the Corporation of the City of London is worried about is liability. That was made amply clear at the meeting hosted by Camden Council at Parliament Hill School in June 2014. The reasons for applying this over-deterministic methodology are not at all what they purport to be. The congruence of legitimate fears of global warming and the Corporation's deep pockets should not be allowed to cause the Heath to be defaced permanently. Can anyone imagine such a project being even conceived if Camden and, say, Haringey councils had overall responsibility for maintaining the Heath?
2014/4332/P	Kate Allardyce	204 Holly Park Estate London N4 4BN	02/08/2014 09:50:28	OBJ	I am strongly opposed to the engineering works proposed to Hampstead Heath ponds. I am a local resident and regular visitor to the Heath and user of the ponds. Independent experts have said that the scheme is unnecessary and there are other more effective methods of flood mitigation. The risk of flood that the scheme is supposed to remedy is very small indeed 1:400,000 years. The proposed works will be extremely damaging to a valuable ecosystem and recreation facility that attracts many 1000s of visitors and tourists. The felling of established trees is unacceptable. The scheme is expensive and will create irreversible damage. This must not be allowed to go ahead.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Lynda Harper	222 Euston Road London Nw1 2DA	02/08/2014 13:48:03	OBJ	This is quite unnecessary given the low risk identified. The ponds are wonderful as they are.
2014/4332/P	Julia Flower	252 Ferme Park Road N89BN	02/08/2014 13:31:43	COMMNT	I am opposed to the proposed engineering works at Hampstead Heath ponds
2014/4332/P	Man-Sze Li	42 Clifton Road London N8 8JA	02/08/2014 13:06:46	OBJ	<p>I see little merit in this proposal and am extremely concerned about its impact on the Heath - if allowed to go ahead.</p> <p>As a regular user of the ladies' pond, I am specifically concerned about the impact of the proposed work on the unique environment and atmosphere of the pond, which should be treasured and preserved for perpetuity, rather than being put into jeopardy.</p> <p>The lack of a secluded and dedicated site for single sex only female swimming, while the proposed work takes place, is unacceptable.</p>
2014/4332/P	Sue Heap	8 Haslemere Road London N8 9QX	02/08/2014 09:14:56	OBJ	<p>Hampstead Heath is a precious local amenity for people who live in all the surrounding boroughs. The ponds are unique. The wild habitat so close to the city is unique. To destroy this environment because of a very tiny risk of flooding makes no sense, either ecologically or financially, except for those who would profit from the contract to carry out the works. The heath would be made unusable for walks and swimming while the work was done, and would be damaged for ever once the works were completed. Please do not pass this planning application.</p>
2014/4332/P	Catherine Gibbs	75 Arlington Road NW1 7ES	05/08/2014 07:07:53	OBJ	<p>I would like to object to this planning application. Two reasons for doing so are: firstly that I am not satisfied with the accuracy of the risk assessment carried out. Why did Aecom come to such very different conclusions about the work proposed and its necessity? Secondly after the wettest winter on record, no flood damage was experienced at Gospel Oak as far as I'm aware. I believe the City of London could achieve the same goals by raising awareness in local populations and improving drainage on the Heath. Please consider carefully the damage that will be done to a valuable habitat and resource should the works go ahead.</p>
2014/4332/P	Matt Sneddon	112 Highgate rd	05/08/2014 00:23:13	OBJ	<p>Dear Sir or Madam,</p> <p>This planning application makes no rational sense whatsoever. It would result in wanton destruction of a much used and loved environment at huge cost to local taxpayers with no scientific benefits whatsoever. Maybe we should plan to cover London with reinforced concrete in case an asteroid might strike. The sanity of those that have brought this application forward has to be brought into question.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Nicola Mayhew	21 Keslake Road Queens Park London NW6 6DJ	04/08/2014 23:04:53	OBJ	<p>As a daily user of the Heath for walking and running with my dog and swimming in the Ladies' and Mixed Ponds I am dismayed at the prospect of the disruption that the proposed works will cause to Hampstead Heath and my own enjoyment of it over a period that I understand will be at least two years and possibly longer.</p> <p>I am also concerned that the permanent impact of the works - the dramatic loss of trees, disfigurement of the landscape and views - will change the character of the Heath and impair the 'natural state and aspect' that the 1871 Hampstead Heath Act requires the custodian of the space to preserve. As well as its importance to thousands of human visitors, the Heath is a unique wildlife habitat within five miles of the heart of London. I fear that by the time the heavy construction traffic has departed we will be left with few if any of the kingfishers, heron, newts, hedgehogs and numerous other species that make it such an extraordinarily rich natural environment.</p> <p>I find it hard to believe that the £15-£17 million the proposed works are expected to cost could not be better spent in other ways that would enhance the Heath's capacity to absorb even exceptional volumes of flood water. It is disappointing to hear that less drastic proposals for 'soft' engineering have not been given full consideration. I have family and friends living in houses that could be affected by serious flooding to the South of the Heath, I wish them no harm and I want to know that they are being kept as safe as is reasonably possible by proper management of risk, water and appropriate emergency protocols. However, while I understand that the City of London would not want deaths on its corporate conscience – or to face the threat of insurance claims or litigation – when compared to Thames Water and Camden Council it appears to be assuming a disproportionate share of responsibility for ameliorating the potential for flooding.</p> <p>The 1 in 400,000 risk model on which this plan is based seems to be a mathematical construct bearing little relation to reality. Having endured the wettest winter on record in 2013-14, I note that the Hampstead and Highgate ponds maintained their three-hundred-year history of experiencing neither collapse nor significant flooding.</p>
2014/4332/P	Paula Ingram	25 Margaret Court Margaret Road Barnet EN4 9NS	06/08/2014 15:36:13	OBJ	<p>I would like to object to the excessive nature of these works and the irreversible environmental damage they will do to Hampstead Heath, a rare pocket of unspoiled nature. I understand that when the City of London Corporation submitted their application they had already been advised by independent experts that they could fulfill their obligations regarding flood safety with a range of less intrusive and destructive measures, but they have chosen to ignore this advice. Sadly, it will be down to the council to recognise that this work is excessive and unnecessary and block this application for the benefit of local residents and those, like myself, who are regular users of the Hampstead ponds.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Annabel Smith	Flat E 7 Belsize Park Gardens	05/08/2014 10:40:32	OBJ	I frequent the ladies pond and the mixed pond. Any disruption to them will cause a lot of unrest within the pond communities. While I am supportive of looking after the Heath and the ponds themselves, I do not support the current proposal due to a) it's intention to reduced flooding in never-before flooded areas b) the amount of disruption to the natural growth and wildlife on the Heath caused by the noise, excavation and pollution and c) the disruption to the ponds and the limited access to them. Please understand the size and vitality of the pond communities, which have been in place since the early 1900's. We are a unique and honorable group, who appreciate the nature of the land and the Heath, and so we want only the best for it and for those who enjoy it. We are but one small piece of what makes Hampstead and London a truly original place. Thank you for considering all of our objections.
2014/4332/P	Melanie Hick	3a Woolstone Road Se232tr	05/08/2014 09:18:52	COMMNT	I am very concerned that these dams will adversely affect the natural environment of Hampstead Heath and affect the public's use of the space negatively. I am also concerned that the City has said this work will not stop future flooding. This work is not in keeping with the nature of the Heath and will be detrimental to local homes and businesses.
2014/4332/P	Carol Robson	25 Goring Road Bowes Park London N11 2BU	04/08/2014 21:37:21	OBJ	The proposed dams will ruin the natural beauty of the ponds and surrounding areas for no good reason. They are not a legal requirement, would not stop flooding and are contrary to the Hampstead Heath Act of 1871 and the principal charitable object for which the Heath and Hampstead Society was formed in 1897. The City of London's response to hypothetical dangers of flooding are excessive and are based on an incorrect interpretation of the law. There have been no deaths, no flooding and no collapse of any dams in the Ponds' 300 year history.
2014/4332/P	Michele Freedman	100 Parliament Hill Mansions	04/08/2014 18:08:25	OBJ	I object to this proposal as the City of London has based plans on unrealistic computer modelling. 160 trees will be felled. dumper trucks and tankers will close the ponds for at least 2 years. Catchpit valley will be obliterated by a massive dam spoiling the views. A 2.5 m dam to be erected above the men's pond with a concrete wall below. Giant spillways are to be gorged between the ponds. This will have a devastating effect on the beautiful and natural environment of the heath that many generations of people have enjoyed. There are softer measures that would fulfil the City of London's legal obligations and I hope they take note of these.
2014/4332/P	Claudia Hope	5 Dalmeny Road London N7 0HG	04/08/2014 18:02:53	OBJ	I have lived near Hampstead Heath most of my life and and am very concerned with the proposal for the damn to be built on the heath. From reading the information on offer, it does not warrant the amount of disfigurement to the existing Heath, the culling of established trees, disruption to the natural habitat and will effect the character of the Ponds and Heath. The costs to the tax payer are substantial when there does not seem to be a valid enough data to support such risk. To date the natural beauty of the Heath has been preserved with no unnecessary development (Hampstead Heath Act of 1871). This proposal contravenes this pledge and you need to listen to users of the Heath and local residents. Please reject this unjustified, destructive, colossal expense that will adversely effect many users and the natural environment.
2014/4332/P	Rebecca Serra	Flat A 22 Langdon Park Road	04/08/2014 15:19:23	OBJ	I object to this, there is no need for such a soul destroying change to the heath. If it goes ahead it will be another nail in the coffin for North London (Camden Stables, Swains etc)

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Susan Nove	6 Erskine Road Primrose Hill NW3 3AJ	03/08/2014 21:48:04	OBJ	I am strongly objecting to the proposed planning due to unrealistic computer modelling that assumes collapse of all the current and existing dams, no warning and no emergency services, and the very worst kind of storm ever possible predicted to happen only once every 400,000 years.
2014/4332/P	Linda Aitken	105 Southwood Lane London N6 5TB	05/08/2014 12:35:15	OBJ	<p>I have lived within walking distance of this part of the Heath for 30 years and, along with my family, have been a regular and passionate user of this unique and glorious place.</p> <p>The proposal under consideration would appear to equate to an extreme form of municipal vandalism. It would have a lasting and major detrimental impact on the beauty of the heath caused by the sheer scale and highly sensitive location of the proposed 'mounds'.</p> <p>It appears highly questionable, from consideration of publicly available technical sources, as to whether the proposed works would be effective and the likelihood of the sort of extreme flooding they have been designed for is so extraordinarily rare that one can not but wonder as to the lack of wisdom and foresight behind the plans.</p> <p>The Heath is one of the most beautiful public urban open spaces in the world. It is not just a London asset but a source of national and even international pride and pleasure. Other cities can but dream of having anything anywhere near something comparably fine. It can not be acceptable for it to be subjected to such over scaled engineering when the odds of flooding caused by this water course are so incredibly low and the Heath is so unique.</p> <p>I therefore object most strongly to this application on grounds of irreparable and unnecessary damage - both aesthetic and ecological - that such a scheme would result in. This would appear to be in conflict of policies within the NPPF, the London Plan and all manner of local policy and associated good practice guidance.</p>
2014/4332/P	V L Sholund	61 Casimir Road London E5 9NU	05/08/2014 17:39:26	COMMNT	I object strongly to this application. There is no need for it - in fact it won't even stop future flooding, and it will result in lasting damage to a site of peace and beauty. It is contrary to the Hampstead Heath Act of 1871. I assume someone is looking to make a lot of money out of this - there is no other explanation for this application that makes sense.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Mrs Elizabeth Mortimer	79 Witney Street Burford Oxon OX18 4RX	05/08/2014 16:43:27	OBJ	I object most strongly to this proposal, which will alter the wild character of Hampstead Heath in a way that is contrary to the Hampstead Heath Act of 1871. The computer modelling on which the need for building dams and altering the ponds is based is both flawed and obviously absurdly unrealistic. The Heath and especially its ponds are enjoyed just as they are by great numbers of people. There is no justification for damaging such a rare and precious public amenity by urbanising what is now a natural and rural feature of the Heath, or for the destruction of the landscape, including the felling of many trees. I hope details of the proposed engineering contract, including its cost, and the specification of the works will be made public and open to scrutiny before they are submitted for approval. There appears to be no justification for spending exorbitant sums of money on a project that is widely regarded as undesirable, unnecessary and contrary to laws enacted to protect the environment of Hampstead Heath. There has been no report of danger from flooding over the past three hundred years. I request the committee to reject this application.
2014/4332/P	Alan McLean	43 The Pryors East Heath Road	04/08/2014 11:47:58	COMMNT	The planned works as currently set out are an over the top proposal/reaction to the topic of flood risk. They produce unsightly structures that ruin forever in part the beautiful landscapes of the heath with no guarantee that they would do the job that they are expected to under some circumstances. So PLEASE drop the proposals and think again. They are indeed DAMNONSENSE. Alan McLean
2014/4332/P	Mark Graham	14A Mortimer Terrace London NW5 1LH	04/08/2014 10:42:13	COMMNT	Unnecessary violation of the Heath and mature trees. Ridiculous in terms of risk planning. To be stopped at all costs. What are you thinking?!
2014/4332/P	Em	5 the grove	04/08/2014 21:36:00	OBJ	I do not believe there is any evidence to support the need for hideously ugly dams to be built around the ponds. The serious flooding across the country this year showed NO sign of such on the Heath. The destruction of the tranquil beauty peace refuge solace giving PUBLIC amenity should not be damaged/destroyed/removed never to be replaced by this program of totally unnecessary works. Please consider how much will be lost. The Romans feared and respected the Genius Loci "guardian spirit" of a special place and new that it must be protected at all times. This hideous program of building works - more destructive than constructive will drive that spirit away - be it on your own heads all you Camden Council officers. The heath will no longer be that special place saved from developers for the people , it will be known as "Yet another Public amenity wrecked by a few money grubbing ignorant council officers and developers waiting for their back-handers. Be a hero - STOP this project and the spirit of the Heath will stay. I am a professional photographer who has been photographing the Heath particularly the beauty of the ponds. My photographs are going to be worth a lot of money if you allow this destruction. You are going to destroy for EVER the beauty of what people come from all over the world to love and cherish the memory of. We will only have photographs and memories. .

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Roser Lavanchy	Flat 6 South Grove House South Groove Highgate London N6 6LP	04/08/2014 16:59:28	PETITNOBJ E	I object to the building of dams at the Hampstead and Highgate ponds, for the following reasons: It is not a legal condition. There has never been a collapse of any dam, no fatalities in 300 years even during storm weather. The proposed dams will not stop flooding from storms as the city states. The proposals are made on a computer generated model, based on a 1 in 400,000 year flood that presumes a total collapse of all Pond dams and massive loss of life.
2014/4332/P	Louise Turner	3A Endymion Road Finsbury Park N4 1EE	04/08/2014 12:16:55	PETITNOBJ E	The proposals will irrevocably change the ponds and the flood risk is overly exaggerated. Raising the sides of the boating pond by 3 meters just obliterates it from view and is not needed. Removing 140 trees will damage the wildlife at the Heath. There are alternatives to keep the ponds safe without damaging the heath.
2014/4332/P	Mrs Elizabeth Mortimer	79 Witney Street Burford Oxon OX18 4RX	05/08/2014 16:43:05	OBJ	I object most strongly to this proposal, which will alter the wild character of Hampstead Heath in a way that is contrary to the Hampstead Heath Act of 1871. The computer modelling on which the need for building dams and altering the ponds is based is both flawed and obviously absurdly unrealistic. The Heath and especially its ponds are enjoyed just as they are by great numbers of people. There is no justification for damaging such a rare and precious public amenity by urbanising what is now a natural and rural feature of the Heath, or for the destruction of the landscape, including the felling of many trees. I hope details of the proposed engineering contract, including its cost, and the specification of the works will be made public and open to scrutiny before they are submitted for approval. There appears to be no justification for spending exorbitant sums of money on a project that is widely regarded as undesirable, unnecessary and contrary to laws enacted to protect the environment of Hampstead Heath. There has been no report of danger from flooding over the past three hundred years. I request the committee to reject this application.
2014/4332/P	Sarah Bisset	7 Belmore Lane Islington London	05/08/2014 01:22:53	APP	It is very unlikely that the works are needed and they will disfigure the Heath which is a source of pleasure for local people and visitors from far and wide. There was no flooding in the recent heavy rains, and to have such major works based on fear that something might happen is ridiculous. The people need a natural place to unwind, and it's likely that building a dam will cause problems for wildlife and spoil the Heath entirely. I strongly oppose this and I am a local person whose children have been brought up on the Heath. Ruining the Heath will ruin my life as far as I'm concerned.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Em	5 the grove	04/08/2014 21:35:59	OBJ	I do not believe there is any evidence to support the need for hideously ugly dams to be built around the ponds. The serious flooding across the country this year showed NO sign of such on the Heath. The destruction of the tranquil beauty peace refuge solace giving PUBLIC amenity should not be damaged/destroyed/removed never to be replaced by this program of totally unnecessary works. Please consider how much will be lost. The Romans feared and respected the Genius Loci "guardian spirit" of a special place and new that it must be protected at all times. This hideous program of building works - more destructive than constructive will drive that spirit away - be it on your own heads all you Camden Council officers. The heath will no longer be that special place saved from developers for the people , it will be known as "Yet another Public amenity wrecked by a few money grubbing ignorant council officers and developers waiting for their back-handers. Be a hero - STOP this project and the spirit of the Heath will stay. I am a professional photographer who has been photographing the Heath particularly the beauty of the ponds. My photographs are going to be worth a lot of money if you allow this destruction. You are going to destroy for EVER the beauty of what people come from all over the world to love and cherish the memory of. We will only have photographs and memories. .
2014/4332/P	Abigail Kingston	10 Alcester Crescent Clapton London	04/08/2014 22:51:06	COMMNT	I am concerned about the loss of such a key wildlife and recreational area. It would be such a loss to no longer have the ponds. While I appreciate the need for flood defences, I am really concerned that the City of London Corporation has ignored independent experts who say that this project is unnecessary, and may have only listened to dam engineers using unrealistic computer modelling, who stand to gain £17 million from this work. I believe that the advice of independent experts is far better and less destructive to the environment: 1. improving the heath's capacity to absorb water 2. improving existing dams and 3. investing in early warning systems
2014/4332/P	Em	5 the grove	04/08/2014 21:35:15	COMMNT	I do not believe there is any evidence to support the need for hideously ugly dams to be built around the ponds. The serious flooding across the country this year showed NO sign of such on the Heath. The destruction of the tranquil beauty peace refuge solace giving PUBLIC amenity should not be damaged/destroyed/removed never to be replaced by this program of totally unnecessary works. Please consider how much will be lost. The Romans feared and respected the Genius Loci "guardian spirit" of a special place and new that it must be protected at all times. This hideous program of building works - more destructive than constructive will drive that spirit away - be it on your own heads all you Camden Council officers. The heath will no longer be that special place saved from developers for the people , it will be known as "Yet another Public amenity wrecked by a few money grubbing ignorant council officers and developers waiting for their back-handers. Be a hero - STOP this project and the spirit of the Heath will stay. I am a professional photographer who has been photographing the Heath particularly the beauty of the ponds. My photographs are going to be worth a lot of money if you allow this destruction. You are going to destroy for EVER the beauty of what people come from all over the world to love and cherish the memory of. We will only have photographs and memories. .

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	David Lake	9 Southside 32 Carleton Rd Carleton Road N7 0QH	02/08/2014 17:20:36	COMMNT	This is unnecessary from a safety point of view, a huge waste of money and will ruin the view.
2014/4332/P	Kate Atchley	#3 26 Parliament Hill London NW3 2TN	02/08/2014 10:34:56	COMMNT	I have lived near the ponds for more than 30 years and, although climate is becoming more erratic, I believe this plan is a gross over-reaction and there is insufficient evidence to support these major, disruptive and disfiguring work. Please reject the application.
2014/4332/P	Ken and Polly Gaw	54 Cromwell Avenue London N6 5HL	04/08/2014 17:04:31	INT	<p>As regular users of the Heath and of the Bathing Ponds, we strongly object to the proposal - Application 2014/4332?P for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is, we understand, as yet, not definitively proven that the works are necessary. (There appear to be several opposing views from experts) And it would be a catastrophe, should the proposal be based on unproven facts and goes ahead. Surely, caution is best. 2. Should the works go ahead, the wildlife and flora of the area will be irreversibly damaged. These invaluable resources must be maintained. The felling of an estimated 160 trees is totally unacceptable. 3. The Bathing Ponds are unique and enjoyed by a great many - a national treasure! And must be retained. 4. The entire proposal is completely out of scale and at odds with what the Heath represents. <p>In sum, we oppose Planning Application 2014/4332/P and we urge Camden Council to reject the application.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Chris Moore	16 Nassington road London NW3 2UD	05/08/2014 19:29:11	COMMNT	<p>In my opinion the proposed changes smack of excessive caution.No doubt some advice has been received suggesting that there is some risk of a flood if no remedial action is taken.Leaving aside that any risk of death.personal injury or property damage caused by flash flooding is likely to be caused by inadequate Victorian drainage systems rather than overflow from one or more of the ponds, I have yet to meet a Professional of any discipline who will advise that any particular course of action is risk free.That is human nature and arises because any professional has to watch his own back and potential professional liability.</p> <p>Because there will always be some risk, the extent of the identified risk therefore needs to be assessed .No flooding from any of the ponds ponds occurred following the exceptional and torrential rains during the winter and spring of 2013/4.In fact there has only been one recorded instance of flooding damage to property - and this could have been alleviated by improvements to the mains drainage system which is quite separate from the water level in the ponds.</p> <p>I therefore object to the proposals and consider that a mature and proportionate response should be given to what has been described as a 1:400,000 year risk .These proposals are not mature or proportionate and give the impression that those responsible for introducing the proposals are only concerned that they should be beyond personal criticism and that "We have to do it".This opinion is not shared universally and there seems no good reason why there should not be a joint application for judicial review of these proposals so that there can be an independent assessment of the extent of the risk posed by the Hampsteand and Highgate ponds.</p>
2014/4332/P	Colette	23 Hartland Road nw6 6BG 23 Hartland Road	02/08/2014 17:41:50	OBJ	<p>This is a futile project which will damage the Heath for no good reason at all. It makes no sense and is at the public's expense. Nobody in the neighbourhood wants this.</p> <p>This application must be stopped in its tracks. It is bad for the environment, bad for the community and will leave its ugly mark forever. Do not let this happen.</p>
2014/4332/P	Bergmann	287 Caledonian Road N11EG London	05/08/2014 20:04:29	COMMNT	<p>I'm against the planning application if you want to damage or destroy our Hampstead woman pond. I can find peace and relaxation after hard work.</p>
2014/4332/P	James Cartwright	39 Coolhurst Road N8 8ET	05/08/2014 16:07:35	OBJ	<p>I am firmly of the opinion that in view of the limited risks posited for instigating these works and the long term natural damage that such works would cause the council should reject this application. The disturbance to the environment and peoples right to quietly enjoy the heath caused by the proposed works would be a singularly heavy handed means to a speculative end.</p>
2014/4332/P	Rohat Cellali-Sik	15 B Mortimer Terrace London NW5 1LH	01/08/2014 17:05:21	OBJ	<p>I object to the proposed engineering works of the Hampstead heath ponds.</p> <p>How could such a plan be even thought of. Leave the park alone.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Judy Townley	3 North Square London NW11 7AA	05/08/2014 16:19:31	OBJ	<p>I have carefully examined all of the available information and wish to object to the application on the grounds that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The works are not proven to be necessary. 2) The changes to the appearance of the Heath will be detrimental. 3) The construction period will cause unnecessary disturbance to Heath users for a long period of time. <p>I therefore urge you to refuse the application.</p> <p>Judy Townley</p>
2014/4332/P	Richard Townley	3 North Square London NW11 7AA	05/08/2014 16:18:16	OBJ	<p>I have carefully examined all of the available information and wish to object to the application on the grounds that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The works are not proven to be necessary. 2) The changes to the appearance of the Heath will be detrimental. 3) The construction period will cause unnecessary disturbance to Heath users for a long period of time. <p>I therefore urge you to refuse the application.</p> <p>Richard Townley BSc FRICS Chair - Central Square Residentis Asociation</p>
2014/4332/P	Eve Rogans	62 Lady Somerset Road NW5 1TU	04/08/2014 08:15:17	COMMNT	<p>I object to this planning application. The works are disproportionate to the risk and the disruption to the heath over the next 2 years would be intolerable.</p>
2014/4332/P	Colette	23 Hartland Road nw6 6BG 23 Hartland Road	02/08/2014 17:41:28	OBJ	<p>This is a futile project which will damage the Heath for no good reason at all. It makes no sense and is at the public's expense. Nobody in the neighbourhood wants this.</p> <p>This application must be stopped in its tracks. It is bad for the environment, bad for the community and will leave its ugly mark forever. Do not let this happen.</p>
2014/4332/P	Elizabeth Stanley	7 Berkley Grove London Nw1 8xy	02/08/2014 16:18:20	OBJ	<p>There was no flooding even in last years heavy rain. The extent of the proposed changes seem extreme and to take an unrealistic and overly pessimistic view of the danger of flooding. I would like to see alternative studies / views taken from other experts to both assess the true level of risk and to consider more enviornmentally sensitive alternatives that will maintain the local habitat much better. The ponds are a London treasure that should not be capable of being deminished in this way by beaurocracy.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Nicole Usigli	27 Pritchard Court Aspern Grove London NW3 2AF	02/08/2014 15:55:18	OBJ	<p>I object to this project for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) LEGALITY: - No legal requirement exists for works on this massive scale under Reservoirs Act 1975.</p> <p>2) UNREALISTIC MODELING: - Plan based on a 1 to 400,000 year probability of an exceptional storm; - assumes non-existence of warning or emergency services.</p> <p>3) DISFIGUREMENT OF HEATH LANDSCAPE: - Unnatural huge earthworks and excavations at Catchpit and Model Boating Pond; - concrete walls at Men's Bathing Pond and Highgate No. 1 Pond.</p> <p>4) TREE LOSS: - over 160 trees would be felled; - large tree loss at Stock Pond to create giant spillway.</p> <p>5) CLOSURE AND DISRUPTION: - 2 years of work requiring parts of the Heath to be closed; - closure of the bathing ponds ; - huge building site, heavy engineering plant, thousands of HGV movements.</p> <p>6) DAMAGE TO WILDLIFE: - Disruption over 2 years, dust, noise, loss of habitat, loss of trees, unnatural enclosures.</p>
2014/4332/P	Robert Giles	2 Priory Avenue	05/08/2014 14:08:20	OBJ	I wish to object to these proposals. They are deeply disfiguring to the natural beauty of the heath and quite unnecessary. The purpose of the Heath and ponds is that they should remain, as far as possible in a natural and unreconstructed state.
2014/4332/P	Matthew Wells	39 Arbour Square E1 0PP	05/08/2014 14:00:11	OBJ	I object to the proposals on the basis that the actions would result in the closure of the ponds for a prolonged period of time. I understand there are alternative measures that do not require heavy construction and feel these should be explored as a first choice. London needs its common spaces.
2014/4332/P	Anne Fleissig	23 Beacon Hill London N7 9LY	05/08/2014 12:40:48	COMMNT	The risks calculated by computer modelling seem extremely unlikely and in any case the proposed damns would not stop all flooding in every eventuality. The scheme is a waste of scarce funds. The current views of the ponds and landscape are unique and contribute to my quality of life and well being every time I walk around the heath.
2014/4332/P	Fiona Grant	21 Grasmere Road London N10 2DH	02/08/2014 11:14:29	COMMNT	I vehemently oppose this application, which will cause major unnecessary and lasting disruption on the Heath. It cannot be right to plan for a once in 400000 year storm at the expense of an important public amenity. Hampstead Heath is a vital green lung for North London. This invasive project is both unnecessary and unacceptable.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Lucinda Meade	46 Voltaire Road London SW4 6DL	03/08/2014 19:37:17	OBJ	My understanding is that this level of work is unnecessary and will lead to disruption, closure and disfiguration of the bathing ponds. There are better, cheaper and less invasive ways of protecting the area that have been put forward by enviromental campaigners.
2014/4332/P	Irene bard	33 Platts lane	03/08/2014 19:09:00	OBJ	I am writing to object in the strongest terms to the planning application for the Heath ponds. Expert opinion would suggest that the odds of a catastrophic event are very low and far too low to justify the closure and potential destruction of Heath amenity and habitats, not to mention the waste of valuable public funds. Please block the progress of this application.
2014/4332/P	Irene bard	33 Platts lane	03/08/2014 19:08:38	OBJ	
2014/4332/P	Virginia Southon	22 Well Road	01/08/2014 17:45:56	OBJ	I object to proposed works due to following -devastation and permanent disfiguring of a unique and beautiful historical landmark,which should be preserved in its natural state. -the felling of trees and damage to wildlife habitats. -construction work traffic,machinery and noise over a long period of time. -the closure of the ponds and popular areas of the heath that we use on a daily basis. -we have lived in Hampstead for over 20 years and have seen this conservation area slowly eroded due to the inability of Camden council to enforce its regulations to protect against overdevelopment. Now we have the City of London stepping in to radically change an area of natural beauty for the worse at a ridiculous cost against the wishes of the majority who actually live near the heath.I want to be able to walk with my children and grandchildren in the future on a heath with views that are not obliterated by massive dams,concrete walls,giant spillways. Please say no to this application.
2014/4332/P	VANESSA EASLEA	5 tHORNHILL GROVE ISLINGTON	02/08/2014 15:53:36	PETITNOBJ E	I am deeply opposed to this dams, concrete walls, giant spillways. This would all devastate engineering work on the Heath. Massive such a unique and wonderful environment for people who use the heath and the wildlife. The risks outlined are far fetched and unlikely to occur.
2014/4332/P	chris gollop	6 Brownlow Court Lyttelton Road Hampstead Garden Suburb London N2 0EA	02/08/2014 12:40:09	INT	There seem to be significant issues with the original report and enough conflict of interest to send this for review. Personally I am concerned that the proposal seems over engineered with very high dams and destruction of mature woodland. These are ponds not lakes.
2014/4332/P	David Rosen	Apartment 16 12 Pond St London NW3 2PS	01/08/2014 15:37:13	OBJ	I have read the arguments for and against this work. I believe that the work will cause massive disruption and long-term disfigurement of the Heath. It seems to me that the flooding risks downstream of the ponds are minimal, and the proposed work will do very little to change those risks.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Peter Cuming	50-56 Talacre Road NW5 4LX	06/08/2014 11:14:15	INT	In my view, the proposals, if implemented, would harm unacceptably the character and appearance of the relevant parts of Hampstead Heath, contrary to policy and the intentions of the Act. Having swum daily for a decade in the Mens Pond I have ample time to understand the local landscape and deplore the excessive and inessential civil engineering proposals. I have built a UK reservoir entirely without concrete. When the appeal is announced, I wish to attend and be heard.
2014/4332/P	Peter Cuming	50-56 Talacre Road NW5 4LX	06/08/2014 11:14:17	INT	
2014/4332/P	Colin Platt	19 Park Avenue	04/08/2014 18:44:54	OBJ	I would like to oppose these plans on the basis that they will ruin a much loved part of the heath for no real reason. As the city admits building these new dams will not stop flooding from future storms. The computer modelling for this proposal is based on a 1 in 400,000 year worst case flood scenario. In the ponds 300 year history, and despite the recent flooding across many parts of the UK, there has been no escape of water from the Hampstead Ponds. Not only is this work unnecessary, but it will seal off large parts of the heath for up to 2 years, lead to the felling of at least 160 trees and cost £17 million pounds. I would much rather see a fraction of that money spent on improving the facilities at the bathing ponds than be excluded from swimming for two years while I watch London's finest open space hacked apart on the basis of bad science and spurious computer projections.
2014/4332/P	Jamie Cusworth	24 Lady Somerset Road	04/08/2014 14:31:10	PETITNOBJ E	This does not sound like necessary improvement works, it sounds like it will permanently damage the Heath and spoil its character.
2014/4332/P	Robert Lloyd	57 Cholmeley Crescent	06/08/2014 12:20:53	COMMNT	The proposals contain no guarantees that the unique and highly precious quality of Hampstead Heath will be properly respected. Therefore they must be opposed. The Heath is one of the greatest urban treasures in the Western World. Necessary work must be done with maximum discretion and until we have reassurances that work will be discreet and incremental no local residents will be able to support such radical changes.
2014/4332/P	Robert Lloyd	57 Cholmeley Crescent	06/08/2014 12:20:53	COMMNT	
2014/4332/P	Robert Lloyd	57 Cholmeley Crescent	06/08/2014 12:20:31	COMMNT	
2014/4332/P	Peter Cuming	50-56 Talacre Road NW5 4LX	06/08/2014 11:14:14	INT	In my view, the proposals, if implemented, would harm unacceptably the character and appearance of the relevant parts of Hampstead Heath, contrary to policy and the intentions of the Act. Having swum daily for a decade in the Mens Pond I have ample time to understand the local landscape and deplore the excessive and inessential civil engineering proposals. I have built a UK reservoir entirely without concrete. When the appeal is announced, I wish to attend and be heard.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Peter Cuming	50-56 Talacre Road NW5 4LX	06/08/2014 11:13:53	INT	In my view, the proposals, if implemented, would harm unacceptably the character and appearance of the relevant parts of Hampstead Heath, contrary to policy and the intentions of the Act. Having swum daily for a decade in the Mens Pond I have ample time to understand the local landscape and deplore the excessive and inessential civil engineering proposals. I have built a UK reservoir entirely without concrete. When the appeal is announced, I wish to attend and be heard.
2014/4332/P	Bronwen Jackson	15 Talbot Road Highgate N6 4QS	04/08/2014 15:20:52	COMMNT	I object to the proposed engineering works for the ponds on Hampstead Heath (as detailed above) and support The Heath and Hampstead Society's opposition to it. My daughter and I frequently use the Ladies' pond in the summer and my sons often fish and have picnics by the boating pond. I am not convinced that the proposed dams would be effective in preventing any flooding from storms and the disruption and environmental devastation from their construction would be very harmful to the community. Yours sincerely, Bronwen Jackson.
2014/4332/P	Sylvia Finzi	4 Cliff Road NW1 9AJ	04/08/2014 14:43:07	OBJ	I am opposed to this plan. The proposals do not offer the best protection against the stated dangers, would be very expensive, and would temporarily disrupt, and permanently scar, the unique facilities that Hampstead Heath offers.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Mary Hogan	140 (b) Nelson Road London N8 9RN	03/08/2014 22:08:05	COMMNT	<p>Thank you for this opportunity to speak out. I urge you please to reject the City of London's Planning Application: number 2014/4332/P.</p> <p>I attended the public meeting you arranged on the subject early in June which was very helpful in understanding all the issues, and well-chaired in difficult circumstances.</p> <p>I went away completely unconvinced that the works the City of London is proposing are in any way necessary. I understand, however, that in making objection to the application, the relevant points are those specified in planning regulations. Therefore I wish to stress the following points:</p> <p>1.Hampstead Heath is a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation. The proposed works would severely affect, in horrifying scale, the character of this protected area. Countless wild plants and insects, as well as birds, small mammals, amphibians and reptiles would be disrupted and removed were the proposed works to go ahead. Whole habitats would be destroyed, food chains disrupted and soil compacted, with consequent loss of bio-diversity. The presence of these habitats and variety of species are of huge benefit to people. They are what make the Heath a healthy, beautiful, inspiring place for all who spend time there, for walking, swimming, relaxation, sports, family fun or conversation.</p> <p>2.The appearance of Hampstead Heath would also be adversely affected. The visual impact would be devastating. To give just a few examples from the proposals: the overbearing 8 foot high dam on the Boating Pond, the loss of scores of trees, the concrete wall by the Men's Pond, the huge earthwork to obliterate the Catchpit Valley. The Heath would appear ugly and industrialised, its wild and natural appearance removed forever.</p> <p>3.This would also be contrary to the Hampstead Heath Act 1871 which requires the Heath to be preserved in its 'natural state and aspect'.</p> <p>While I am making this objection on my own behalf as a regular user of the Heath, I work on the staff of The Conservation Volunteers. I am therefore more aware than many people that both Camden Council and the Corporation of London have previously carried out some excellent green space work in the Borough and on the Heath. I also know that nationally and internationally, bio-diversity is massively important. It underpins the support systems on which we all depend. The City's motives in making this application are obscure, and the power of refusal lies in your hands. Camden Council, please take a stand here.</p>
2014/4332/P	Misbah Arif	11 Cotswold Gate London NW2 1QS	03/08/2014 20:17:19	OBJ	<p>I object to this planned engineering works as I understand from my reading that the proposed works are not necessary for flood protection, and actually will not be effective. There will be the loss and irreversible damage to wildlife and green spaces, which are rare in London and need to be persevered and protected effectively. As well as effecting Camden residents this effects residents of neighbouring boroughs who also enjoy the healthy spaces on the Heath like the ponds.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Peter Davey	17a Pond Street London NW3 2PN	05/08/2014 20:26:07	OBJ	I wish to object to the City of London's proposals. I have lived next to the Heath and Parliament Hill for 35 years and been a regular swimmer at the ponds throughout that time. The proposals are an entirely inappropriate response to a hypothetical risk that has been massively exaggerated. The works would completely ruin the 'country' nature of the heath and make the ponds look like dam projects. It is totally inappropriate to suggest sacrificing such a much-loved amenity as a solution to other potential risks downstream. Concerns about flooding in Gospel Oak would be better addressed by ensuring the drains are adequate to carry away surface water, perhaps in combination with other alternative long term policies (such as stopping concreting over gardens etc). The stewardship of the heath as 'heath-land', for future generations to enjoy, should be an over-riding principal objective for all the parties involved.
2014/4332/P	Ann Wiggins	20 BARRINGTON ROAD	04/08/2014 13:28:00	COMMNT	Very worried about the environmental impact of heavy duty lorries on the Heath and the two year work which will cause enormous disruption to Heath users, to the environment, and to the wildlife. Is there not a simpler, less intrusive way that things could be managed?
2014/4332/P	robert tyndall smart	27 highgate west hill n6 6np	04/08/2014 13:26:26	OBJ	<p>In addition to the comments previously submitted by me, it is self evident that the development details of which are given below (for which planning permission has now been granted) will be carried out concurrently if the Ponds project goes ahead. The construction traffic and disruption which this development generates close to/coinciding with the proposed Dams project traffic/disruption will materially aggravate every single one of the Ponds project objections already made.</p> <p>Planning Application - 2013/6674/P</p> <p>Site Address 1-11A Swain's Lane & 109-110 Highgate West Hill London N6 6QX</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Naomi	97 Tufnell Park Road London N70PS	06/08/2014 08:19:10	OBJ	<p>The proposal to remodel the ponds on Hampstead heath for the purpose of a extremely unlikely 1:400,000 chance of a probable maximum flood is a shocking waste of £17m in the current economic climate. Apart from the economics, I object for many, many reasons: There is no legal requirement to build the dams, which even the City of London admits will not guarantee the elimination of the threat of flooding. Flooding from sewers is more likely to cause damage to property than from the current ponds being breached. Having just had wettest winter on record there have been no ill-effects to the ponds which have never collapsed nor caused any major flooding in their 300 years' existence The devastation that the heath and its users will endure for over 2 years in order to create the dams and other measures is already creating stress and upset before works have even started. Heavy plant machinery over this period will compact the ground and actually increase the potential for flood risk. There will be a permanent disfiguring of the Heath that the City of London is required under the Hampstead heath act of 1871 to preserve in its natural state and aspect. Wildlife will be massively affected, especially the birdlife around the ponds. Moreover, the importance of benefits of the heath to the health and wellbeing of London's crowded and stressed population can not be underestimated. For me particularly, the ladies pond is a lifeline; that makes me cope with my depression and stress and engage in cardio activity in an environment that fills me with elation. Should these plans go ahead, it will be closed for over 7 months with no women only swimming facilities being provided in the meantime and we will lose the unmeasurable benefits of using that amenity. I know that my mental and physical health will be affected by this, and I am not alone to feel this. The design for the remodelled changing room block - I am not aware that any of the users of the pond have asked for this, so it feels like the City is applying to do yet more unrequired/unwelcome building - has been poorly thought out with regards entrance from her and exit from the lifeguard block.</p> <p>I urge you to reject this application that has been presented regardless of the results of the City's own limited consultation exercise, where in the absence of the option of being able to say whether we, the public and heath users wanted the plans to go ahead, two thirds of respondents expressed dissatisfaction with all of the dam proposals.</p>
2014/4332/P	Naomi Jacobs	55a Sunny Gardens Road London NW4 1SJ	04/08/2014 16:32:46	PETITNSU PP	This will have a major negative effect on the local community that uses the heath and the swimming ponds. I am devastated to hear that my access to the swimming ponds and heath is going to be restricted, and for work that is not at all necessary. Attending planning meetings on the subject has led to our views being ignored and patronised. It is time for Camden Council to listen to us, the ordinary people who use the heath.
2014/4332/P	Renata	24 Milborne House Cresset Road London	03/08/2014 22:05:45	PETITNSU PP	I've been going to Hampstead ponds since 1998. They keep me in touch with the nature, keep me spiritually and physically well. The ponds are huge positive part of my (and other peoples) existence on Earth. They literally mean my life to me. There must be other places to build massive dams.
2014/4332/P	Sue Nove	54 Falkland Road Kentish Town NW5 2XA	03/08/2014 21:43:16	OBJ	I wish to object to this planning which is based on unrealistic computer modelling that assumes collapse of all the existing dams, no warning and no emergency services and the very worst kind of storms ever possible happening which may happen every 400,000 years. The delicate and beautiful nature and trees in this area, offer a home to very precious ecosystem which must be preserved and allowed to flourish and be UNDISTURBED, which is the huge attraction and value of the existing area.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	laurence bard	33 platts lane london nw3 7nn	03/08/2014 18:56:29	OBJ	This application should be refused. It is wholly unnecessary, a waste of public money, and damaging to the Heath, particularly in the long term.
2014/4332/P	robert tyndall smart	27 highgate west hill n6 6np	04/08/2014 13:26:26	OBJ	<p>In addition to the comments previously submitted by me, it is self evident that the development details of which are given below (for which planning permission has now been granted) will be carried out concurrently if the Ponds project goes ahead. The construction traffic and disruption which this development generates close to/coinciding with the proposed Dams project traffic/disruption will materially aggravate every single one of the Ponds project objections already made.</p> <p>Planning Application - 2013/6674/P</p> <p>Site Address1-11A Swain's Lane & 109-110 Highgate West Hill London N6 6QX</p>
2014/4332/P	robert tyndall smart	27 highgate west hill n6 6np	04/08/2014 13:26:04	OBJ	
2014/4332/P	keith brainin	41 Grasmere rd london n10 2dh	04/08/2014 13:21:51	OBJ	I strenuously object to these plans as they are patently over engineered for the issue at hand, will disfigure the heath and serve no real purpose - given that the eventuality that are designed for has never happened
2014/4332/P	Andrew Marks	7 Eton Road London NW3 4SS NW3 4SS	04/08/2014 13:21:32	COMMNT	<p>Dear Madam, Sir</p> <p>I would like to register my very strong objection to these proposed works on Hampstead Heath.</p> <p>In my view the works are completely unnecessary, and they would seriously adversely affect the Heath.</p> <p>Regards Andrew Marks (regular Heath user for decades)</p>
2014/4332/P	Lucinda Langford	14 Langbourne Avenue	07/08/2014 08:56:38	COMMNT	I am NOT in favour of such extensive and expensive works based on a once in 400,000 year prediction. The damage to the heath and the disruption to swimming is totally disproportionate. This is a gross waste of public money that could be better spent on social housing, schooling and health care. It helps the construction industry but no-one else. Modest improvements to existing dams and investment in early warning signals seem far more sensible precautionary measures. Regular heath users and Ladies pond swimmers will be mentally scarred by this outrageous construction should it go ahead. Please see sense and stop it.
2014/4332/P	laurence bard	33 platts lane london nw3 7nn	03/08/2014 18:56:07	OBJ	This application should be refused. It is wholly unnecessary, a waste of public money, and damaging to the Heath, particularly in the long term.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Cllr Maeve McCormack	c/o Town Hall	05/08/2014 23:00:26	COMM	<p>I am writing to support this application. For many years residents of Gospel Oak ward, particularly (but not exclusively) those in Oak Village, Julia Street and Elaine Grove, have been extremely concerned at the risk of potential flooding from the Hampstead Heath ponds. This fear was of course realised in the 1970s when the roads in the Mansfield Road area were severely flooded.</p> <p>I welcome this application from the City of London Corporation and believe it addresses many of the concerns which were raised by local residents at our area action group when we discussed the risk of flooding last summer.</p> <p>Further, I believe it complies with Camden's Core Strategy, Development Policy 23, and will provide increased protection against flooding for much of our community and other downstream communities in certain circumstances.</p> <p>I have been contacted by seven residents urging support for this application and no residents have contacted me opposing it. I would urge the overwhelming evidence and support for this proposal to be taken into account by this committee.</p>
2014/4332/P	dinah Gallop	15 Oak Village London NW5 4QP	04/08/2014 16:10:20	SUPPRT	I strongly support this application and associated ones as I believe it will offer some protection from the floods which hit this house in the 1970s. As far as I can see it complies with Core Strategy DP 23.
2014/4332/P	D Prowse	59 Ripplevale Grove N11HS	04/08/2014 13:31:17	COMMNT	Massive over-reaction and waste of money that will spoil the present Heath because of doubtful future risk. If there is £17m available, there are far better things to spend it on.
2014/4332/P	Catherine Adeyeye	18 Cholderton salisbury	04/08/2014 13:30:12	OBJ	This is going to have huge impact on the lungs and 'eyes' of London, dont marr this picture perfect place that I love now as I've always done
2014/4332/P	Catherine Adeyeye	18 Cholderton salisbury	04/08/2014 13:30:02	OBJ	
2014/4332/P	Jennifer Jackson	7 Camden Place Bourne End Buckinghamshire SL8 5W	04/08/2014 13:29:59	OBJ	<p>I do not consider the proposed works merit the disturbance to the wildlife and the geography of the Heath.</p> <p>I understand that the perceived risk of flooding to property lower down the area is nowhere near as great as has been portrayed.</p> <p>The disruption to the use of the bathing ponds would not be justified.</p>
2014/4332/P	Jennifer Jackson	7 Camden Place Bourne End Buckinghamshire SL8 5W	04/08/2014 13:29:47	OBJ	

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Paula king	16 westerham Bayham st Camden Nw10ju	01/08/2014 16:05:53	COMMNT	I am heart broken that they might disturb anything for the wildlife and people that use the ponds .i believe this untouched special environment is vital for all the North London people that need a sanctuary . I don't believe it is necessary to alter anything that gives respite to people especially because it is. Vital for the physical and mental wellbeing of many who would otherwise suffer greatly without this recourse . Therefore this saves actually saves the council money in the long term
2014/4332/P	R A Loren	30 VALLANCE ROAD LONDON N22 7UB	01/08/2014 16:03:31	COMMNT	<p>It looks to me as if Atkins have given their clients the answer to how can they be absolutely certain that no flooding will ever occur due to the ponds. The answer, of course, is to vastly over-engineer the defences.</p> <p>No attempt seems to have been made to carry out an objective evaluation of the existing system and its real probability of failure.</p> <p>I guess none of the above are, strictly speaking, planning issues but affect the final decision.</p> <p>So a major objection is the adverse impact on the surroundings. Instead of the current gentle interventions to form the ponds, we are now being faced with far more major engineering works with all that implies for the natural surroundings of the fields and heath.</p>
2014/4332/P	Richard Alwyn	19 Wood Vale	06/08/2014 12:23:13	OBJ	<p>I write to object to the proposed plans regarding the dam works on Hampstead Heath. These plans are disproportionate to the risk that has been identified - namely, a 1 in 400,000 year flood of Biblical proportion. In recent years, when rainfall has been exceptional, there has not been a single incident of flooding and the proposed measures far outweigh any potential, reasonably identified dangers. The Heath is an essential space for the health of its many visitors - its neighbours are a lucky minority but it draws people from far and wide and is vital to their physical and mental well-being. To disrupt the use of the Heath and above all to so radically alter its landscape, all for a significant cost - £15 million - cannot be justified by a prediction concerning a 1 in 400,000 year chance (and neglecting how that 1 in 400,000 chance would, in any event, unfold). The Hampstead Heath Act of 1871 exists to protect the Heath. The Reservoirs Act 1975 exists to protect people from the potential failing of a reservoir. In this case, the Heath Act is being ignored entirely in favour of the Reservoirs Act which is being pursued in a disproportionate manner. If the City is obliged to respect the advice of its engineer, then it is also obliged to act within the Hampstead Heath Act and, together with its engineer, should seek a reasonable solution to a more reasonably determined risk. I urge the City of London, who have looked after the Heath so well since 1989, to think again about the advice that it is getting from its engineer and not to go down in history as the custodians of the Heath who failed to protect it from the profiteering of an engineering proposal that destroyed one of the most valued and prized features of the London landscape.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Jennifer Blain	189 Mount View Road	02/08/2014 13:21:16	OBJ	<p>I oppose this application on the grounds that it is overbearing, out of character and will have an adverse effect on the character of the neighbourhood. The heath is a treasured and valuable area of landscape in a continually expanding city which already puts huge pressures on its open spaces.</p> <p>A heavy-handed 'engineering' solution will have an adverse effect on both the biodiversity and character of the heath. This brutal project will directly affect current and future users of the heath and local residents.</p> <p>It will also alter the perceptions of ALL Londoners and visitors who currently think of London as a great capital city that cherishes its green spaces as well as its built environment and cultural assets.</p>
2014/4332/P	John Wilkinson	95 Parliament Hill Mansions Lissenden Gardens London NW5 1NB	02/08/2014 09:59:04	OBJ	<p>As a regular user of the Hampstead and Highgate model boating pond, I wish to register my objection to the proposed works on the chain of ponds. These works, which I understand independent experts consider excessive and unnecessary, will disfigure the present landscape, reduce the number of trees and cause major disruption for a sustained period of time. Moreover the model boating pond is likely to be unavailable to me and other modellers throughout the works. I understand, from the information available, that more conservative measures would provide as good or better protection from the risk of flooding as well as fulfilling the City of London Corporation's obligations towards households downstream of the pond chain. I trust the council will consider these issues and reject the proposed works in their present form.</p>
2014/4332/P	annie sherburne	138 columbia road E2 7RG	05/08/2014 08:09:41	COMNOT	<p>The heath is a unique place that has remained undisturbed for hundreds of years, this cannot go ahead, messing around with waterways will completely change the nature of the heath and all the tributaries, springs and resultant streams and ponds and watercourses, and the plants that these water courses nurture and support. There are few places that are so perfect. If it isn't broke, don't fix it. NO to this it is vandalism.</p>
2014/4332/P	annie sherburne	138 columbia road E2 7RG	05/08/2014 08:09:19	COMNOT	
2014/4332/P	Juliet Singer	42 Laurier Rd	04/08/2014 14:54:09	OBJ	<p>I see no real reason why this dam needs to be built. It will cost so much money and spoil the Heath for many people not to mention the wildlife that will be affected. The evidence says it will not stop future flooding.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Jason Gormley	7 Wesleyan Place	01/08/2014 17:45:29	OBJ	<p>Hello. I live in Dartmouth Park in the area allegedly at risk. If Camden Council approves this application, will they then hold themselves to the same 1 in 400,000 year standards that the City are using to justify the scale of their proposed works? Camden Council obviously has a duty to protect householders and as I understand it, the floods in Gospel Oak/Dartmouth Park in the 1970's were caused by inadequate drainage - which I believe is a responsibility of Thames Water and Camden Council. I understand work has since been done to help prevent potential drainage problems, however with the increase in extreme weather conditions I am keen to hear what Camden Council and Thames Water have planned for the Fleet River and drainage in this area to bring it up 21st century standards - the Fleet River and drains are what will cause problems long before any of the Heath Ponds. If the City is genuinely concerned about potential loss of human life, I believe they should work together with Camden Council to implement an early warning system to safeguard people - much like those employed in the United States (especially along the Eastern Seaboard) where they have excellent precautions in place to warn people of extreme weather events - precautions we could copy and implement right here in North London. Rather than excessive and incredibly disruptive works on the Heath, money would be better spent put towards practical measures like this that will actually save human lives.</p>
2014/4332/P	Katharine Talbot	Flat 25 Ronann Apartments 26 Orsman Road London N1 5QJ	05/08/2014 20:28:05	OBJ	<p>I am very concerned about the proposed engineering works to the ponds on Hampstead heath. This is for several reasons:</p> <p>The estimated two year construction period would see massive disruption to the heath - ruining what is a vastly important area of natural beauty in the capital, and used by thousands of people every year, both Londoners and visitors. This disruption could also have major and long term impacts on wildlife on the heath, whose natural patterns would be disrupted and may well not return to the heath afterwards.</p> <p>The loss of 160 trees is appalling, in such a beautiful green space.</p> <p>The proposed dams would permanently disfigure the heath, changing its natural appearance forever.</p> <p>The rationale for building these dams is unreliable. The flood risk is minute, and in the 300 years of the ponds existence no flooding has ever taken place. This is particularly relevant given we have just had the wettest winter on record. In addition this plan takes no account of other water bodies who should be planning for flooding, water companies in particular.</p> <p>Lastly, the huge costs of this project surely cannot be justified, especially in 'an age of austerity' where the money could surely be better spent elsewhere.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	R Foster	Flat 51 Moreland Court Finchley Road NW2 2PL	05/08/2014 15:58:45	PETITNOBJ E	<p>The City of London's proposed dam works on Hampstead Heath will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Permanently disfigure the Heath• Not eliminate the risk of downstream flooding or loss of life which the City of London claims these proposals will address <p>I call on Camden Council to reject the City of London's Planning Application.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Joanne O'Brien	2 Wesleyan Place Highgate Road NW51LG	01/08/2014 16:41:06	OBJNOT	<p>I am writing to object to the plans to carry out damning works.</p> <p>My objections are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The works are futile and destructive. The City of London authorities have not proved their necessity. We have had heavy rainfall on the Heath in recent years and there has been no flooding of any kind. The existing structures of the ponds are perfectly fit for purpose and the risk of a flood on such a huge scale occurring is virtually non-existent. In the last 300 years we have had no collapse of the ponds' structures or flooding. The reasoning employed by the City of London is extremely misguided, ill-conceived and illogical. 2. The plans are of dubious legality and again the City of London's argument is highly questionable. They invoke the Reservoirs Act of 1975. However, the Act does not require works to be carried out on such a huge scale. 3. The City of London is required under the Hampstead Heath Act of 1871 to preserve it in its "natural state and aspect". These proposed work contravene the Act. The compaction to the soil that would be caused by thousands of HGV movements would actually add to the risk of flooding. 4. Under this plan, over 160 trees would be felled. This would be an atrocious loss of woodland for the local environment with the loss of such a precious natural resource. 4. The destruction and disfigurement of the Heath landscape is a very serious concern for me as a local resident and frequent Heath user. These proposed works would lead to unnecessary damage to local quality of environment. The proposed hideous and massive earthworks which also include a huge concrete wall by the Men's Pond would be a massive intrusion on the landscape, especially when viewed in conjunction with a widespread loss of trees, as mentioned above. 6. The closure of the bathing ponds and the closure of parts of the Heath whilst these works could be carried out over a long period is another very serious concern to me. 7. No consideration of civil contingencies measures e.g. early warning systems or evacuation procedures that Camden Council is required to have in place. <p>Overall, these illogical, futile and destructive plans would be very damaging and disruptive to the local environment and wildlife. As a local resident and frequent user of the Heath, I feel deeply concerned and worried at the prospect of such great loss and destruction to my local environment.</p>
2014/4332/P	Sol	81b hartland road	04/08/2014 22:14:15	OBJ	I oppose to this plan. It will destroy the ponds

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Prof T Baldeweg	38 Summerlee Avenue London N2 9QP	04/08/2014 22:13:59	OBJ	The proposed plans are an excessive and wasteful response to a negligible risk of flooding. The developers had to resort to assuming rainfalls to the area for their calculations on a scale that would have most of London flooded. A more appropriate plan of maintaining the existing dams has not even been considered.
2014/4332/P	Lily Dior	115 Torriano Ave Kentish Town NW5 2RX	04/08/2014 18:50:53	PETITNOBJ E	As a resident of Camden, I am very concerned with the proposal for the dam to be built on the heath. From reading the information on offer, it does not warrant the amount of disfigurement to the existing Heath, the culling of established trees, disruption to the natural habitat and will effect the character of the Ponds and Heath. I am also astounded by the cost to the tax payer when there does not seem to be a valid enough data to support such risk. My friends have been visiting the Ponds (Ladies and Mens and Boating) for 3 generations and have been pleased that so far, the natural beauty of the Heath has been preserved with no unnecessary development (Hampstead Heath Act of 1871). This proposal contravenes this pledge and you need to listen to users of the Heath and local residents. Please reject this unjustified, destructive, colossal expense that will adversely effect many users and the natural environment.
2014/4332/P	Sheila Goncalves	FLAT 3 77 FARLEIGH ROAD N16 7TD	06/08/2014 19:17:06	OBJNOT	I object to this proposal because: - it will have a detrimental visual impact on Hampstead Heath, which is currently enjoyed by thousands of people - It will certainly affect the character of the heath (it will look more like a dam!) - the development is out of scale, disproportionate to the flooding risk in the area. It has been reported that the proposal refers to a one in 400,000 year flood-like event. As far as I am aware, there hasn't been any flooding in the history of the pond to justify the development - the construction will destroy the natural habitats of birds and other animals, as well as trees
2014/4332/P	Markus Golser	29 Downside Crescent London NW3 2AN	01/08/2014 21:04:41	OBJ	I am strongly opposed to the scheme, as it would significantly alter the aspect of Hampstead Heath with no proven tangible benefit. The proposed works are in contravention of the Hampstead Heath Act of 1871 which requires that Hampstead Heath be preserved in its "natural aspect and state".
2014/4332/P	Helena Walters	31 Fairfax Place London NW6 4EJ	05/08/2014 18:12:31	OBJ	I object to the proposed work. It is not necessary, it would damage the environment, and it is an enormous waste of money and resources, that can be used where they are really needed.
2014/4332/P	Diana Lloyd	53 Pitfold Road Lee London SE12 9JB	04/08/2014 19:48:41	OBJ	I totally object to these proposals as they will cause unnecessary damage to the Heath. I cannot see any benefits from the plans.
2014/4332/P	Megan Peat	87 Gaskell Road London N6 4DU	03/08/2014 21:18:47	OBJ	The proposed works are disruptive and threaten the special nature and wildlife of the heath. I question the necessity of the work, as it is based on excessive risk assumptions and doesn't seem to take account of alternative, less disruptive, options.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Amanda Checkley	27 Oakeshott Avenue N6 6NT	03/08/2014 21:14:29	OBJ	The plans would devastate this beautiful and unique natural environment. The risk of flooding is minute and this is therefore a disproportionate intervention.
2014/4332/P	Karen Davies	33 Muswell Hill Place London N10 3RP	03/08/2014 14:07:55	COMMNT	I would like to object to these proposed works, to the fact that they will cost 17million pounds to prevent a flooding event that is highly unlikely, and which will change the nature of the heath and the current ponds forever. I think it is unacceptable to remove perfectly healthy trees, and change the whole aspect and environment for works that are not necessary. I believe there is something suspicious about this work, that someone is set to gain a great deal by proposing works costing 17 million pounds. The heath and the ponds belong to the public and are an essential retreat from the pace of life in London, for our physical and mental health.
2014/4332/P	Serena Davies	97 Leigh Gardens	01/08/2014 16:12:09	OBJ	As a regular user of the Hampstead Heath and the ponds I am writing to object to application 2014/4332/P. The City of London has based its plans on unrealistic computer modelling that assumed: the collapse of all existing dams, no warning and no emergency services and the very worst kind of storm possible - predicted to happen only once in 400,000 years.
2014/4332/P	alex geddes	15 Churchill rd london	03/08/2014 12:33:04	COMMNT	I object, unrealistic computer modelling that assumed: the collapse of all existing dams; no warning and no emergency services and the very worst kind of storm ever possible - predicted to happen only once in 1000 years
2014/4332/P	Eileen Bissell	100 Parliament Hill mansions Lissenden gardens London NW5 1NB	02/08/2014 12:10:13	OBJ	Plans are based on unrealistic computer modelling that assumed: the collapse of all dams; no warning and no emergency services;and the very worst kind of storm possible - predicted to happen only once in 400,000 years
2014/4332/P	Eileen Bissell	100 Parliament Hill mansions Lissenden gardens London NW5 1NB	02/08/2014 12:09:51	OBJ	

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Grzegorz Ksiazek	Solar House Flat 12 37 Station Road N22 6AF London	06/08/2014 09:27:07	OBJ	<p>Application No 2014/4332/P Proposed engineering works to the Hampstead and Highgate chains of ponds. Comments submitted to LB Camden by Highgate resident</p> <p>The City of London has applied to Camden Council for planning permission to carry out work which would substantially change the nature of the Hampstead Heath ponds. There are reasons why the proposed scheme should not be allowed.</p> <p>The significance and value of the ponds</p> <p>The major argument against any change to this landscape has already been made by The City of London Corporation in a published “Statement of Significance” (2009). As custodian, The City listed the Heath’s key features - and explained why they must be conserved. The Statement of Significance (http://bit.ly/1mqLTLR) says: “the Heath has retained its ‘natural’ character and rare sense of ‘ruralness’, a unique find just four miles from the centre of London; a piece of encapsulated countryside in the city. The Heath’s distinctive landscape has become nationally renowned, immortalised in the paintings of Constable and instantly recognised as one of the principal open spaces in London”</p> <p>Regarding The Statement of Significance"s purpose</p> <p>“This Statement sets out what makes the Heath significant and lays down the baseline upon which conservation and management objectives can be developed to ensure that its historic landscape character and component buildings and features are conserved and enhanced for future generations. . . the local and regional importance of the Heath as a public open space is recognised through its designation as Metropolitan Open Land”</p> <p>The City acknowledges that the ponds are a surviving landscape feature forming a vital part of the Heath’s character and heritage:</p> <p>“The Heath landscape is the outcome of changes in ownership and management, both agriculture and landscape design and survival against the pressures of development and industry particularly through the 19th and 20th centuries. The impacts of these phases of the Heath’s history remain evident today illustrated by over 55 principal artefacts, monuments and archaeological sites which together with surviving landscape features, including the remarkable population of veteran trees, ancient hedgerow boundaries and strings of ponds, form a vital part of the Heath’s character and heritage”</p> <p>The City adds that the ponds, as they (still) are, collectively form an essential part of the character of the Heath:</p> <p>“The strings of ponds are a significant hydrological resource and collectively form an essential part of the character of the Heath”. The City notes that: “The ponds are also importantly valued for their visual amenity”</p> <p>The City’s proposed plan for the ponds is inconsistent with everything previously said and done about the Heath. The protected landscape would obviously be radically changed in perpetuity by the plan, with vital features spoilt.</p> <p>The London Plan and other considerations</p> <p>This planning application concerns Metropolitan Open Land. Permission cannot be granted solely by Camden Council. The City planning application requires the concurrence of the Mayor of London and of the Secretary of State.</p> <p>Under Policy 3D.10 of the London Plan, the Mayor and the boroughs “should maintain the protection of Metropolitan Open Land from inappropriate development”. The proposed</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Consultees Addr: Received:

Comment: Response:

development is inappropriate given the existing ponds' importance as vital features of a landscape with unique historic, recreational and nature conservation value.

The Heath also has protection under the Hampstead Heath Act. The City has inherited a duty to maintain "its natural aspect and state being as far as may be preserved". The application contravenes this requirement.

Continued...

...continued

It has not been proved that engineering works are essential. In any case under London Plan 3D.10 "Essential facilities... will only be acceptable where they do not have an adverse impact on the openness of MOL".

The proposals would curtail the openness of the aspects towards and from the ponds.

These vital elements of the Heath's character, which the City accepts are importantly valued for their unique visual amenity, would be lost if the plan goes ahead.

Since fear of flooding lies behind this application, it is worth noting that the London Plan highlights vast swathes of London carrying a hugely greater risk of flooding than the Heath or anywhere else in North London. The London Plan map based on Environment Agency data can be viewed at <http://bit.ly/1qokrqq> . Much of the City appears to be at a far greater risk than anywhere in Camden.

The London-wide regional flood risk appraisal (2009) makes no mention of any risk from the ponds <http://bit.ly/1p5C6PY>. Those parts of London at most risk from flooding are protected by the Barrier said to be designed to withstand up to a one in 1,000 year event. Camden Council's Flood Risk Management strategy <http://bit.ly/1zUkFaJ> says:

"Camden is not at risk from flooding from the sea or rivers. It is primarily at risk from surface water runoff (i.e. rainwater that is on the surface of the ground and has not entered a watercourse, drainage system or public sewer), groundwater or flooding from sewers which have either burst or gone beyond capacity due to heavy rainfall.

While there is no flood risk from rivers or the sea, Camden does have a number of water bodies which pose a very low risk. Work by the City of London Corporation has identified that there is the potential for significant loss of life in the highly unlikely event (0.01% chance/1 in 10,000 year return period) that one of the major dams on either of the chains were to be breached."

Compared to the flood risks accepted by the rest of Greater London, the City's present proposals represent a disproportionate (10x) response. Camden's Flood Risk Management Strategy has already considered the risk of the Heath ponds overtopping and finds that: "The more likely event to take place in the north of the borough is surface water flooding. Because of the steep hills, there is a risk that, in an extreme rainfall event, water will rush down the slope causing significant flooding at the bottom".

To summarise, in these highly unlikely circumstances, significant floods would still result anyway – simply due to the lie of the land.

If the one in ten millennium deluge the City fears does happen, it would not be possible to distinguish (in the subsequent flooding) which waters were arising from surface runoff, which from ground saturation, which from sewer overcapacity, which from plain direct rainfall - and which from pond over-topping. In the circumstances it would not be possible to "blame" the

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

City of London Corporation for ensuing catastrophe. The flood would be an “Act of God” for which no-one could be held responsible.

There is more to be lost than there is to gain. Camden Council should therefore say no to this particular application.

On the Council's own analysis, hill water run-off in general is a more likely problem in North Camden than pond over-topping. If so, could not the £17million be better spent as part of a joint City of London/Camden project to improve flood drainage at the foot of the northern slopes? Would it not make better sense to cope with this and the other more general flood risk problems documented with an improved drainage scheme to serve the streets where it is most needed? Camden's and the City's engineers should be working together to see if a better plan might serve the community.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Shane Rowles	97 Mayfield Road London N8 9LN	06/08/2014 12:41:58	COMNOT	<p>I am objecting in the strongest possible terms to the proposed works on the dams on Hampstead Heath. I have been following the developments with interest for the last three years and all that has been revealed during this time has whole heartedly convinced me that there is no need for these major works which would destroy the heath as we know it.</p> <p>As a weekly heath user for over 30 years – walking, picnicking, woodcraft folk sessions, children’s parties, adult birthday parties, dog walking and swimming - I relish it is a wonderfully unique London space. It has changed imperceptivity over this time and visiting is a delightful way of marking the seasons in all weathers.</p> <p>As a regular all year round user of the ladies pond, it would be devastating to have it out of action and so changed by the proposals.</p> <p>In particular I object to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City of London ignoring its requirement under the Hampstead Heath Act of 1871 to preserve it in its “natural state and aspect”. • The works taking at least 2 years, massive disruption to the Heath. • Permanent disfigurement. Large areas inaccessible during works. • Proposing to fell at least 160 mature trees as part of these works, to keep spillways clear. • Wildlife being disrupted, sensitive environment damaged by traffic and heavy machinery. • Works over 2 year period, requiring use of heavy plant on the Heath. Likely to worsen the soil compaction and increase flood risks. • Works costing £17million, which is money which could be better spent elsewhere. • Failing to consider alternatives e.g. Stephen Myers’ proposals reported in the Camden New Journal on 4 July 2014 (greater use of the Heath’s natural capacity to absorb flood water requiring much smaller modifications to the existing dams). • Basing proposal on risk model of the 1 in 400,000 year “probable maximum flood” and seeking to “virtually eliminate” the risk of dam failure. • Illogical approach and this work is not a requirement of the 1975 Reservoirs Act. • Taking no account of the responsibilities of other bodies like Camden Council and Thames Water to reduce the impact of flooding. • Taking no consideration of civil contingencies measures e.g. early warning systems or evacuation procedures that Camden Council is required to have in place. • Not allowing for other infrastructure which would fail earlier than the proposed dams, and still lead to flooding and deaths e.g. drains and sewers south of the Heath. • Not taking into account that in over 300 years’ existence the ponds on Heath have not collapsed or caused any major flooding. Have just had wettest winter on record with no ill-effects to the ponds. • City of London ignoring the results of its own limited consultation exercise (November 2013 – February 2014) where two thirds of respondents were very dissatisfied with all of the dam proposals. And being given limited options to comment on in first place.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Sondhya Gupta	14 Harvey Road London N8 9PA	04/08/2014 19:00:13	OBJ	<p>The proposed works will permanently disfigure the heat, changing its character and contrary to the 1871 Act. The damage caused by heavy machinery to the natural environment will have massive implications for wildlife that will take many years to recover.</p> <p>Both during these prolonged and invasive works, and as a result of them, the Heath's special aspect - valuable asset to the health and wellbeing of those that use it - will be lost.</p> <p>The risk model to which the plans are based is excessive - a 1 in 400,000 year maximum probable flood and do not take into account other measure that could either fail before these do, or mitigate the risk to life and property. We have recently had an incredibly wet winter and no adverse effect have been observed. The felling of mature trees in order to keep spillways clear could in itself pose a risk to soil stability - has this been considered?</p> <p>Please consider alternatives to this excessive and expensive proposals, which do exist, that would maintain the character of the Heath.</p>
2014/4332/P	Patrick Alwyn	19 Wood Vale	06/08/2014 12:32:23	COMMNT	<p>I write to object to the proposed plans regarding the dam works on Hampstead Heath. These plans are disproportionate to the risk that has been identified - namely, a 1 in 400,000 year flood of Biblical proportion. In recent years, when rainfall has been exceptional, there has not been a single incident of flooding and the proposed measures far outweigh any potential, reasonably identified dangers. The Heath is an essential space for the health of its many visitors - its neighbours are a lucky minority but it draws people from far and wide and is vital to their physical and mental well-being. To disrupt the use of the Heath and above all to so radically alter its landscape, all for a significant cost - £15 million - cannot be justified by a prediction concerning a 1 in 400,000 year chance (and neglecting how that 1 in 400,000 chance would, in any event, unfold). The Hampstead Heath Act of 1871 exists to protect the Heath. The Reservoirs Act 1975 exists to protect people from the potential failing of a reservoir. In this case, the Heath Act is being ignored entirely in favour of the Reservoirs Act which is being pursued in a disproportionate manner. If the City is obliged to respect the advice of its engineer, then it is also obliged to act within the Hampstead Heath Act and, together with its engineer, should seek a reasonable solution to a more reasonably determined risk. I urge the City of London, who have looked after the Heath so well since 1989, to think again about the advice that it is getting from its engineer and not to go down in history as the custodians of the Heath who failed to protect it from the profiteering of an engineering proposal that destroyed one of the most valued and prized features of the London landscape.</p>
2014/4332/P	Tom Alwyn	19 Wood Vale	06/08/2014 12:28:34	OBJ	
2014/4332/P	Joseph Alwyn	19 Wood Vale	06/08/2014 12:31:12	COMMNT	
2014/4332/P	ELIZABETH MEAKINS	19 WOOD VALE	06/08/2014 12:25:14	OBJ	
2014/4332/P	Elena Carofyllakis	95 Redston Road London N8 7HG	04/08/2014 14:23:23	COMMNT	<p>These plans seems too drastic and ill thought out. The disruption and subesequent change to the Heath's landscape goes against the ethos it is meant to be a wild and untouched area of london. I am against the plans</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Sallyanne Sweeney	Flat 11 5 Inverness Street NW1 7HB	04/08/2014 13:52:02	OBJ	I am extremely concerned about these proposals. This would cause massive environmental and social disruption to the Heath, permanently disfiguring the area. I'm very concerned about the potential loss of multiple trees, temporary closure of bathing ponds and believe the high cost of these plans would be better used elsewhere as the reasoning for these works seems completely unnecessary.
2014/4332/P	Louise McCullagh	96 Florence Road London N4 4 DR	04/08/2014 13:48:44	OBJ	I wish to register my objection to the proposed works due the unnecessary disruption and damage to the wildlife and community that populate and use the Heath. The dams will change the nature of the views and facilities and will not stop flooding from storms as you have admitted. There is no legal obligation to build the dams and the computer model that you used presents a 1 in 400,000 year worst flood scenario that presumes total collapse of all pond dams & massive loss of life. Please note that to date there has been no collapse of any dams, no escape of water and no deaths in any storm in the ponds 300 year old history. Building these dams is a waste of natural resources to spoil one of the city's best natural spaces. Please do not do it.
2014/4332/P	Carina Redig de Campos	6 Cherry Tree Road N2 9QL	04/08/2014 13:09:16	OBJ	I have concerns about the level of disruption that would be caused by these works and the length of time these disruptions would be in place. I feel that the natural environment will suffer, as well as the Heath losing visitors due to the noise and the ruined views. Further, I can't help but believe that other areas of the Heath (not under construction and refurbishment) will also suffer due to the need for vehicle and personnel access, diggers and trucks churning up the grass all around as well as digging trenches where intended. Hampstead Heath is a wonderful place to explore and relax, having lived in the area my whole life I have not known the pond system in the heath to present insurmountable problems with flooding and groundwater. I think the length of time this will take, the level of works needed, the money it will cost, surpasses the worth of the completed works. In short, I don't think this needs to be done, and I would much rather it wasn't.
2014/4332/P	Alicia Sufit	43 Ridge Road Haringey London N8 9LJ	04/08/2014 13:15:36	COMMNT	I totally object to the proposed work as unnecessary and destructive. I was born in Hampstead and currently still visit very regularly. Please do not tinker with the present arrangement regarding the ponds. I cannot understand this proposal other than certain parties will profit from it financially. Leave well alone!

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Andy Watts	70b Fleet Road London NW3 2QT	04/08/2014 13:11:59	OBJ	<p>Dear Sir,</p> <p>Having reviewed the planning application for the extension of dams in the Hamspead and Highgate ponds, I would like to register an objection to these proposed works.</p> <p>I fear that the impact of the construction will have an irreparable effect on the pond sites, and the wildlife in the local area.</p> <p>Given that the ponds already have flood safety devices in place, and the proposed works are intended to combat a 1 in 400,000 chance flood, I do not believe that the works and the disruption they will cause are justified.</p> <p>Please shelve this application, until more research can be conducted regarding the likely cost/benefit ratio of this work, taking into special consideration the natural flora and fauna of the area.</p> <p>Many thanks</p> <p>Andy Watts</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Helen Payne	22 Froggnal Lane London NW3 7DT	04/08/2014 10:23:47	OBJ	<p>I live in NW3 and am a regular user of Hampstead Heath. I object on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Legality. After reading and listening to both sides of the argument, I am not persuaded that it is necessary to do the work under the 1975 Reservoirs Act with amendments, and I favour precedence of the 1871 Hampstead heath Act. 2. Tree felling. I am extremely concerned about the number of trees to be felled. Some may be poor specimens, some may not be of particular importance, but it should NEVER be considered desirable to remove trees from their position. Trees are a valuable and increasingly scarce resource; Hampstead Heath might well lose more in future years as a result of disease - massaria, ash dieback, oak processionary moth (even though not currently present, always a risk), other diseases of which the public is not yet aware. In addition, the designated Catchpit Area will have a markedly changed appearance, which cannot be welcomed in comparison to its current "natural" state. Even though the loss of Veteran Trees is limited, the importance is not the parts, but the whole. 3. Appearance of Heath Landscape. I do not like the design of the proposed dams. The current landscape is a bucolic haven only minutes from central London; dams with a municipal appearance, even though much modified from the original models, can only detract from the beauty of Hampstead Heath, which was designated under the Hampstead Heath Act as a place for "quiet enjoyment". Since that date, much emphasis has been placed on its beauty and naturalness. The proposed dams are unnatural. Moreover, in the non-statutory public consultation, the public was presented with only some options. We were therefore steered in particular directions, offered only an "either/or" choice. There was no "leave well alone" option. 4. Unrealistic panic-mongering. Much has been made about the risk of downstream flooding. I can understand that members of the Corporation of the City of London do not want to be personally liable in the event of a flooding catastrophe. However, it does seem ridiculous that this is based on a one in 400,000 year possibility. It cannot be a realistic premise. There is more chance of being run over by a car - whether within the jurisdiction of the City of London or outside it. I am persuaded that it is more important to keep the downstream sewers in good condition, and this cost will be less than the proposed cost of the proposed works on the Heath. Moreover, if we were to experience such a cataclysmic event, London's early flood warning system would have been implemented already, surely? Residents downstream would have been evacuated (as they were on the east coast of England as recently as the end of 2013 & beginning of 2014). I question the modelling undertaken to reach the conclusion that a "real" risk exists, and believe that other entities in the business of providing the UK's infrastructure do not employ such impractical and inoperable measurements of risk. The Quantitative Risk Assessment seems to have been absolute rather than a relative measurement. 5. Disruptive nature of proposed works. Hampstead Heath is a haven for 7 million people every year. Dog walkers, families, sports organisations, runners, cyclists, fishermen, birdwatchers, swimmers, nature lovers, people who just like to go for a walk. Also thousands of tourists. Is it appropriate that these heavy engineering works should disfigure and damage the Heath for an extended period of time? Some areas will never recover, not just the areas where there are new works proposed, such as Catchpit and Stockpond, and the reconstruction of some of the other dams, but also the routes taken by heavy machinery and vehicles on their ways to the designated works areas. Is this pain worth the gain for such a minuscule chance of disaster? Untold distress will be caused by undertaking these works: local people will be very very depressed at the sight of it all, and justifiably angry. When English Heritage felled 26 mature trees earlier in 2014 on Kenwood West Meadow (for which no permission was

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					required), there was uproar. They have not been forgiven for this. If this upset was for 26 trees, imagine the upset for over 160 trees. Please consider the fact that the City of London plans to start the tree removal soon, this autumn, even before approval has been granted, and even before hearing the ruling of the Judicial Review. So these trees may end up having been felled needlessly. Once they have been felled, they will have gone for ever. Consider the public reaction to this. I believe the Corporation of the City of London has gone too far in this application. It is such a shame - they have consistently been respected and admired since they took over the running of the Heath for the way in which they have managed it. They are about to throw away all the goodwill and respect they have worked so hard to earn and deserve.
2014/4332/P	Alison R Noyes	The Watch Tower Dungeness Road Dungeness Kent TN29 9NF	04/08/2014 11:25:46 APP		<p>I lived in West Hampstead for 36 years and used the Ponds throughout that time, before that time and indeed since whenever I return to London.</p> <p>I am at a loss to understand how Camden can be contemplating such an act of devastation. At the very least is the brutal disfigurement of significant parts of Hampstead Heath. Huge earthworks and excavations at the Catch Pit and Model Boating Pond! Concrete walls at the Men's Bathing Bond and Highgate No. 1 Pond!</p> <p>This is not to mention the loss of 160, and more, precious trees.</p> <p>Please have reference to the Reservoirs Act 1975 and take good note that altering the landscape to such an extent will leave the Heath open to destruction by giant storms. There seem to be no proper provisions in place if there were a storm for adequate warnings to the emergency services.</p> <p>Further, such plans would close popular parts of the Heath for at least two years, the bathing ponds would be closed, there would be heavy engineering plant and thousands of HGV movements. Worse, there would be untold damage to wildlife.</p> <p>This scheme is tragically ill-considered and I earnestly and respectfully beg you to rescind it.</p>
2014/4332/P	Charles Edward Reynolds	7 Oak Village	06/08/2014 11:48:56 COMMNT		<p>I am writing in support of the application.</p> <p>I have attended most of the Stakeholder Meetings where the various options, and the development of the proposal, were discussed. I have also read all of the reports produced.</p> <p>The proposal spreads the work needed over all of ponds with minimal work on the most sensitive ones. Most of the works are in areas that can accept the greatest change. The works include environmental and water quality improvements as well as achieving the main objective, improving dam safety.</p> <p>My original interest was in the latter objective because I live in an area that was severely flooded in 1975, but as a frequent Heath user I was also interested in retaining the parkland feel of the Heath. The proposal addresses the dam safety issue in a more 'natural' way than the original proposal to just armour the three largest pond dams. I believe it will provide some additional flood relief in smaller, more frequent, storm/ rainfall events than the extreme design criteria used for the dam safety issue.</p> <p>Obviously, there will be problems with access and disruption during the construction phase but in the long run the Heath will be much improved in many aspects other than the main aim of dam safety.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Morag meddle	Ceylon cottage Greenhill st Dingwall	01/08/2014 15:48:36	OBJ	I object to this application because these proposals wreck the unique natural environment enjoyed because of the refuge this gives in needing untamed places for the soul! I believe that the unrealistic computer modelling by the so called experts is bringing in money for this project on false pretences when assuming the collapse of dams and only the very worst storms predicted to happen that could affect this would be lonely once 400,000 years. Therefore I feel this corrupting influence should be halted .
2014/4332/P	Alice Stride	24 Lady Somerset Road London NW5 1UP	04/08/2014 14:09:58	OBJ	THIS WILL RUIN A BEAUTIFIUL PART OF LONDON. I cannot understand the motivation. The backlash is enormous. The work will NOT eliminate the risk of downstream flooding or loss of life which the City of London claims it will. BACK OFF AND DO NOT RUIN THIS TREASURE. This pointless, expensive and SHAMEFUL ruination.
2014/4332/P	Hana Levy	Inglewood Road	04/08/2014 13:56:29	OBJ	I really don't think this should go ahead. It would be horrendous for the environment with the amount of tree's that would need to be felled to facilitate the works, not to mention the level of construction that would mean we can't use vast area's of the Heath for 2 + years. Please don't do this. It's completely unnecessary. The Heath is perfect as it stands and has stood for many years.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Melissa Fairbanks	76 C South Hill Park	07/08/2014 00:03:34	OBJ	<p>You have already received many letters from people far more knowledgeable than myself - on the legality (or not) and the efficacy of these planned works on Hampstead Heath. I will not need to repeat all the reasons why this plan is not only illegal but also erroneous in its presumptions.</p> <p>So I am writing from one who has lived most of my life on or near the Heath. I know all the pathways, the trees, the woods and the ponds. I am nearing 70 years old and I have never known a pond to be anywhere near dangerously overflowing.</p> <p>That is my experience - and I reiterate that you have had many experts giving you good reason why this is so - and why it is so unlikely that it should ever flood in the preposterous proportions that your computer model suggests.</p> <p>I want to tell you that these plans will devastate one of the most extra-ordinary gifts of London. There is no where else with the mixture of wildness and yet beautiful order - a natural and most perfect idyll. The ponds are home to so much wonderful wildlife - I have followed the families of swans on the ponds for many years - and before them, all the other ducks and geese and moorhens. I am appalled that in your reasoning you do not show any care about this. You say you are improving the natural environment - but that is extremely unlikely.</p> <p>The trees that are due to be felled - CoL says they are just immature unimportant trees...this remark could only be made by someone with very little care for the Heath itself.</p> <p>The bottom line is that this is going to DEVASTATE the Heath.</p> <p>Is that what you want?</p> <p>I for one, will most certainly have to move away. I can not bear to see the destruction, listen to the machinery, and think of the financial greed and dubious reasons that have led to this work being carried out.</p> <p>I will leave the area -and you can be sure that many others if they in the past visited the Heath - will choose to go elsewhere.</p> <p>Why come to a plot of land with bulldozers and cement mixers for the next few years - and then to a place with cement spillways and "manufactured" views and treeless areas?</p> <p>For those that use the ponds to swim (I refer to the human swimmers - but equally I could speak for the feathered ones) - their joy and pleasure in using the ponds is going to be devastated.</p> <p>All in all - I beg of you to refuse permission for this most destructive plan.</p> <p>If it goes ahead you must take responsibility for ruining not only the most beautiful area of London but forever changing the history of such a beloved part of London.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Gary Heather	59 Mayton Street London N7 6QP	04/08/2014 10:19:21	OBJ	<p>I call on Camden Council to reject the City of London's Planning Application.</p> <p>The proposed works specify massive dams, spillways, concrete walls and embankments. They include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of a huge 40m wide by 5.6m high embankment in the Catchpit Valley; • Construction of a massive 2.5 m dam at end of the Model Boating Pond; • Felling at least 160 trees; • Taking 2 years to complete; • Estimated costs of at least £17 million; • Inevitable and irreversible damage to the Heath and its wildlife. <p>The City's rationale for these works involves a dubious interpretation of the law. It refers to a computer model of a 1 in 400,000 year "probable maximum flood" and works that would "virtually eliminate" the risk of dam collapse in the event of this flood.</p> <p>The works would contravene the Hampstead Heath Act of 1871 which requires that Hampstead Heath be preserved in its "natural aspect and state".</p> <p>The works appear unnecessary in relation to the almost non-existent risk identified; it appears to be more akin to a work creation scheme for private contractors to make profit from. No doubt the works would also be used to introduce changes detrimental to casual swimming in a non-commercial environment of natural beauty. I am against the dams project - I say: save the ponds!</p>
2014/4332/P	jamie kelsey-fry	32 cyrus house malta street london ec1v 0bu	05/08/2014 10:09:57	COMMNT	<p>I am not clear whether any of this work is a necessity to the extent that it outweighs the disruption caused</p> <p>Very concerned about the potential disruption to wildlife and potential disruption to quality of human life</p> <p>Not sure that the work is not violating common access laws.</p> <p>Concerned about water quality disruption.</p>
2014/4332/P	Tim Green	28 Roderick Road NW3 2NL	04/08/2014 08:49:43	OBJ	<p>I have lived by Hampstead Heath all my life and have never experienced any risk or significant damage of flooding. To spend this amount of money on what I believe to be unnecessary improvements should not be permitted. I am a council tax payer in Camden and believe there are significantly more important uses of monies notably education. I am against the proposed changes in landscape which will reduce the beauty of the park and the waste of time and money to change it.</p>
2014/4332/P	Michelle Sinclair	11 Highgate West Hill	04/08/2014 13:45:26	PETITNOBJ E	<p>I object to this application. The works proposed are unnecessary. Far less intrusive measures have been suggested by independent experts which would give better protection if the unlikely event were to happen (predicted once in 400,000 years)</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	D Prowse	59 Ripplevale Grove N11HS	04/08/2014 13:31:39	COMMNT	Massive over-reaction and waste of money that will spoil the present Heath because of doubtful future risk. If there is £17m available, there are far better things to spend it on.
2014/4332/P	Jo Mohammed	35 Windsor way Brook green London W14 0UA	04/08/2014 12:36:22	OBJ	<p>A major cause in the recent increase in flooding is the fact that people are chopping down thier trees and paving over thier gardens.</p> <p>The roots of trees and plant life absorb and hold back rain water, this is no rocket science.</p> <p>If these plans go ahead to destroy hampstead Heath and chop 160 trees in the process, you will have a bigger problem on your hands that what you started with.</p> <p>I would also question city of Londond's intentions after they spend £17million carrying out this destruction, how will this be funded? will they then start charging people to use the Heath and the swimming ponds?</p> <p>the ponds are used by local communities and many parents who can't afford to take thier children to swimming pools over the summer, where will they go when they can't afford the entry fees?</p> <p>this needs to be addressed baccuse London as a city is becoming less and less accessible to its local communities.</p> <p>I object wholeheartedly to these plans.</p> <p>They MUST NOT go ahead.</p>
2014/4332/P	David Robson	31 Christchurch Hill	05/08/2014 12:11:09	OBJ	As a Hampstead resident and daily Heath user I strongly object to this crazy scheme. It is obviously - since it's impossible to see who else gains by it - a money-making scam.
2014/4332/P	Ian Angus	47 Fairmead Road London N19 4DG	03/08/2014 23:18:47	OBJ	The proposals are ill-conceived and would contradict current sound practice in flood relief and surge management; they would also replace the proven combination of causeways reinforced by tree roots which have stood well the test of time.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Cathy Buckley	26 oakford road	03/08/2014 22:35:24	OBJNOT	<p>I have swam regularly in the ponds, throughout the year, for the past 10 years they are a hugely important part of my life as they are for many others.</p> <p>The proposed major works to the ponds do not bear thinking about and would devastate the unique and beautiful natural environment, vital to local wildlife and migrating birds, and enjoyed by millions of visitors.</p> <p>My understanding is that the proposals following recommendations of water engineers Atkins and are based on unrealistic computer modelling that assumed the collapse of all existing dams ,no warning and no emergency services and the very worst kind of storm ever possible - predicted to happen only once in 400,000 years. The Thames flood barrier is designed to cope with 1:1000 year flood risk and main sewer system in London 1:70 years. The flood risk threshold adopted for the study is therefore simply far above that required. Independent experts recommend that homes and lives could be better protected by:</p> <p>improving the Heath's natural capacity to absorb water that could even be diminished by heavy construction.</p> <p>Minor improvements to existing dams that have already proven safe through the wettest winter on record in 2013 and the floods of 1975</p> <p>investing in early warning systems that would alert residents and workers to flood risks from elsewhere such as sewers and run-off heavy rain.</p> <p>lawyers say that the softer measure would fulfil the City of London obligations to protect downstream households, and preserve the beautiful precious ponds and the heath for its wildlife and many visitors for years to come.</p>
2014/4332/P	Mr T.M. Higgison	330 Field End Road Eastcote Middlesex HA4 9PG	04/08/2014 16:43:34	OBJ	<p>This proposal will irrevocably damage the character of this part of the Heath which is loved and cherished by many, with no benefit to anyone.</p> <p>This proposal must be rejected and buried.</p>
2014/4332/P	Harry Lascelles	2 St Albans Rd NW5 1RD	04/08/2014 16:37:28	OBJ	<p>As a local resident, I can't approve of this construction.</p> <p>The weather event threat is negligible, the cost and disruption high and the ugly features will permanently disfigure this beautiful part of the heath.</p> <p>Please don't let health and safety pressure this decision that we locals know isn't required, and engineers admit won't help.</p> <p>We are blessed to have access to these ponds. Keep them as the local residents and visitors want.</p>
2014/4332/P	Michael Helston	33 Colvestone Crescent	04/08/2014 09:22:28	OBJ	<p>This proposal seems entirely unnecessary, costly and, worst of all, wilfully damaging to the environment of Hampstead Heath. While Camden might be the relevant Local Authority, Hampstead Heath is for the use of all Londoners. Camden should therefore take this into account: this is not a purely local issue.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Alexander Goransson	Iris Court Lanacre Avenue London	03/08/2014 20:59:43	PETITNOBJ E	I hereby object to any re-construction work on Hampstead Heath, which would result in the (temporary) closure of the bathing ponds.
2014/4332/P	Gill Paul	8 Courthope Road	03/08/2014 16:32:58	OBJ	This scheme is a ridiculous waste of public money. Numerous surveys have found the proposed works to be unnecessary, and independent experts have suggested alternative methods that could be carried out more cheaply yet still be just as effective. The City appears to have relied solely on the reports of the dam engineers who would benefit from the proposed works, but plans are based on unrealistic computer modelling. The works could even lessen the natural ability of the Heath to absorb heavy rainfall. I have swum in the Women's Pond since 1996, all year round, and am just one of the millions of people who enjoy its natural environment in the heart of the city, with a chance to retain a contact with nature. Huge concrete walls and the loss of more than 160 trees would devastate this unique place and spoil it for generations to come. It's already lasted well over a century in its current state, enjoyed by grandmothers, mothers, daughters, aunts and nieces. Please don't be the ones to spoil it for current users and the generations still to come.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Rob Culley	24 Embassy Court 54 Bounds Green Road London N11 2HA	04/08/2014 20:56:56	COMMNT	<p>As a regular swimmer on Hampstead Heath I am very concerned about these plans for major disruptive works on the Heath. I understand that they are designed to protect against the possibility of a once in 400,000 flood, a event so rare that it is ludicrous to aim to protect against it. Sensible protection measures are aimed against events that may happen one in a few hundred years and even the far more important Thames Barrier is not expected to be useful beyond the end of this century.</p> <p>It is my understanding that far more modest and sensible measures have been proposed to reduce flood risk, which is not in itself a bad idea e.g. the proposals from David Myers published in the Camden New Journal on 4th July, which would increase the natural capacity of the Heath to retain water. I would urge the council to reject these unnecessary plans and Instruct the City of London Corporation to consider these more sensible measures instead. Works on the proposed scale would be a violation of the 1871 Hampstead Heath Act, which is meant to protect the Heath from destructive development. The proposed new dams would be unsightly and disruptive to wildlife and require the destruction of 160 trees. Heavy construction traffic would blight the Heath for up to two years, during which time parts of it would have to be closed to the public, including the swimming ponds. There is no provision for women only swimming during this period.</p> <p>The heavy construction traffic would itself undoubtedly damage the Heath and by compacting the soil it would increase the risk of flooding - which didn't happen at all during the wettest winter for a hundred years, which we have just had.</p> <p>The modelling work by Atkins on which these proposals based has also been shown to be false - I believe another consultancy, AECOM, has challenged it. I work in computer modelling myself (transport, not engineering) and I know that results like these cannot be taken as unquestionable truth.</p> <p>In conclusion, I once again urge the Council to reject this £17m act of vandalism - the money could be spent in so many better ways - and ask the Corporation to rethink its plans.</p> <p>Yours faithfully,</p> <p>Rob Culley</p>
2014/4332/P	Nathaniel Lane	38A Lawford Road Kentish Town London NW5 2LN EX19 8NP	05/08/2014 16:56:50	OBJ	<p>To Whom it may concern.</p> <p>I am objecting to this scheme, because the dam would ruin hampstead heath and money would be better spent on the flood defences at the thames barrier.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Em	5 the grove	04/08/2014 21:35:38	OBJ	I do not believe there is any evidence to support the need for hideously ugly dams to be built around the ponds. The serious flooding across the country this year showed NO sign of such on the Heath. The destruction of the tranquil beauty peace refuge solace giving PUBLIC amenity should not be damaged/destroyed/removed never to be replaced by this program of totally unnecessary works. Please consider how much will be lost. The Romans feared and respected the Genius Loci "guardian spirit" of a special place and new that it must be protected at all times. This hideous program of building works - more destructive than constructive will drive that spirit away - be it on your own heads all you Camden Council officers. The heath will no longer be that special place saved from developers for the people , it will be known as "Yet another Public amenity wrecked by a few money grubbing ignorant council officers and developers waiting for their back-handers. Be a hero - STOP this project and the spirit of the Heath will stay. I am a professional photographer who has been photographing the Heath particularly the beauty of the ponds. My photographs are going to be worth a lot of money if you allow this destruction. You are going to destroy for EVER the beauty of what people come from all over the world to love and cherish the memory of. We will only have photographs and memories. .
2014/4332/P	Mrs Nicola Tomei	100 Highgate West Hill London N6 6NR	03/08/2014 18:27:16	OBJ	I object to the Corporation of London's proposals to do major work on the dams on Hampstead Heath. I do not believe they have exhausted other possibilities that are not so catastrophic for the environment. For instance maybe the Heath should be exempt from the Reservoirs Act, dams could be strengthened and work could be done collaboratively with Thames Water and flooding authorities. I am not convinced this proposal is necessary and it could potentially damage the Heath now and for further generations.
2014/4332/P	Jonathan Checkley	27 Oakeshott Avenue London N66NT	03/08/2014 16:59:51	OBJ	The works are far too large and intrusive for the supposed benefit, which is to prevent a flood around Gospel Oak once in each 400,000 years. The present beauty and amenity of the ponds will be severely damaged. Therefore I am very much AGAINST this application.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Michael McGowan	605 Lordship Lane Wood Green London N22 5LE	02/08/2014 20:21:59	AMEND	I used to live in the Barbican and expected the Corporation to behave in the public interest and in a transparent manner. I am very familiar with Hampstead Heath. My wife used to work at the Royal Free and all our seven children were born there. Until a recent minor knee operation it was within easy running distance. I was recently working near there for a month and have enjoyed walking, swimming, attending concerts and events there and have swum in two of the ponds and the Gospel Oak pool. I live in Haringey where planning applications can be seen in considerable detail on line. This plan app by the City is brief in the extreme. It is not good enough to only have full details in a library I cannot visit before 7th. My objection is to the meagre information provided which is a clear attempt by the City to smuggle this very extensive planning application through - perhaps there are city bankers behind it. The committee should refuse to pass the application and insist proper information is provided. There are some aspects which I approve of like the expansion of the boating lake. But it appears there will be massive dams which quite change walks along paths by the pools from open vistas to narrow passageways. Apparently there is no need for these - certainly the planning application says nothing - and there is no indication of the effect on wildlife. I cannot think that Camden Council is in cahoots with City types and is happy to have such a brief and evasive planning application on its site. Surely it is not legitimate for the city to slip a very major, expensive and (two year long) disruptive landscape alteration to one of London's classic parklands on such a very brief description (unless one lives near one particular library) and the Council is fully entitled to insist on a far more detailed application justifying such an application. Indeed, if it does not do so it is failing in its public duty.
2014/4332/P	Marnie Watts	41 Dunboyne Road London NW3 2YY	04/08/2014 21:06:15	OBJ	I Object to the building of dams on Hampstead heath ponds. I am a local user of this beautiful land and do not feel that this is the answer to prevent flooding, rather improving the Heath's natural capacity to absorb water should be considered.
2014/4332/P	Michael Gay	166 Tufnell Park Road London N7 0EE	03/08/2014 17:30:38	COMMNT	I wish to object to the planning application regards the 1 in 400'000 year likelihood chance of a flood. The work required would greatly spoil views of the men and women's bathing ponds. The cost could be better spent elsewhere. I have been swimming in the ponds on the Heath regularly since 1961 and hope to carry on for many years to come.
2014/4332/P	Ben Murray	17 Elthorne Court Elthorne Rd London N19 4AF	03/08/2014 16:23:47	OBJ	I would like to object to the proposals to build dams around the Hampstead ponds. I believe there is a substantial risk that the works will have an adverse affect on the visual beauty and character of the Heath, meant to be maintained in its 'natural aspect and state' according to the Hampstead Heath Act 1871. Some of the assumptions on which the proposals rest seem deeply flawed, and I ask that the Council properly and fully scrutinise the plans before making any decision.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Chris Jones	35 Timms Road Banbury OX16 9DN	03/08/2014 20:55:39	OBJ	<p>My objections to the proposed development are:</p> <p>1 During the construction work what is now an area of peaceful country would become dangerous, ugly and noisy. Local people, tourists and swimmers would be excluded from areas which they have enjoyed for many years.</p> <p>2 Some of the damage to the environment and wildlife would be permanent, and the new dams, spillways and other structures would spoil the Heath for ever.</p> <p>3 The proposed works are quite unnecessary. The proposal is based on ridiculous computer models of events which would never happen in a million years. The existing dams were adequate to protect lives and property during last winter, when other parts of the country suffered destructive floods.</p> <p>4 Independent experts have said that minor improvements to existing dams would give protection to people and property downstream of the Heath, and would fulfil the City of London's legal obligations.</p>
2014/4332/P	Louisa S Kaplin	flat 15 weatherbury hse wedmore st london N194RB	03/08/2014 16:18:11	COMMNT	I support the points made by the Damn Nonsense campaign, which does represent my views. As such, I object to the London Corporations planning application & the proposals therein.
2014/4332/P	Viktoria Horvath	17/A Lindfield Gardens	03/08/2014 16:17:06	OBJ	<p>I would like to object this application. The reason: the plan of City of London hasn't convince me at all. There is no real danger, it never was. The construction work would make so much damage in the enviroment which should be preserved in its own natural state, According to the Hampstead Heath Act of 1871. ! Building huge dams are everything but preserve the nature! I call it very heavy permanent artificial investment! I ask Camden Council to reject this proposal, as it doesn't meet the real requirements of Hampstead Heath, and people who live around and on it. Also doesn't explained in facts, why is it so important! We can't rely on some hypothetical estimation which has no real datas, facts behind. Spending huge amounts of money on something which is safe and beautiful on its own way, ruin the nature, and wildlife? For what? It didn't cause any problem in any way to anyone. How many life was taken or risked on the Heath because of flood? How many houses was ruined on the Heath because of flood? So what is the real reason to build those dam? Obviously has nothing to do with safety causes at this state! Why not spend that amount of money on risked areas, such as Sunbury, Walt on Thames, etc.... They had been flooded heavily early this year and last year as well. Wouldn't it be more propriate to spend that money and help the people out over there, then here in Hampstead Heath, where everyone and everything is just doing well without any dam, because there is no danger here at all? Thank you for taking time to read my objection. I hope you will take it into consideration.</p> <p>Viktoria Horvath</p>
2014/4332/P	Alison King	61 Mulgrave Road London W5 1LF	05/08/2014 23:32:25	OBJ	Your current proposals are excessive and not in keeping with the area. You will spoil a beautiful and natural area with overkill on health & safety measures.
2014/4332/P	Claire Cave	11 Fassett road E8 1PA	03/08/2014 23:56:01	COMMNT	I implore Camden council to think very carefully about allowing the proposed dam projects to go ahead. It is not at all clear that they are necessary to deter flooding; and they will cause irreparable damage to an area of outstanding natural beauty. Wildlife will also be affected.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Maurice Whitby	13 Shirlock Road NW3 2HR	04/08/2014 14:15:29	OBJ	Having studied the arguments I am convinced by those who say the dams are unnecessary. The damage to the Heath we love would be appalling.
2014/4332/P	June Gibson	22 Chandos Way London NW117HF	04/08/2014 14:14:41	OBJ	<p>This is a shocking, unnecessary and hugely expensive proposal.</p> <p>The proposal, if implemented, would go down in the annals of Hampstead Heath as a gross abuse of powers by its guardians in severely interfering permanently with the Heath, its public amenities and its glorious wildlife. There is no need for it.</p> <p>I feel that the dams project is worthy of a Public Inquiry to determine what is right for the mass of people, now and through future ages, who enjoy the Heath. It isn't just for local people. People come from far and wide, young and old, to sample the recreational pleasures of the Heath and the Ponds.</p> <p>The horrendous construction work alone is grounds for objection, and refusal of this destructive action.</p>
2014/4332/P	Lucy Sadler	20 Cardigan Road London	04/08/2014 13:56:22	OBJ	I object to this proposal. It is unnecessary and will adversely affect thousands of people who use the Heath daily. The works would cause permanent disfigurement and Wildlife will be disrupted and sensitive environment damaged by traffic and heavy machinery.
2014/4332/P	annette steele	2 lynton road nw6 6bn	06/08/2014 22:18:00	OBJ	Please do not allow this desecration of the natural beauty of the heath. The works are unnecesary and the dam engineers have a conflict of interests in that they will benefit from the works going ahead. Needless expense, needless work and uglification.
2014/4332/P	Claire Jackson	166 Tufnell Park Road London N7 0EE	02/08/2014 20:34:52	OBJ	<p>I object to the proposed works on Hampstead Heath. The City of London's proposed dam works on Hampstead Heath will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permanently disfigure the Heath • Not eliminate the risk of downstream flooding or loss of life which the City of London claims these proposals will address <p>The proposed works specify massive dams, spillways, concrete walls and embankments. They include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of a huge 40m wide by 5.6m high embankment in the Catchpit Valley; • Construction of a massive 2.5 m dam at end of the Model Boating Pond; • Felling at least 160 trees; • Taking 2 years to complete; • Estimated costs of at least £17 million; • Inevitable and irreversible damage to the Heath and its wildlife. <p>The City's rationale for these works involves a dubious interpretation of the law. It refers to a computer model of a 1 in 400,000 year "probable maximum flood" and works that would "virtually eliminate" the risk of dam collapse in the event of this flood. The works would contravene the Hampstead Heath Act of 1871 which requires that Hampstead Heath be preserved in its "natural aspect and state"</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Pia Rainey	100 Liverpool Road London N1 0RE	04/08/2014 18:25:51	PETITNOBJ E	I am against the proposed engineering works on hampstead heath because it will forever destroy its natural and slowly evolved character in one fell swoop. I use the heath every week for walking and have done so for the last 25 years that my family and I have lived in Islington, where there is no green space to speak of. I also use the ladies pond all during the summer and the concrete dams will totally spoil and destroy the character of all the ponds. It is totally unnecessary the works that are being prposed asince there is no flooding of any kind and the money should be used in flood plais, not on a well draining heath.
2014/4332/P	David Pashley	56 Mount View Rd London N4 4JR	04/08/2014 19:23:28	OBJ	I use Heath at least once a week. The work itself is going to disrupt the Heath hugely for a long time, and then it will take years for the vegetation to recover. The work will distort the ponds area for ever. The case for flooding is based on a vast extreme. I oppose the City's application.
2014/4332/P	Mrs D Rosenberg	25 Cranbourne Gardens Cranbourne Gardens NW11 0HS	03/08/2014 20:40:07	APP	My entire family have benefitted from the bathing ponds. As my husband cannot easily tolerate chlorine the male pond is ideal for him. Ditto for our children, and for myself. These ponds are unique in London, and we plead with you not to distroy them. It would be a pity that so many who have benefitted throughout the years would suffer an irreplaceable loss. Thank you
2014/4332/P	Mrs D Rosenberg	25 Cranbourne Gardens Cranbourne Gardens NW11 0HS	03/08/2014 20:40:06	APP	
2014/4332/P	Mrs D Rosenberg	25 Cranbourne Gardens Cranbourne Gardens NW11 0HS	03/08/2014 20:39:45	COMMNT	
2014/4332/P	Nathaniel Lane	38A Lawford Road Kentish Town London NW5 2LN EX19 8NP	05/08/2014 16:56:29	OBJ	To Whom it may concern. I am objecting to this scheme, because the dam would ruin hampstead heath and money would be better spent on the flood defences at the thames barrier.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Victoria Midwinter	7 Halliwick Road London N10 1AA	02/08/2014 23:17:20	COMMNT	The proposed works are disproportionate to the risk of flooding which they are supposed to alleviate. A more rational risk analysis needs to be undertaken. Two years of work, with heavy machinery on site, ruining the enjoyment of those who use the Heath, significant period of closure of the Ladies pond, destruction of trees and habitat and the construction of unsightly high embankments has huge negative impact when set against the minimal potential risk of flooding and consequential loss of life.
2014/4332/P	beatrice gerencser	37 hendon way	02/08/2014 23:16:57	COMMNT	We love the way the park is now, it does not need change. Construction should be not carried out in there.
2014/4332/P	Laraine Goss	5 Perrins Court Hampstead London	04/08/2014 19:35:58	OBJ	The risk threshold for this project is far fetched and will be unnecessarily costly. The proposed construction works will devastate the environment. Homes and the environment could be better protected using more sensitive methods.
2014/4332/P	Pia Rainey	100 Liverpool Road London N1 0RE	04/08/2014 18:25:29	PETITNOBJ E	I am against the proposed engineering works on hampstead heath because it will forever destroy its natural and slowly evolved character in one fell swoop. I use the heath every week for walking and have done so for the last 25 years that my family and I have lived in Islington, where there is no green space to speak of. I also use the ladies pond all during the summer and the concrete dams will totally spoil and destroy the character of all the ponds. It is totally unnecessary the works that are being prposed asince there is no flooding of any kind and the money should be used in flood plais, not on a well draining heath.
2014/4332/P	Richard Clarke	4 Penn Road Islington London N7 9RD	04/08/2014 17:26:04	OBJ	I believe that these works are unnecessary and environmentally damaging and that the planning application should be rejected. Richard Clarke
2014/4332/P	John Avery	39 Loraine Road London N7 6HB	03/08/2014 17:23:39	OBJ	These works seem to be costly and appear unnecessary. The works seem to be a disproportionate response to the the potential threat. I am very concerned by the number of trees that will be cut down. It's commonsense that trees aid drainage. It seems that the works approach is counter productive in this regard. I suggest it would be sensible to revisit the predictive modelling that you are using.
2014/4332/P	Tracey Gardiner	33 Moray Road	03/08/2014 09:17:18	OBJ	Dumper trucks and tankers would close the ponds for over 2 years at least. Trees will be cut down. Devastate a unique and beautiful natural environment. Softer measures would fulfil the City of London's legal obligations.
2014/4332/P	Tracey Gardiner	33 Moray Road	03/08/2014 09:16:56	OBJ	
2014/4332/P	Oliver Pick	21 Dagmar Terrace	03/08/2014 06:52:18	OBJ	Strong objection to planning application.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Linda Saunders	37 a Glenloch Road London NW3 4DJ	03/08/2014 17:21:32	OBJ	The proposed works to the ponds would be in breach of the Hampstead Heath Act, having a significant impact on the natural state of the heath, disfiguring it and threatening its natural state. The £17m would be better spent elsewhere
2014/4332/P	Linda Saunders	37 a Glenloch Road London NW3 4DJ	03/08/2014 17:21:11	OBJ	
2014/4332/P	susan Ali	15 Jackson's lane Highgate London N.6 5 SR	02/08/2014 17:24:32	COMMNT	I object to the proposed work, because of the damage it will do the heath.
2014/4332/P	David Taylor	25 Ferme Park Road London N4 4EB	06/08/2014 22:16:22	COMMNT	<p>Dear Camden Planning Department, I object the the Dam Construction Project for the following reasons:</p> <p>The City of London has based its plans to construct new dams on unrealistic computer modelling that has assumed the collapse of all existing dams. Not only that but there would be too many trees felled in this beautiful part of Hampstead Heath and also dumper trucks churning up the soil, tankers would close the ponds for several years and stop people using these popular areas of the heath over 2 years. If there was no warning and no emergency services, the very worst kind of storm ever possible would happen only every 400,000 years so the risk threshold is so far fetched, local sewers would fail in a flood event with a probability of once every 70 years.</p> <p>Even the Thames Barrier is only built to manage the sort of flood predicted to occur once every 1,000 years.</p> <p>Instead of constructing these dams, softer measures would fulfil the City of Londons legal obligations rather than destroy an area of the Heath that so many people enjoy the facilities there.</p> <p>I sincerely hope you will carefully consider these objections and thank you for your attention with a matter that affects the unspoilt parts of Hampstead Heath.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, David Taylor.</p> <p>My email address is:daveactivist@gmail.com</p>
2014/4332/P	Chris Green	flat 15 nightingale court	01/08/2014 11:26:45	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	Chris Green	flat 15 nightingale court	01/08/2014 11:26:30	PETITNOBJ E	
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.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
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.
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 Atkins 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.
2014/4332/P	j.meacher.	n6 5st	01/08/2014 14:28:28	AMEND	
2014/4332/P	j.meacher.	n6 5st	01/08/2014 14:28:06	AMEND	

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
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.
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"> 1.The massive scale of engineering works proposed has not been proven to be required by the Reservoirs Act 1975. 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. 3.The modelling used is unrealistic: 1 in 4000,000 probability and assumes their is no warning. 4.This will cause over 2 years of huge works, heavy plant machinery, HGV's, closure of the Heath and swimming ponds. 5.The works will lead to the loss of 160 trees, and the City of London has already just felled 60 at Kenwood. 6.This will cause unestimable damage to wildlife. <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	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.

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	Matthew Young	26 Victoria Road South Woodford E18 1LG	04/08/2014 13:07:12	OBJ	<p>This appears to be nothing more than a knee-jerk reaction to a computer generated potential doomsday scenario. The CoL seems to be intent on forcing its will on the borough and residents of Camden apparently without due regard to the rising tide of protest. I do not live in the borough, however, I use the ponds as a leisure resource (as do many countless others) and this proposal will do irreparable damage not only to the Heath (which in itself is a London Landmark and should be protected) but to the ponds and the lives of the residents (and others) who use the facilities regularly. I hope that the borough will be strong enough to resist this application which appears to be nothing more than a work generation exercise.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Rupert Marques	39 stoneleigh wells somerset ba51hg	02/08/2014 20:27:39	OBJ	<p>Dear</p> <p>I am very concerned about the plans to develop the ponds to reduce potential flood impacts. I use the Heath on a regular basis and feel that the scheme will irrevocably alter Heath to the detriment of all who use the wonderful place, and all the wild creatures who live there.</p> <p>The reasons for my objections are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The proposed works are massively obtrusive and completely out of character for the area · The need for the proposed works has not been sensibly assessed. In particular the assumptions on which it is based are wholly unrealistic (eg no warnings would be given) · The threshold for risk mitigation has been set absurdly low – a 1 in 400,000 year event is not a credible basis for action · While some measures against floods may be necessary, there are alternatives to large scale dams, particularly increasing the Heath's natural capacity to absorb water. I do not believe these have been adequately considered. · Disruption of habitats – eg nesting kingfishers, swans, reed warblers, and so many other birds. <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Rupert Marques</p>
2014/4332/P	rosie cottrell	14a Gayton Road Hampstead NW31TX	05/08/2014 19:32:41	OBJ	<p>I have lived in Hampstead for over 17 years within walking distance of the Heath and have enjoyed many hours on it over this time. The views of the ponds are truly beautiful. I am appalled by the current plans to construct massive dams over both chains of ponds effectively closing off large parts of the Heath for 2 years. Even more importantly permanently disfiguring a world famous site currently protected by the Hampstead Heath Act 1871. It is used and enjoyed by hundreds of thousands of Londoners and visitors. I understand that the work will involve the felling of at least 160 mature trees which I find unacceptable. There is NO legal requirement to build these dams. In over 300 years there has been no collapse of the ponds, no major flooding or loss of life. I strongly object to the plans for Hampstead Heath proposed by the City of London.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Ruth Draper	14 Summerlee Gardens London N2 9QN	04/08/2014 17:17:49	OBJ	<p>I object strongly to the proposals for a number of reasons:</p> <p>* The City are proposing huge works in an essential area of green land that provides recreation for tens of thousands of Londoners all year round, contributing to our physical and mental well being. The Heath has been managed over hundreds of years with gradual intervention that has more recently been in keeping with the Hampstead Heath Act of 1871, which states that the Heath must be kept in its 'natural state and aspect'. The proposals would have sections of the Heath looking like a badly designed municipal park, and do not meet the requirements of the 1871 Act, nor the needs of those who use the Heath.</p> <p>*The works will cause huge disruption and permanent damage to wildlife on the Heath, including flora, bird and insect life, and the felling of at least 160 mature trees. This is totally unacceptable.</p> <p>*The approach in the planning application is not proportionate, and is indeed irrational. It aims to reduce the risk of flooding to virtually none, an impossibility; and takes no account of the responsibilities of Camden Council or Thames Water to prevent flooding and reduce risk.</p> <p>*Finally, if any work does take place, it is essential that single sex swimming is available in the early morning ALL through the work</p>
2014/4332/P	Verity Wilkinson	24 Carrol Close NW5 1TF	02/08/2014 20:25:07	OBJ	<p>I call on Camden Council to reject the planning application from the City of London which seeks permission to build and enlarge dams on Hampstead Heath.</p> <p>The City of London's proposed dam works on Hampstead Heath will permanently disfigure the Heath, and will not eliminate the risk of downstream flooding or loss of life which the City of London claims these proposals will address. The proposed works specify massive dams, spillways, concrete walls and embankments. They would involve the felling of at least 160 trees; Inevitable and irreversible damage to the Heath and its wildlife; and would ruin the amenities available for swimming in the natural beauty of the Heath's bathing ponds, particularly the Ladies pond.</p> <p>The City's rationale for these works involves a dubious interpretation of the law. It refers to a computer model of a 1 in 400,000 year "probable maximum flood" and works that would "virtually eliminate" the risk of dam collapse in the event of this flood. The works would contravene the Hampstead Heath Act of 1871 which requires that Hampstead Heath be preserved in its "natural aspect and state".</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>Dr. Verity Wilkinson</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Richard Harvey	41 Lisburne Road	02/08/2014 19:46:38	COMMNT	<p>The proposed works are completely out of keeping with the character of Hampstead Heath. The model boating pond would become a cross between a leisure park and a municipal reservoir. The new high dams would block important views and the landscape would be destroyed. This would be in contravention of the 1871 Hampstead Heath Act.</p> <p>It will be detrimental to the Heath itself to excavate large amounts of earth to construct the two large dams. The pleasing western slope to the model boating pond would be altered to incorporate at its base a steep 1 in 3 gradient which would be both unsightly and unsafe.</p> <p>No attempt has been made by The City of London to put forward a design which does not compromise the landscape.</p>
2014/4332/P	David Naylor	7 Courtside London N8 8EW	05/08/2014 08:48:00	INT	<p>Please REJECT this application. The works are clearly not necessary and will spoil the ponds. Felling these established trees will also be an environmental crime.</p> <p>Perhaps a less disruptive solution could be found for de-silting the ponds and rebuilding of the changing rooms.</p>
2014/4332/P	irene bard	33 platts lane london nw3 7nn	03/08/2014 18:59:31	OBJ	<p>This application should be refused. It is wholly unnecessary, a waste of public money, and damaging to the Heath, particularly in the long term.</p>
2014/4332/P	irene bard	33 platts lane london nw3 7nn	03/08/2014 18:59:31	OBJ	
2014/4332/P	irene bard	33 platts lane london nw3 7nn	03/08/2014 18:59:10	OBJ	
2014/4332/P	Elizabeth	10 Edison Road N8 8AE	03/08/2014 16:06:30	OBJ	<p>The major construction works that are proposed will ruin the utterly unique and exquisite natural environment and bizarrely are unnecessary -- the plans are based on a draconian model that predicts the type of storm that statistically would only be seen once in 400,000 years. Why waste precious funds at a time of financial hardship and cause environmental and aesthetic devastation if it isn't absolutely necessary? There are a number of effective measures that could be taken without this major project - have they been considered?</p>