

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Keith Hammond	Heathdene Vale of Health London NW31BB	28/07/2014 18:52:43	OBJ	<p>Dear Sirs,</p> <p>It would seem that the prime reason for carrying out these works is not valid.</p> <p>We have just experienced the wettest winter in 100 years with levels of rainfall not known in our lifetime. The Somerset levels were flooded if you recall.</p> <p>The ponds in Hampstead and Highgate were unaffected and the water levels were never in danger of breaching the banks, despite the high water table.</p> <p>So I can't understand what the need is to dam these ponds and spoil the natural habitat that tens of thousands of people enjoy throughout the year.</p>
2014/4332/P	John Forrester	69 Whitehall Park London N19 3TW	29/07/2014 15:05:39	COMMNT	<p>I am totally opposed to the proposed engineering works (dams). It seems a classic case of ruining the thing you are trying to save. The risk to be averted is a very rare event, probabilistically speaking; the precautionary principle does not operate in areas of such low probability. What is proposed would fundamentally alter the character of the Heath and is in spirit against the nineteenth century Act which governs the preservation of our beloved Heath. Please do not approve this plan.</p> <p>I should add that I have lived nearly all my life near to the Heath - in Belsize Park (1949-57), Golders Green (1957-70) and Highgate (1984-2014). I love the Heath and am thoroughly opposed to this desecration.</p>
2014/4332/P	Ian Bass	Flat 2 8 Blackdown Close N2 8JF	29/07/2014 14:51:15	OBJ	<p>I object to these unnecessary works in the strongest possible terms. They will cause massive disruption to the Heath and leave the place worse than when they started.</p>
2014/4332/P	merilyn moos	30 Cressida Rd N19 3JW	29/07/2014 14:41:43	COMMNT	<p>Stand up to the bullying of the city of London. The heath is used massively by camden residents but by thousands of others every month- it makes London a bearable place to live. It is an oasis of green and almost peace. The works proposed would destroy that for a minimum of 2 years and destroy so many trees for ever. Protect the Heath, protect the environment, and protect your votes.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Tim Fearn	124 Etchingham Park Road London N3 2EH	29/07/2014 14:40:26	OBJ	<p>I strongly object to the proposed works on the following grounds:</p> <p>1) The works are in direct contravention of the 1871 Hampstead Heath Act which states that the heath must be preserved in its natural aspect and state. The ponds are an integral part of the landscape of Hampstead Heath and any changes to their appearance will indelibly destroy its natural appearance.</p> <p>2) The reasons given for the works are at best spurious, and are based on modelling to prevent a flood which may occur once in 400,000 years. Therefore, the scope of works is completely unnecessary for such a miniscule risk.</p> <p>3) The works will affect the local wildlife, cutting off vital corridors between the ponds. In addition, the dam construction will involve felling over 150 trees which also form part of the Heath's natural aspect.</p> <p>As a regular user of the Heath, I urge you to reject this proposal.</p>
2014/4332/P	Piroska Markus	156 Commonwealth Way SE2 0LE	29/07/2014 14:54:57	OBJ	<p>Completely disagree. Damns are known to be more harmful than useful. In addition, the green open public spaces of London, with their trees, grass and ponds/lakes/canals, make London into a habitable place. If misguided commercial interest will allow to destroy the green public spaces, London will become unhealthy and an inhuman place to live in. Even commercial interest will suffer, although this is not my issue. Keep London green and human, there is already too much pollution and too much change just to follow the selfish interest of a few companies, a few rich people. They won't be able to eat their money when there will be nothing healthy left to eat and no fresh air to breathe. The Hampstead ponds are just so beautiful, they are restful, they are good for body and soul. Thousands of people enjoy the benefits as they walk there, play there, or swim there, which is unbelievably nice. A dam in Hampstead would be crime against the local people, and the people of London. I used to work for Camden Social Services for over 7 years. Those days I went to the heath very regularly. Now I live in South London and I still often travel up to enjoy Hampstead and to swim in the Ladies' Pond. It is a special experience. Swimming in a swimming pool is not even half the pleasure and the health benefits are questionable in a swimming pool, full of chloride.</p>
2014/4332/P	Charlotte Cornwell	105 Sotheby Road London N5 2UT	29/07/2014 14:40:05	PETITNOBJ E	<p>The scale of the work covered by this application and the damage it will do to the Heath's environment is totally out of all proportion to the perceived 'danger' it's supposed to avert. At a time of austerity for so many of us who use the Heath everyday, £17m that the project will cost could be far better spent on other projects i.e. to help schools provide sports facilities for our children, provide affordable housing etc.</p> <p>The chances of this disastrous flood occurring any time soon is laughable. Please listen to the overwhelming opposition of we the people.</p>
2014/4332/P	Charlotte Cornwell	105 Sotheby Road London N5 2UT	29/07/2014 14:40:05	PETITNOBJ E	

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Charlotte Cornwell	105 Sotheby Road London N5 2UT	29/07/2014 14:40:05	PETITNOBJ E	The scale of the work covered by this application and the damage it will do to the Heath's environment is totally out of all proportion to the perceived 'danger' it's supposed to avert. At a time of austerity for so many of us who use the Heath everyday, £17m that the project will cost could be far better spent on other projects i.e. to help schools provide sports facilities for our children, provide affordable housing etc. The chances of this disastrous flood occurring any time soon is laughable. Please listen to the overwhelming opposition of we the people.
2014/4332/P	Tanya Eskander	28 Brocas Close NW3 3LD	29/07/2014 09:54:16	OBJ	I object to the closure of the Hampstead Heath Ponds!
2014/4332/P	Mary-Jayne Rust	14 Priory Gardens London N6 5QS	28/07/2014 19:53:20	OBJ	I vigorously oppose the planned engineering works because, first of all this seems utterly unnecessary as the risks seem so small. Secondly, it is one of the last wild ecosystems to remain in a large city, so very important to so many people - for physical AND mental health, as well as vital spiritual sustenance. The works will cause serious disruption to wildlife, many rare species such as kingfishers, even more rare to find these beings so close to central London.
2014/4332/P	Charlotte Cornwell	105 Sotheby Road London N5 2UT	29/07/2014 14:39:44	PETITNOBJ E	The scale of the work covered by this application and the damage it will do to the Heath's environment is totally out of all proportion to the perceived 'danger' it's supposed to avert. At a time of austerity for so many of us who use the Heath everyday, £17m that the project will cost could be far better spent on other projects i.e. to help schools provide sports facilities for our children, provide affordable housing etc. The chances of this disastrous flood occurring any time soon is laughable. Please listen to the overwhelming opposition of we the people.
2014/4332/P	Carola Darwin	65 Dresden Road London N19 3BG	29/07/2014 17:24:35	OBJ	Hampstead Heath and its ponds are one of London's unique features. I regularly swim in the Ladies' Pond, and value, above all, the unspoilt natural beauty and the chance to get close to the Heath's aquatic wildlife. The proposed dam would destroy this forever. The ponds have never overflowed in their 300 year history, and are unlikely to do so, because there is very little water flowing into them from above.
2014/4332/P	Charlotte Cornwell	105 Sotheby Road London N5 2UT	29/07/2014 14:39:31	PETITNOBJ E	The scale of the work covered by this application and the damage it will do to the Heath's environment is totally out of all proportion to the perceived 'danger' it's supposed to avert. At a time of austerity for so many of us who use the Heath everyday, £17m that the project will cost could be far better spent on other projects i.e. to help schools provide sports facilities for our children, provide affordable housing etc. The chances of this disastrous flood occurring any time soon is laughable. Please listen to the overwhelming opposition of we the people.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Katherine Evans	137 West End Lane London NW6 2PH NW6 2PH	29/07/2014 12:59:17	OBJ	<p>I have been using Hampstead Heath for recreational purposes since moving to London in 1979. I live in NW6.</p> <p>I am also a regular user of the Ladies Pond.</p> <p>I have studied these proposals and consider that the case has not been made for the necessity on any convincing grounds.</p> <p>My primary concern is that the developement is monumental and massively intrusive and will permanently affect the beauty of the environment which is to be treasured and protected at all costs.</p> <p>The proposals are unquestionably out-of-scale and the design is insensitive.</p> <p>I feel very strongly about this. I would like to be informed of the committee date as I would like to be able to attend if I am able to do so.</p>
2014/4332/P	Walter Solomon	8 Buckland Crescent London NW3 5DX	29/07/2014 11:16:12	OBJ	<p>Dear Sir or Madam</p> <p>I object to the above planning application on the following grounds:</p> <p>The wild character of the heath will be irrevocably be changed and its beautiful untamed nature will be destroyed.</p> <p>The proposed development is completely out of character compared to the nature of the heath</p> <p>I request that the planning application be refused</p> <p>Walter Solomon</p>
2014/4332/P	L. Bredt	9 CONEWOOD STREET N5 1DJ	29/07/2014 16:50:11	OBJ	<p>I strongly object to this application as the proposed necessity for dams is not grounded in sound scientific research and a disproportionate response that will have a hugely detrimental effect on the beauty of the heath and the use by millions of Londoners. I do object to taxpayers money being spent on unnecessary and damaging ventures, when London needs money spending on far more urgent issues.</p>
2014/4332/P	Harvey allen	18 milkman grove	30/07/2014 06:58:31	COMMNT	<p>This is a silly and expensive project that is of no use</p>
2014/4332/P	Bridget Pavitt	57 Axminster Road Holloway LONDON N7 6BP	29/07/2014 18:01:11	OBJ	<p>Hampstead Heath Ponds are an historic and vital part of the environment, being used by many Camden and North London inhabitants. This is a unique facility in London, and it is vital we retain them.</p>
2014/4332/P	Caroline Greene	29 Clifton Road Clifton Road 29 Clifton Road 29 N22 7XN	29/07/2014 23:21:38	OBJ	<p>The Heath is a rare and precious wildlife haven and this project will permanently change it for the worse. It makes no sense and it is very suspicious that there is going to be a lot of money made in the short term. The Heath needs to be protected. There does not seem to be good evidence that this work is necessary at all.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Bridget Pavitt	57 Axminster Road Holloway LONDON N7 6BP	29/07/2014 18:00:50	OBJ	Hampstead Heath Ponds are an historic and vital part of the environment, being used by many Camden and North London inhabitants. This is a unique facility in London, and it is vital we retain them.
2014/4332/P	Damien Lane	56 Wildwood Road London NW11 6UP	29/07/2014 17:53:07	COMMNT	<p>I am a frequent Heath User. I object strenuously to this project that will scar London's finest open space for no good reason. There has been extreme weather for many of the most recent winters and the flooding that this is scheme is designed to prevent has not even come close to materialising.</p> <p>This feels to me like vested interests like Consultants and Construction companies leading the planning and decision making process.</p> <p>Please reconsider.</p> <p>Thank You</p>
2014/4332/P	Ellie kavner	120 belsize lane	29/07/2014 16:44:29	WREP	this work will damage the most outstanding resource available to Londoners that makes Camden both special and healthy by interfering with the ponds and other amenities and is not necessary. please do not grant planning permission
2014/4332/P	Caroline Hammond	Heathdene Vale of Health Hampstead NW31BB	29/07/2014 08:49:47	OBJ	<p>Dear Sirs,</p> <p>I do not understand why the COL insist that these works are essential when it t would seem that the prime reason for carrying out these works is not valid.</p> <p>Last year we just experienced the wettest winter in 100 years with levels of rainfall not known in our lifetime. The Somerset levels were flooded if you recall.</p> <p>The ponds in Hampstead and Highgate were unaffected and the water levels were never in danger of breaching the banks, despite the high water table.</p> <p>So I can't find anyone who understands what the need is to dam these ponds and spoil the natural habitat that tens of thousands of people enjoy throughout the year.</p>
2014/4332/P	Romee Tilanus	31 Ockendon Road	28/07/2014 20:05:55	OBJ	The work the Corporation is proposing would permanently damage the Heath, without any material benefits. The recommendations for bigger dams have been prepared by the engineering industry with a vested interest of creating work for themselves out of apparent scare stories they manufacture themselves. Leave the Heath and its ponds in peace by refusing to sanction this work.
2014/4332/P	Romee Tilanus	31 Ockendon Road	28/07/2014 20:05:33	OBJ	

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Elizabeth Murray	80 Huddleston Road London N7 0EG	28/07/2014 16:46:53	OBJ	I understand the need to plan for flooding and climate change. But I am unconvinced that this level of engineering is required, and I think the money could be used more fruitfully. the Heath is a remarkable amenity, used by people from all over North London, which makes an important contribution to health and wellbeing. The benefits of access to natural surroundings on both mental and physical health are well attested, and there are concerns that the proposed work will undermine the naturalness of the Heath environment.
2014/4332/P	Rebecca	214 Grove Rd	29/07/2014 14:11:02	COMMNT	PLEASE do not alter or damage the heath with construction, it is a pure haven in London, a place that has been dangerously impinged upon with commercial building.
2014/4332/P	Dr Robert Leane	21 Denning Road London nw3 1st	28/07/2014 21:38:46	OBJ	I strongly object to this project. 1) Spending so much money for a 1 in 400,000 year event seems madness, especially when other parts of the country flood on a regular basis. Surely the money could be better spent elsewhere??? 2) I have spoken to many people about this, and I am yet to meet someone who thinks this project makes any sense, and is anything other than a waste of money at a time when the country is desperately cutting back on more important things in an attempt make ends meet. 3) Too many trees are already felled around Hampstead and the view from my flat has changed adversely and dramatically over the 20 years that I have been here. We don't need to cut yet more trees down! Let alone all the other damage and disruption that will take place. 4) The ponds have been there for something like 300 years with no problem, and surely it would be much easier to put early warning systems in place.
2014/4332/P	Cheyne Towers	79b Parliament Hill Mansions Lissenden Gardens London NW5 1NB	29/07/2014 15:46:03	OBJ	I am a Camden resident and I use the Heath every day and know the ponds. I Utterly oppose this idea and believe it is completely ridiculous. Do not allow thisto happen!

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	N Vuichard	25 Hillcroft crescent Ealing w5 2sg	29/07/2014 23:54:45	OBJ	<p>I object to the proposed submission for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> . Legally, Reservoirs Acts 1975 does not require works to be carried out on this massive scale . Realistically: look at the probability's model used: 1 biblical flood in 400 000 years!!! . Ignoring warnings and emergency services . Environmentally: permanent disfigurement of the Park, permanent to long term loss of fauna and flora, massive cut of trees . 2 years work planned means 4 years in reality during which: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> no bathing ponds no access on large parts of the Heath heavy engineering plant and thousands of HGV movements . £17million likely to be doubled <p>FAILING TO CONSIDER ANY OTHER ALTERNATIVE, FAR MORE REALISTIC AND LESS COSTLY : is that the good care of a Custodian?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> . Forgetting about all other bodies like Camden Council and Thames Water to reduce any flooding . City of London has ignored the results of its own limited consultation exercise (2013 and 2014) where two thirds of respondents were dissatisfied with all the dam proposals. Limited options given to comment on in the first place . Proposed works in the Ladies Pond not in tune with what was said and was is needed. Security (!) as well as swimming access issues during work <p>Under the pretense of Health and Safety new law, this project shows a total lack of respect and consideration for human beings, wildlife and Nature. A total lack of respect for LIFE. Who, in the Council, will dare to put his/her name on it?</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Mr M. Barton	12a Millfield Lane	29/07/2014 18:30:07	OBJ	<p>I attended the public meeting at Parliament Hill School. Surprised that only one option was offered (and that a contractor was already signed up): little if anything said about disruption to local residents and a barely plausible justification for wishing to go ahead with the scheme. On the basis of a 400,000 to one chance of a serious flood I object to the scheme going ahead . Instead I suggest that an effective early warning scheme is installed for the most vulnerable neighbourhood (check New Orleans). I also suggest that alternative, less disruptive and unsightly proposals are presented to the general public.No-one seems to have explored using the underground rivers Fleet & Kent to which excessive above ground water can be diverted thus preserving the existing rural atmosphere of the heath. In particular the current plans seem unnecessarily ambitious and out of scale with the landscape. For example, the boating pond will end up looking like some hydro-electric scheme - forgetting the purpose for which it was intended. A dam of 2.5m obscures the view from the southern path. And has anyone thought that the boating pond should be shallow enough to retrieve a model boat SAFELY?</p> <p>The design has done nothing to convince me that the end result will enhance the appearance of Hampstead Heath. The ponds now look exactly what they are: ponds - not reservoirs. By pointing to the to the excellence of the wild park at the Olympic site(created by your contractors) your case is flawed because the heath has been allowed to emerge naturally over 300 years as a rural delight in the heart of the city. It owes nothing to manufactured "naturalness". As a resident of Millfield Lane, I have yet to see any proposals for access to the site. As everyone knows, this is a heavily congested road at the best of times. Building schemes attract trucks and contractors" vans; walkers and others need constant access. I would object in the strongest possible terms if access to the dams (assuming they go ahead) is to be made from Millfield Lane. The safety of pedestrians, including children, would be at considerable risk if no separate provision is made - preferably by creating a secure access road across the heath from the main road.Bulky material could be helicoptered in.</p> <p>Much of this disruption would be avoided if the current proposals are scaled down sufficiently to reduce the risk of flooding combined with an effective early warning system. As things stand, the proposals are wholly unacceptable. They need thorough testing by independent experts (Dutch?) and several alternatives fully explored before any further hasty decisions are made.</p>
2014/4332/P	F. Fornasier	19 E Clapton Square	29/07/2014 14:39:12	OBJ	I think it's a terrible idea and object to it entirely.It would damage the heath, whose whole point and loveliness is to be exactly as it is, free, wild and wonderful. You must be crazy.
2014/4332/P	Graham Davies	23c Langland Gardens	29/07/2014 17:32:27	OBJ	This is an unwarranted disruption to a site of historical and natural beauty. The Heath may never be the same again and this opens up the floodgates to a wealth of other planning and development applications. There is already enough "development" work being undertaken on Hampstead Heath by the City of London e.g. managing trees (i.e. felling them), and an 1871 Act of Parliament was set up to protect the Heath from this. Surely this is illegal given the low risk of the threat of flooding that they are supposedly protecting against.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	simon perrott	75 dartmouth park hill london nw51jd	29/07/2014 20:30:33	COMMNT	I am appalled by this proposal. The ponds of Hampstead are one of the things that makes London such a livable and beautiful city. During the past week I have swam in the Mens pond 4 times; each time there was at least 2-3 dozen others also enjoying swimming in the pond. If this goes ahead it would be a travesty.
2014/4332/P	Tom Hinotn	9b St Thomas's Gardens	29/07/2014 17:03:07	PETITNOBJ E	This is totally unnecessary and a huge waste of money! As a Camden resident I object to this. It is totally unreasonable to deface one of the few natural areas in London and fell numerous ancient trees. A two year time scale is also unacceptable. The work that is proposed is totally disproportionate to the risk that exists and the damage to the heath will be irreversible. Please reject this for the good of the area, the residents, the natural beauty and all that enjoy it. Please resist the urge to push something through that is based on dubious computer analysis by people who have no regard for the users of the heath.
2014/4332/P	Barney Larkin	Flat 1 23 Highgate West Hill London N6 6NP	29/07/2014 15:57:31	OBJ	<p>Dear Camden Council,</p> <p>I object to this obdurate waste of money. The work is unnecessary, completely overstated considering the minimal risks, and will severely impact the environment, wildlife and people's enjoyment of the heath.</p> <p>I'd like to know what the alternatives are to this level of disruption. I'd like to know how the company was selected and more about the tender process for this project. I'd like to know how it was initially tabled, why now? Why is this essential work? I'd also like to know who performed the risk assessment and what their assessment criteria was.</p> <p>Yours Sincerely,</p> <p>Barney Larkin - local resident</p>
2014/4332/P	Nicholas Buxton	61 Exchange House 71 Crouch End Hill London N8 8DF	29/07/2014 21:41:25	COMMNT	I object to this proposal on the grounds that it is an excessive response to a hypothetical danger, and it would appear to contravene the 1871 Act that requires the Heath to remain in its 'natural aspect and state.' The Heath is a wonderful, necessary and much-loved resource used by many, and it would be permanently blighted by this proposal.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Peter Goodey	12 Sandwell Mansions West End Lane London NW6 1XL	29/07/2014 12:37:12	OBJNOT	<p>This work would contravene the Hampstead Heath Act of 1871 on the debatable conclusion of a 1 in 400,000 year event.</p> <p>Permitting this work would set a very dangerous precedent that would effectively override conservation laws if partisan studies can show a remote risk of damage to property. In practice this could open a back door into property development. Modern homo sapiens only evolved 250,000 years ago.</p> <p>Given that the City of London Corporation commissioned this study and 1 in 400,000 was the best statistic that could be arrived at, and the costs of the work, would seem to indicate an ulterior motive in commissioning this work at all. Especially given their thwarted desire to close the ponds.</p>
2014/4332/P	Joo Teoh	29 Kenwood Road N6 4EA	29/07/2014 15:14:46	OBJ	<p>As a local resident who uses the Heath and the ponds every week, I am strongly opposed to this development. The proposed development will destroy the natural setting, it will change this side of the Heath forever, and kill any sense of community that has been built up by those who use the ponds. This is an exercise in politics and economics, this is by no means necessary, nor essential. It must not be granted permission to proceed under any circumstances.</p>
2014/4332/P	Philip Herbert	5 newbury lodge hamilton park west n5 1ad	29/07/2014 14:28:55	INT	<p>I am against the Dams - there has been no significant evidence to prove they are required or essential . how about improving the facilities at all the ponds - updating the changing rooms , sun bathing areas - opening up to allow resting / sunbathing on the grassy areas . No Dams - more rest areas .</p>
2014/4332/P	Philip Herbert	5 newbury lodge hamilton park west n5 1ad	29/07/2014 14:28:33	INT	
2014/4332/P	Fred Leplat	11 Temple Fortune Lane NW11	29/07/2014 15:19:00	OBJ	<p>I oppose the application because of the impact on the Heath and question whether it is necessary given the very low level of risk</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Alice Hunter	Flat 1 98 Lady Margaret Road London N19 5EX	28/07/2014 20:41:53	COMMNT	<p>I am writing to object to the above work that is planned to take part on Hampstead Heath. I have been swimming in the Kenwood Ladies pond for several years and when I found out about the prospect of them being closed for unnecessary work I was appalled.</p> <p>Firstly, the ponds provide a sanctuary for regular swimmers and are a big draw for tourists. Closing the ponds, even if only temporarily, would leave people without this special place. Many of the people who swim in the ponds go there regularly - although the lido is nearby it is not the same and doesn't provide the same unique experience for tourists and regulars alike.</p> <p>I'm also unconvinced by the reasons presented for the work. A one-in-400 chance of flooding (which hasn't occurred for 300 years) is not adequate reason to carry out these intrusive and costly works. We've just had the wettest winter on record and the ponds did not flood. Even in the highly unlikely event that flooding did occur, the people who live in the houses that MAY be at risk would be able to take provisions to stop the flooding i.e. using sandbags.</p> <p>The money that you propose to spend on these works would be far better spent improving facilities such as toilets or perhaps providing recycling facilities on the Heath to reduce waste and litter.</p> <p>Overall I cannot see justification for these works and urge you to reconsider.</p>
2014/4332/P	David Lowe & Celia Bangham	101 Torrington Park North Finchley London N12 9PN	29/07/2014 15:28:07	OBJ	<p>As regular users of Hampstead Heath and its Men's and Ladies' Bathing Ponds, we wish to place an objection to the City of London Corporation's proposals for dam works on the Heath. Our grounds for objection are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed developments will be out of scale with the current environment and amenities. They will create much deeper ponds, with large and ugly embankments. The reasons given to justify this are based on spurious assessments of flooding risk that lack credibility and should be discounted. There has been no significant flooding from the ponds in the past 300 years, not even during 2013, the wettest winter on record. Creating significantly deeper ponds would surely increase, rather than decrease, the risk of floods. 2. The City of London Corporation is required, under the Hampstead Heath Act of 1871, to preserve it in its "natural state and aspect". Much of the value of the Heath lies in this natural state, with only minimal interference to create pathways etc. The planned dam works will permanently destroy the current natural aspect of the ponds, with the Boating Pond and Bathing Ponds at least being changed into unsightly municipal water reservoirs. 3. The plans forecast the loss of about 160 mature trees. 4. The development would permanently destroy much natural habitat, which currently supports a wide variety of wildlife in the vicinity of the ponds.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Piroska Markus	156 Commonwealth Way SE2 0LE	29/07/2014 14:54:46	OBJ	Completely disagree. Damns are known to be more harmful than useful. In addition, teh green open public spaces of London, with their trees, grass and ponds/lakes/canals, make London into a habitable place. If misguided commercial interest will allow to destroy the green public spaces, London will become unhealthy and an inhuman place to live in. Even commercial interest will suffer, although this is not my issues. Keep London green and human, there is already too much pollution and too much change just to follow the selfish interest of a few companies, a few rich people. They won't be able to eat their money when there will be nothing healthy left to eat and no fresh air to breath. The Hampstead ponds are just so beautiful, they are restful, they are good for body and soul. Thousands of people enjoy the benefits as they walk there, play their, or swim there, which is unbelievably nice. A damn in Hampstead would be crime against the local people, and the people of London. I used to work for Camden Social Services for over 7 years. Those days I went to the heath very regularly. Now I live in South London and I still often travel up to enjoy Hampstead and to swim in the Ladies' Pond. ir si a special experience. Swimming in a swimming pool is not even half the pleasure and the health benefits are questionable in a swimming pool, full of chloride.
