

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Christopher Smith	15 Yeatman Road Highgate N6 4DS	23/07/2014 23:37:30	INT	I am against the proposed works as it is an over reaction to the perceived threat of flooding, caused by the ponds over flowing in an extreme event ! This can be managed in a more holistic way, with minimal disruption to the heath and it's users. Early warning systems of an impending deluge could help with an evacuation. Even if you build dams and hold the water back, it is going to arrive downstream at some stage !! So let's save the heath from years of disruption to it's users and the wild life, trying to exist with fewer trees and reduced habitat. Let's create a more holistic approach with the heath and it's users contributing, rather than being bullied into submission by the big boys !!!
2014/4332/P	Mark Barclay	22 Constantine Road London NW3 2NG 22 Constantine Road	09/07/2014 17:25:04	OBJNOT	<p>As a local resident and daily user of The Heath I am totally opposed these proposed damaging and wholly unnecessary works that are tantamount to corporate vandalism.</p> <p>Firstly, there is no legal basis for these works. The works would be in direct contravention of the 1871 Hampstead Act and the proposed works fall outside of the remit of the 1975 Reservoirs.</p> <p>Secondly, in the event of catastrophic flood, which the City predicts is likely to occur no more than once every 400,000 years (!), any raising of the dams will have no impact, given that most of London will be under several feet of water if the City's prediction were true.</p> <p>Thirdly that once in 400,000 year event is a standard never before applied to any form of public works and is plainly nonsensical.</p> <p>Fourthly, Hampstead Heath is the jewel in London's crown - a unique and natural open space. If these disgraceful and disfiguring works are sanctioned, it will set a precedent for other superfluous structures on the Heath which will lead to its ultimate disappearance. This would be a personal tragedy for many millions.</p> <p>The pond dams should be properly maintained and managed and there are numerous unexplored alternatives to maiming the Heath that can fall within the boundaries of the 1871 Act.</p>
2014/4332/P	annabel jankel	annabel jankel 17 cavendish mansions mill lane london	24/07/2014 15:48:07	COMMNT	There is no need to spend £17M to build dams to protect the few buildings and some - on an offchance - surroundings that may possibly get flooded, but very very very unlikely, as the stats demonstrate. Why not insure the area, and buildings instead as the cost of insurance (if deemed necessary by housholders,) could be offset against their council tax. The maintenance alone, will be an ongoing extra burdon. I am wondering as an investigative journalist might wonder, who will be afforded this contract, or contracts, and who benefits financially from awarding it and winning it?
2014/4332/P	Barry Fox	22 Holmefield Court Belsize Grove NW3 4TT	27/07/2014 12:20:31	COMMNT	My concern is that Corporation of London cannot be trusted. In 2004/2005 they gave a variety of spurious reasons for closing swimming ponds on Hampstead Heath and only withdrew the plans when faced with public outrage. Why should they now be trusted on placing hugely expensive contracts to build dams to protect against statistically insignificant risks - when the work will be hugely disruptive to the Heath and surrounding area?

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Barry Fox	22 Holmefield Court Belsize Grove NW3 4TT	27/07/2014 12:20:09	COMMNT	My concern is that Corporation of London cannot be trusted. In 2004/2005 they gave a variety of spurious reasons for closing swimming ponds on Hampstead Heath and only withdrew the plans when faced with public outrage. Why should they now be trusted on placing hugely expensive contracts to build dams to protect against statistically insignificant risks - when the work will be hugely disruptive to the Heath and surrounding area?
2014/4332/P	Bridget Leach	316 Alexandra Park Road London N22 7BD	15/07/2014 14:34:58	OBJ	As a user of the swimmings ponds and a lover of the Heath I feel very strongly that the proposed works should NOT be carried out. The heath is a place where many people in and around London find peace and quiet and where nature has been allowed to flourish. A huge number of people appreciate this and cities need these special places. The proposed works will involve uprooting a large number of trees and erecting what can only be very unsympathetic structures, and so not only will the Heath be changed forever but the impact of the building works will be awful for users of the Heath and ponds too. And all of this for works which are of questionable benefit anyway, the case for them is not proven. Please, please stop and think before embarking on these rather brutal works on such a wonderful landscape loved by many people.
2014/4332/P	Bridget Leach	316 Alexandra Park Road London N22 7BD	15/07/2014 14:34:36	OBJ	
2014/4332/P	Peter Dockley	129 Constantine Rd NW32LR	23/07/2014 12:38:58	COMMNT	I am appalled by the ridiculous plans to create huge dams on the Heath Ponds, which will despoil the much loved landscapes of the Heath for ever. I use the Heath on a daily basis and the thought of heavy machinery and trucks dominating parts of the Heath for two years, spreading toxic fumes from diesel fuel, and severely limiting our access to favourite parts of the Heath is both depressing and infuriating, all for a minute risk of any actual flooding; 1 in 400, 000 is I think the statistical probability. Even the stated legal prerogative seems to have no real basis in law, and is to be challenged through a judicial review. I would sincerely ask the Camden Planning Committee to turn down these proposals. The suspicion amongst many of us who love and use the Heath is that the contractors involved will make huge profits from these proposed works but the real cost will be felt by ordinary Heath users who will lose the vital recreational and leisure facilities afforded by these beautiful open spaces. Many of us are kept sane by the frequent access to Nature that the Heath provides, in an increasingly stressful world. Diesel fuelled trucks and heavy machinery dominating large parts of the Heath for two years will only add to levels of stress and tension. The disruption to wildlife is another distressing aspect of these plans, as is the loss of over 160 mature trees. This is all unthinkable. I really hope the Planning Committee will take the sane course and reject these heavy handed plans. Thankyou, Peter Dockley
2014/4332/P	brian simpson	50 Milton Park London N6 5QA	11/07/2014 10:28:20	OBJNOT	The scheme will damage the appearance of the Heath is not legally required and it will not prevent flooding of residential areas downstream. The existing dams should be strengthened internally to prevent collapse, without altering their external appearance.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	edward markwardt	13 sirdar Road Wood Green London N22 6QP	26/07/2014 22:00:17	OBJ	I have used the boating, mens and mixed bathing ponds regularly for over 40 years and that area of the Heath for recreational purposes for the same length of time. I object to the planning application as this will result in the cutting down of hundreds of trees some of which are mature. The ponds will be closed for some years and large areas of the heath closed to the public for the same length of time. There will be massive disruption to the Heath and surrounding roads by large lorries and tipper trucks. The work is not necessary on such a large scale. Homes and lives could be better protected by improving the Heaths natural capacity to hold water, by making minor improvements to existing dams and investing in an early warning system. The Catchpit valley above the mixed pond should remain and not be obliterated. The concrete wall above the mens pond should not be built because it will be unsightly, the work disruptive to residents, visitors and wildlife. The boating pond does not need to be redesigned or spillways built. The City of London Corporation has based its proposals on unrealistic computer modelling and does not need to proceed with the works proposed.
2014/4332/P	Kath Miller	3 Francis Walk Islington London N10LJ	15/07/2014 10:02:32	PETITNOBJ E	I object to the proposed dam works appl. no. 2014/4332/p on the grounds that it would permanently adversely alter a unique beautiful landscape used by Londoners, and visitors the world over...entailing the massive felling of trees, environmental loss to humans and wild life. The proposed plan would make for a far blander, less human London. The Heath as it is makes London special and a great place to live.
2014/4332/P	Wendy Wallace	44 Leaside Avenue London N10 3BU	15/07/2014 09:59:15	COMMNT	Please leave our precious resource - that is of inestimable value to the physical and mental health of the people of London - alone. The scheme will spoil the natural beauty of our ponds and seems of dubious merit. Also overwhelmingly unpopular.
2014/4332/P	edward markwardt	13 sirdar Road Wood Green London N22 6QP	26/07/2014 22:00:17	OBJ	I have used the boating, mens and mixed bathing ponds regularly for over 40 years and that area of the Heath for recreational purposes for the same length of time. I object to the planning application as this will result in the cutting down of hundreds of trees some of which are mature. The ponds will be closed for some years and large areas of the heath closed to the public for the same length of time. There will be massive disruption to the Heath and surrounding roads by large lorries and tipper trucks. The work is not necessary on such a large scale. Homes and lives could be better protected by improving the Heaths natural capacity to hold water, by making minor improvements to existing dams and investing in an early warning system. The Catchpit valley above the mixed pond should remain and not be obliterated. The concrete wall above the mens pond should not be built because it will be unsightly, the work disruptive to residents, visitors and wildlife. The boating pond does not need to be redesigned or spillways built. The City of London Corporation has based its proposals on unrealistic computer modelling and does not need to proceed with the works proposed.
2014/4332/P	IAN KAY	11 BALMORAL COURT WEMBLEY PARK DRIVE WEMBLEY HA9 8JQ	15/07/2014 15:43:24	COMMNT	THE PROPOSED DAMS: 1. WORSEN THE VIEW OF THE AREA 2. WILL DISRUPT SWIMMING IN THE PONDS 3. THE STATED RISK OF MASSIVE FLOODING IS REMOTE

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Sophie Richmond	7 Montague Road N8 9PJ	14/07/2014 08:48:32	OBJ	I wish to object to this planning application. It is unnecessary, costly, and will ruin a beloved part of the Heath for its many thousands of users forever.
2014/4332/P	Pauline Croker	63a Dresden Road	15/07/2014 20:48:52	OBJ	Protection from notional flooding means thousands of Heath users adversely affected for two years plus. Please think again.
2014/4332/P	David Baker	74D AMWELL STREET LONDON EC1R 1UU	23/07/2014 10:18:16	OBJ	I wish to object to this planning application. It is unnecessary, based on unrealistic modelling. It will cause huge disruption and the loss of large number of trees. And I don't believe the Reservoir Act 1975 requires such large works.
2014/4332/P	Mary Cance	80 Burghley Road London NW5 1UN	21/07/2014 18:21:13	OBJNOT	The proposed engineering works are primarily contrary to the 1871 Hampstead Heath Act that seeks to protect the landscape of Hampstead Heath from major alteration. The proposed works are major engineering and will not only change the landscape permanently (contrary to the act) But disrupt public access to a much used and loved public open space for a significant period. A event public consultation by the CoL about the works revealed widespread. Disapproval of the works and has been ignored. Promises to keep a swimming facility for women only open have been reneged on. Proper, effective public flood warning systems have not been Put in place. The proposed works are extraordinarily disfiguring disfiguring of our well loved landscape.
2014/4332/P	Michael Tomkins	3 Wellington Road Kensal Green London	24/07/2014 23:12:40	COMMNT	I object to any development that will damage the scenery and effect the wild life in the Hampstead ponds. I swim in this lovely area every year and object to anything that will spoil it. Please leave it as it is and respect peoples objections.
2014/4332/P	Crispin Tucker	30 QuernmoreRoad London N4 4 N4 4QX	21/07/2014 08:58:42	OBJ	Will cause a huge amount of disruption on and around the Heath to produce something which is completely unnecessary; indeed the structures themselves will have to be rebuilt several times due to ageing before the chance of them serving their intended purpose is met.
2014/4332/P	Peter Sussmann	33 Northway NW116PB	18/07/2014 12:42:02	COMMNT	As a user of Hampstead Heath and the amenities thereon, strongly object to proposals under application 2014/4332/P Peter Sussmann 33 Northway NW11 6PB
2014/4332/P	Audrey lovelock	1 Lansdowne house	27/07/2014 09:58:32	OBJ	I don't agree with this works there has never been any problem and the probability is too low to validate the works. Please don't do it the damage is too great

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	edward markwardt	13 sirdar Road Wood Green London N22 6QP	26/07/2014 21:59:55	OBJ	I have used the boating, mens and mixed bathing ponds regularly for over 40 years and that area of the Heath for recreational purposes for the same length of time. I object to the planning application as this will result in the cutting down of hundreds of trees some of which are mature. The ponds will be closed for some years and large areas of the heath closed to the public for the same length of time. There will be massive disruption to the Heath and surrounding roads by large lorries and tipper trucks. The work is not necessary on such a large scale. Homes and lives could be better protected by improving the Heaths natural capacity to hold water, by making minor improvements to existing dams and investing in an early warning system. The Catchpit valley above the mixed pond should remain and not be obliterated. The concrete wall above the mens pond should not be built because it will be unsightly, the work disruptive to residents, visitors and wildlife. The boating pond does not need to be redesigned or spillways built. The City of London Corporation has based its proposals on unrealistic computer modelling and does not need to proceed with the works proposed.
2014/4332/P	Maria Attridge	6 Fairlawn Mansions	25/07/2014 23:13:51	COMMNT	I deeply object to this destruction of the delicate Hampstead flora and fauna.
2014/4332/P	Dave Chambers	4 cleve rd nw6 3rr	24/07/2014 22:46:40	OBJ	It's totally unnecessary and wont improve the heath visually , environmentally or for safety. Damnonsense
2014/4332/P	Mr and Mrs Jeremy Sinclair	Millfield Cottage Millfield Lane London N6 6JH	24/07/2014 16:13:55	OBJ	Reasons for objection: i. The proposed dam wall crosses our land and we have not agreed to have it; ii. We haven't received accurate drawings of the proposal with regard to its height above existing ground lines and certainly don't want a wood clad wall across our garden; iii. The height of the wall between the boating pond and the swimming pond seems excessive. Other Points: iv. We would suggest the council await the outcome of the judicial review before coming to a conclusion; v. We will resist with all available means any impairment of our house or garden.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Tricia Clarke	79 Yerbury Rd London N19 4RW	09/07/2014 18:46:30	OBJ	<p>I am a regular Heath user and swim in the mixed and ladies ponds. I object to this application as the cost and damage to the environment of the Heath is not justified by the perceived threat of flooding which is small. 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> <p>The City became custodian of the Heath in 1989. It is now making a planning application to Camden Council to carry out the proposed works. You can also help in other ways.</p>
2014/4332/P	Masha Karp	Flat E Whitefriars Court 77 Compayne Gardens London NW6 3 RT	24/07/2014 23:19:02	COMMNT	I object to the dam building. Please leave the Heath alone!

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Lina Pio	Flat 2 Prince Arthur Court Prince Arthur Mews NW3 1RD	19/07/2014 16:26:36	OBJ	<p>The harms identified are entirely imaginary, and nobody but the developers stand to gain out of this.</p> <p>Please respect the 1871 Heath Act and leave it as it is.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
2014/4332/P	Elizabeth Valentine	41 Falkland Road	11/07/2014 22:14:03	OBJ	<p>This application should be rejected on the grounds that it will permanently disfigure the Heath, its legal necessity is in doubt --indeed it contravenes the 1871 Hampstead Heath Act, it is based on a spurious model of risk and will not prevent the supposed flooding.</p>
2014/4332/P	Deborah Shewell	Lady Margaret Road N19 5EX	25/07/2014 18:39:51	OBJ	<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>We 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. The works would contravene the Hampstead Heath Act of 1871 which requires that Hampstead Heath be preserved in its "natural aspect and state".</p>
2014/4332/P	Carrie Longton	34 Pilgrims Lane	16/07/2014 12:48:16	COMMNT	<p>Please do not do this. It will destroy one of the few remaining wild parts of London. The stats supporting it make no sense at all - at all! During the wettest winter ever when the rest of the Uk was drowning the ponds levels weren't even particularly high. I know. I swim in them all year round. What is being proposed will ruin my life and the lives of countless others who find solace and peace in the ponds as they are.</p> <p>This sounds emotive, but I have also attended meetings and studied plans. I live locally and want to remain safe and secure and I have heard NOTHING that makes me think that this scheme will add to my safety and security. I implore someone on the planning committee to look again at the facts, be bold and stand up to the developers and destroyers of natural beauty. Please do not go ahead. Please</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Farid Littleproud	Flat B 4 Kemplay Road London NW3 1SY	19/07/2014 19:38:01	OBJ	I think it is terrible that in a time of financial austerity, Camden Council wants to spend so much money on such a pointless project that will disrupt the lives of some many users of Hampstead Heath. It is clear to the public that there is no need for this project because the chance of flooding is so low and it is in fact due to corruption within the council. Knowing the type of people that use Hampstead Heath, if the project goes ahead, there will be direct action which will further increase the cost of the project, and also eventually there will be legal action against the council. I do hope that the council comes to its senses and cancels the project.
2014/4332/P	Rose Ades	3 Pottery street London SE16 4PH	23/07/2014 15:13:56	OBJ	The proposed engineering works comprising dams and other infrastructure to reduce potential flood risk should not be permitted - because it will severely damage the heath's natural capacity/resilience to flooding and more general climate change/severe weather mitigation - alternate approaches (particularly including retaining existing trees, and planting more) which have multiple benefits should be considered before this kind of 'sledge-hammer' which will cause considerable habitat, eco-system and social loss as well as being at odds with the statute that created the heath, and at odds with responsible, modern and sustainable river catchment management practices.
2014/4332/P	Sarah Sutton	9 Gold Hill SP7 8HB	18/07/2014 22:24:56	OBJNOT	<p>Hampstead Ponds and Heath are uniquely beautiful and have been appreciated and respected over generations for the sensitive way they have been used, managed, protected and preserved. However, the current planning proposal seems heavy-handed and at odds with the nature and purpose of the original agreement and principles.</p> <p>As the Ponds have never flooded, even during the most severe weather in the UK for decades. Why is this project needed at all?</p> <p>I would like to make four primary objections:</p> <p>1) The cost - it is an extraordinary sum to be spending on a project that so many dispute is necessary. Could the money be diverted towards maintaining the local drains and sewers instead?</p> <p>2) Personal safety - The ponds have an open feel to them at present. The raised banks proposed in the construction would create a closed-in, tunnel effect. The new man-made construction has the potential to channel walkers and hide them from view, creating a potential problem spot, with the potential to jeopardise personal safety.</p> <p>3) Protection of habitat - Those with expertise say that the noise and upheaval would destroy much of the biodiversity, which would take years to recover - if at all.</p> <p>4) Privacy and light - The height of the new construction has the potential to intrude on the privacy and quality of light of some of the current residents in Millfield Lane.</p> <p>Finally - please listen to the voices of your local residents. The upheaval will lead to a decrease in visitors and will prevent people from using the ponds. (Is that perhaps part of the plan?) Once changed, the uniqueness and beauty will be gone forever.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Miles Aldridge	19 Brookfield Mansions Highgate West Hill London N6 6AS	15/07/2014 10:15:28	PETITNOBJ E	I have studied all the available data on this proposed scheme and it is clear that this project is a waste of money and time as well as making the ponds unusable for those who presently use them daily. I hope this misguided scheme is shelved and the money saved is used for other more worthy projects
2014/4332/P	paul fincham	20 belitha villas london n1 1pd	15/07/2014 10:26:08	INT	I am a frequent user of the bathing ponds on Hampstead Heath and object to these works on the grounds that they are an unnecessary waste of taxpayers' money, will cause disruption, will disfigure the heath and will provide no discernible benefit. Paul Fincham
2014/4332/P	Caspar van Vark	56 Twisden Road	15/07/2014 10:15:04	COMMNT	I question the need for these works to be done. Having attended the public meeting in early June, it appears that the chance of any catastrophic flood is extremely small, and these major works are therefore totally disproportionate to the risk.
2014/4332/P	SIMON PRENTIS	5 VILLAGE MOUNT PERRINS COURT LONDON NW3 1QU	23/07/2014 11:15:14	INT	The great joy of the Heath is the unspoilt, organic character of its landscape. The ponds, originally constructed as reservoirs, have been there for several hundred years and there is no recorded instance of flooding. As the CoL's own consultation survey shows, the public are overwhelmingly against what would be an unsightly and intrusive scar on a landscape that was one of the very first to be preserved as a natural resource for the nation by an Act of Parliament. This application is being driven overwhelmingly by a fear of potential legal accountability based on an event with a vanishingly small probability of occurring -- once in 400,000 years -- and should be thrown out for the absurdity it is. The money would be much better spent on improving the drainage and sewage systems in the vicinity which would fail much faster under extreme conditions than the existing dams are ever likely to do. Alternatively, CoL could use their budget to take out insurance -- at odds of 400,000 to one they should get some pretty good rates. On a final note, I understand that the 1975 Reservoirs Act does not require work to be carried out on such a scale in any case. Do the right thing and send them packing.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Tom Playford	26 Mackeson Road London NW3 2LT	23/07/2014 11:10:47	OBJ	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I object to these proposed works on Hampstead Heath.</p> <p>They are unnecessary from legal, safety and environmental reasons. They are modelling for a storm with a 1 in 400,000 year probability and assuming no warning of emergency services.</p> <p>The Heath's landscape will be disfigured. An ugly concrete wall at the Men's Bathing pond as well as huge earthworks.</p> <p>160 trees will be felled for no real gain.</p> <p>There will be significant disruption from heavy plant and the closure of the popular bathing ponds.</p> <p>It also seems likely that these works will contravene the Hampstead Heath Act (1871) (16. [The Greater London Council] shall at all times preserve as far as may be the natural aspect and state of the Heath...)</p> <p>In summary, this planning application should be rejected as it is unnecessary and causes significant damage to the Heath and disruption to those who use it or live near to it.</p> <p>Tom Playford</p>
2014/4332/P	Erik de Haan	2 West Hill Court	15/07/2014 13:02:43	OBJ	<p>I have been swimming in the men's pond since 2000, on a very regular basis, and I have never seen the water level rise beyond the lowest fence/pier level. Draining is entirely adequate. A project like this strikes me as absurd, wasteful, and damaging to the landscape and nature. If more safety is needed it would be easy to create an overflow basin lower down, next to parliament hill busstops. At the very least alternatives should be considered.</p>
2014/4332/P	MICHAEL ELLMAN	66 GODDARD PLACE LONDON N19 5GT	23/07/2014 10:03:04	INT	<p>As a frequent user of the Men's Pond and the Mixed Pond, I object to the planned dam raising and alterations to the chain of ponds on Hampstead Heath, which are unnecessary, and will spoil the amenities of the ponds.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Steve peacock	1 West Hill Court Millfield Lane N6 6JJ	27/07/2014 12:33:33	OBJ	<p>I wish to object to the proposed works to the chains of ponds on Hampstead Heath.</p> <p>The proposals are based on scenario modelling that is completely unrealistic - a weather event with a 1 in 400,000 year probability, happening without warning, and with no emergency services in place (let alone the fact that such an event would have such consequences that dams on the Heath would be irrelevant).</p> <p>The proposal will lead to unacceptable disfigurement of the landscape with the huge earthworks and concrete walls ruining the essentially natural landscape of the Heath. The loss of 160 trees as part of the work is unacceptable.</p> <p>Finally, the disruption to users of the Heath and nearby residents, and harm to wildlife of over 2 years construction work is not acceptable, involving closure of significant parts of the Heath, use of heavy plant machinery, and a huge amount of HGV traffic.</p>
2014/4332/P	Marianne Mattinson	143a Prince of Wales Rd. NW53PU	27/07/2014 12:33:06	COMMNT	<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. 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".
2014/4332/P	Michael McDonough	45 Dongola Road London N17 6EB	23/07/2014 10:44:40	OBJ	<p>I feel these works would utterly destroy the unique character of the ponds whereas the benefits are tenuous. London is unique in being a world class city with an area of such wildness close to its centre. Carrying out these works would irrevocably mar one of the capital's outstanding features. These ponds are of incalculable benefit to many people, particularly those suffering from mental health or emotional problems. Taking away the wild nature of the ponds would destroy their healing properties. I am not convinced that alternative means of protecting against floods wouldn't be just as effective as these proposed works.</p>
2014/4332/P	Sue Vroobel	22 Constantine Road	13/07/2014 21:08:59	OBJ	<p>I oppose the engineering works. It is a disgrace that the City is planning to spend £15,000,000 on unnecessary work that will ruin the natural and unique environment. I attended the recent meeting and was absolutely horrified to see the proposed plans.</p>
2014/4332/P	SUSAN ROSE HIGHGATE CAAC CHAIR	HEATH WINDS MERTON LANE N6 6NA	27/07/2014 09:54:41	COMNOT	<p>Highgate CAAC feels that no detailed response to this planning application which clearly has the potential to cause immense damage to the Conservation Area and the amenities of many local residents until the legality of the proposals has been established by means of the pending judicial review. No decision is possible until after this has been decided.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Charles Simmonds	205 Tufnell Park Road London N7 0PU.	27/07/2014 02:25:38	OBJ	<p>Dear Camden,</p> <p>Please stop this absurd example of expensive vandalism.</p> <p>Shutting down our beloved swimming ponds along with the others whilst spending upwards of £10m on a one-in-400,000-year risk is ridiculous.</p> <p>Furthermore, the end result threatens to change the character of serveral areas of the heath for the worse whilst destroying many of the heath's mature trees.</p> <p>The alternative, cheaper and dramatically less impactful and damaging proposals are far more suitable and sensible.</p> <p>With thanks,</p> <p>Charles Simmonds. London N7 0PU. Regular heath user and pond swimmer.</p>
2014/4332/P	Ruth Steadman	Flat 10 55 Fitzjohns Avenue London NW3 6PH	25/07/2014 17:54:34	COMMNT	<p>These works sem to be entirely unnecessary. Even after the drenching rains earlier this year the ponds did not flood. To spend vast amounts of money to prevent a once in 400,000 year event seems both arbitrary and foolish. Meanwhile there would be a 100% certainty of spoiling Hampstead Heath, a vital London amenity, certainly for the duration of the works and very possibly in perpetuity. An 18 foot high dam would block out views, more than 100 trees would be cut down, and for what? To give work to Atkins? The Hearh's users, as the. consultation found, overwhelmingly do not want these works. I very much hope you, as the representatives of the Heath's users, will reject this proposal.</p>
2014/4332/P	David Wilson	83 Tufnell Park Road N7 0PS	16/07/2014 11:24:15	COMMNT	<p>The proposed works will damage the natural aspect of Hampstead Heath, which is protected by act of parliament. They proposals are the result of an unreasonable approach to risk assessment.</p>
2014/4332/P	M-J Low	Vivary Cottage Vale of Health London NW3 1AZ	21/07/2014 10:38:41	OBJ	<p>I object to this application. There is no need for the amount of work that is being put forward. There are far easier solutions which wouldn't need heavy construction. What are the chances of having this heavy downpour anyway?Warning systems would be a far better solution.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Casimir Knight	2b South Hill Park	20/07/2014 07:10:41	OBJ	<p>I believe this application to be totally without merit. It has been put forward due to (i) flooding concerns which are completely unrealistic and (ii) the self-interest of engineers who will themselves benefit from the works. The works are both unnecessary and over-engineered. They will do enormous visual damage to the Heath - damage which can not be undone. The City of London's ongoing commercialisation and "rationalisation" of the Heath is sadly destroying it.</p> <p>The dam works are not required by the Reservoirs Act 1970, and they are forbidden by the Hampstead Heath Act 1871. This question will be resolved in the High Court. Until then, Camden should refuse permission to proceed.</p>
2014/4332/P	Birgit Maass	16 Fitzroy Square	18/07/2014 14:47:06	INT	I am worried about the impact on nature and wildlife on the Heath. I am also of the opinion that it is an unnecessarily big construction that is proposed.
2014/4332/P	Ruth Steadman	Flat 10 55 Fitzjohns Avenue London NW3 6PH	25/07/2014 17:54:31	COMMNT	These works sem to be entirely unnecessary. Even after the drenching rains earlier this year the ponds did not flood. To spend vast amounts of money to prevent a once in 400,000 year event seems both arbitrary and foolish. Meanwhile there would be a 100% certainty of spoiling Hampstead Heath, a vital London amenity, certainly for the duration of the works and very possibly in perpetuity. An 18 foot high dam would block out views, more than 100 trees would be cut down, and for what? To give work to Atkins? The Heath's users, as the consultation found, overwhelmingly do not want these works. I very much hope you, as the representatives of the Heath's users, will reject this proposal.
2014/4332/P	Jill Grinstead	Flat 3 9 Highgate High Street N6 5JR	25/07/2014 14:47:10	COMNOT	<p>Dear Camden</p> <p>Thank you for the chance to comment. First, in my view the size of this scheme is disproportionate to the risk of flooding and will change for ever the character of an exceptionally natural feature in an urban setting, a feature of which Camden and its residents are very very proud. I use the ladies bathing pond every week, including during the winter when I am in town and thus feel entitled to comment.</p> <p>Secondly, there appear to be competing legal arguments about the necessity of the dam enlargement scheme. If the lawyers cannot agree, then surely Camden must not allow the application. I would propose rejection or a further full review of the legal and environmental options.</p> <p>Kind regards Jill Grinstead 9 Highgate High Street N65JR</p>
2014/4332/P	David Wilson	83 Tufnell Park Road N7 OPS	16/07/2014 11:23:59	COMMNT	The proposed works will damage the natural aspect of Hampstead Heath, which is protected by act of parliament. They proposals are the result of an unreasonable approach to risk assessment.
2014/4332/P	David Wilson	83 Tufnell Park Road N7 OPS	16/07/2014 11:23:48	COMMNT	

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Paul Mylrea	17 Baalbec Road N5 1QN	16/07/2014 16:57:40	COMMNT	I oppose these works, which I do not believe are required, which will disfigure the Heath, and which will not eliminate the risk of downstream flooding which is the ostensible reason for the works. I believe the works are in breach of the Hampstead Heath Act 1871. In addition, I do not believe there has been a proper consultation, with several of the pictures used misrepresenting the impact, for example including trees which are marked for felling under the actual works. The consultation has also failed to take account of the opposition of key stakeholders. I believe these works are not in the interests of resident, Londoners or indeed anyone who wishes to preserve green spaces.
2014/4332/P	Daniel Rogger	36 Chandos Way NW117HF	15/07/2014 22:06:27	COMMNT	<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>It seems that 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 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>I call on Camden Council to reject the City of London's Planning Application.</p> <p>With best wishes,</p> <p>Dan Rogger</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Dominique Le Gendre	Flat 18 Lucas House Albion Avenue London SW8 2AD	24/07/2014 22:28:59	OBJ	<p>I object to the works proposed on the following grounds:</p> <p>1. Legality:</p> <p>Reservoirs Act 1975 does legally not require works to be carried out on this huge scale.</p> <p>2.Unrealistic Modelling:</p> <p>The models for a giant storm with a 1 in 400,000 year probability assumes no warning and no emergency services.</p> <p>3. Disfigurement of the Heath landscape:</p> <p>New and unnatural huge earthworks and excavations at Catchpit and Model Boating Pond. Concrete walls at the Men's Bathing Pond and Highgate No.1 Pond.</p> <p>4. Tree Loss:</p> <p>Over 160 trees are scheduled to be felled with a large tree loss at Stock Pond to create a giant spillway.</p> <p>5. Closure and Disruption:</p> <p>2 years of works will require closure of popular parts of the Heath; Closure of bathing ponds. Heavy engineering plant and thousands of HGV movements resulting in congestion and road damage. Damage to wildlife.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	William Johnston	3 Islingword Street Brighton	15/07/2014 19:13:21	OBJ	<p>I write as a former regular user of the Heath and ponds, and now as an irregular visitor, but with concerns and considerable knowledge of Hampstead Heath and its value.</p> <p>This application is completely over-the-top; based on a risk assessment of such catastrophic proportions as to be quite meaningless. If the conditions were to occur such as might produce the consequences described in this application, most of London would in any case be drowned by the sheer quantities of water that would have to be involved.</p> <p>Last winter was one of the wettest on record. There was absolutely no indication of any problem whatsoever with any of the existing dams.</p> <p>The damage, in any case, that will be caused to Hampstead Heath if this application is agreed rivals the consequences described in the application. One is a risk of almost negligible likelihood; the other is a certainty in the light of the work being proposed.</p> <p>If risk assessments were to be applied in this manner generally in relation to engineering projects, nothing new would ever be built, and anything older than ten years would need to be condemned.</p> <p>The application is a nonsense and should be rejected.</p>
2014/4332/P	David Halpern	13 Devon Rise London N2 0AA	20/07/2014 21:41:23	OBJ	<p>As a regular user of the Heath and swimmer in the Men's Pond, I strongly object to these works, which are contrary to the 1871 Act and involve ugly and disproportionate work in order to meet an infinitesimal risk.</p> <p>I understand that the Heath & Hampstead Society is bringing judicial review proceedings. I urge the planners to await the outcome of those proceedings.</p> <p>I cannot understand why the CoL is opposing the JR proceedings - you would have thought that they would be delighted to get a ruling confirming that these works are unnecessary.</p>
2014/4332/P	John Weston	9A Gainsborough Gardens Hampstead London	20/07/2014 17:55:41	OBJ	<p>The dams proposal is neither necessary nor required by law. It will ruin the tranquility of the heath for years during construction and leave a municipal, over-engineered solution to a non-existent problem. The ponds have never flooded, even in the storm of 1975. And even if a catastrophic 1 in 400,000year storm were to occur the drains would be overwhelmed and areas beneath the dams would be flooded long before the possibility that the ponds would flood. This is health and safety gone mad.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Elaine Harris	17 Langland Gardens	23/07/2014 11:39:46	COMMNT	Please don't ruin the peace and tranquility of this wonderful and unique area of London. The construction work will badly affect the lives of the thousands of Heath users who regularly walk around the ponds and the paths. There is no justification for this and no good, validated reason that has been put forward that justifies the expense and disruption. Perhaps there are other more sinister, undisclosed reasons why this work is being planned. An ulterior motive that the public have not been told about. If this is the case surely there is a legal obligation to provide full disclosure and details of who will be benefiting financially from this work. I'm sure it's not being done for purely altruistic reasons, very few things are.
2014/4332/P	Sheila Fitzgerald	62 Blake Road	27/07/2014 20:45:50	OBJ	Dear Caretakers of the public good, Please do all in your power to stop extreme, needless construction on our beloved Hampstead Heath. Please reject the Corporation of London's disfiguring, exaggerated plans and open the way for sensible alternatives to this overly expensive, hugely intrusive scheme. Present and future pond lovers will be forever indebted. Thank you!
2014/4332/P	Robert Sutherland Smith	18 Widecombe Way Hampstead Garden Suburb London N2 0HL	15/07/2014 14:02:02	OBJNOT	I oppose this application. Hampstead Heath is a rare, unique and comparatively small place. It will needlessly demean and destroy prospects forever: e.g. the views over the boating pond, one of the most charming and attractive prospects on the Heath. Preserving such views is the spirit and purpose of the 1871 Hampstead Heath Act. The council must insist that alternatives are fully examined. In the belief of many they have not.
2014/4332/P	Robert Sutherland Smith	18 Widecombe Way Hampstead Garden Suburb London N2 0HL	15/07/2014 14:01:40	OBJNOT	
2014/4332/P	Amelia Thompson	6 Tornay House	27/07/2014 17:37:55	OBJ	I don't believe this work needs carrying out. I believe there is insufficient proof to approve this plan.
2014/4332/P	Helen Lachmann	21 St Leonard's Square London NW5 3HL	27/07/2014 17:36:47	OBJ	I write to object to this application on the grounds of destruction of a precious environment and public amenity, tree loss, and the out of character and permanently visible nature of proposed changes. For what it's worth I also object to the waste of public money and the over defensive response of the City of London Corporation and failure to consider less destructive solution. I have lived and worked near the Heath for 15 years and am appalled and the proposed wanton damage to a much loved and widely used area of natural open space and beauty.
2014/4332/P	Margaretha Smits	23 Highgate High Street	25/07/2014 18:00:55	OBJ	Please don't allow this large scale construction work to be carried out. The risk of flooding is minimal and the scale of this proposal completely out of proportion. A 1:400000 years risk? And we've just had the wettest winter on record with not a drop overflowing. The only people benefitting from this would be the contractors while millions of Londoners and visitors will suffer. The Heath is such a special place, don't allow the destruction of this beautiful haven of wildlife and tranquility.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Lucy Murphy	41 St John's Grove London N19 5RP N19 5RP	25/07/2014 17:30:12	COMMNT	<p>This proposal is flawed in so many aspects. The reason for doing the work is to prevent something that has so far never happened. There must be far more pressing needs for such a huge expenditure.</p> <p>It will result in the loss of many trees, and the disturbance of a natural ecosystem that would take many years to recover.</p> <p>Hampstead Heath is a sanctuary to animals, birds, insects and not forgetting us humans. Two years of chaos and destruction must be avoided to preserve this sanctuary.</p> <p>And what will we end up with - an eyesore. The views across the ponds are a delight not only for bird watchers and swimmers but also in terms of the overall visual harmony of the environment for all those who use the Heath. The proposed earthworks will take away that natural vista and replace it with a clearly man made structure in the form of a series of raised dam walls.</p> <p>Please, please stop this unnecessary and damaging planning proposal.</p>
2014/4332/P	Gary Michalek	80 South Hill Park The Studio London NW3 2SN	17/07/2014 15:21:41	OBJ	<p>The standard being applied (a one in 400,000 year event) is totally arbitrary and they provide no justification for this apart from a desire to keep their names out of the paper in the event of a disaster (an oft expressed fear during their presentation last month). Not only is the project unnecessary but the before/after pictures are dishonest, using tricks of perspective, blatant colouring over of details, and careful selection of views to make it seem less destructive than it is.</p> <p>I understand there is a great deal of money involved and work provided for a great many labourers, but the heath is not meant to be used as a money making venture for the corporation or any companies they do business with. In spite of their assertion (at the abovementioned meeting) that they are the landowners of the heath, they are not. I hope that the moneyed influence they can exert does not give them the chance to act like they are.</p>
2014/4332/P	Eliza Tyrrell	18 Penerley rd London sE6 2LQ	25/07/2014 18:37:07	COMMNT	<p>Clearly there is no proven case for the benefits or need for these works. The dam is unnecessary and a cynical attempt to recover the use of the ponds from the people who enjoy the landscape and healthy exercise the ponds provide. Please stop this crazy proposal and show us money and power don't always buy the right to destroy nature for no reason. I travel from the other end of London regularly to use the ponds. The women's pond is the ONLY outdoor women's space in London and should be protected</p>
2014/4332/P	claire roche	victoria pk rd victoria park road e95dy	25/07/2014 17:58:10	PETITNSU PP	camden please dont let them do this xx
2014/4332/P	claire roche	victoria pk rd victoria park road e95dy	25/07/2014 17:58:10	PETITNSU PP	

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Yvonne Moore	77 SOuth Hill Park	25/07/2014 17:58:01	OBJ	I object very strongly to the application build dams on Hampstead Heath. We have lived here for nearly 50 years and have never had a problem with flooding. STOP trying to ruin our beautiful Heath please, leave it alone. I find it unbelievable as to the proposed build, and quite unbelievable that someone can even think up proposals of this sort.
2014/4332/P	claire roche	victoria pk rd victoria park road e95dy	25/07/2014 17:57:48	PETITNSU PP	camden please dont let them do this xx
2014/4332/P	Tim Coppard	55 Lissenden Mansions Lissenden Gardens London NW5 1PR	25/07/2014 17:57:40	OBJ	I am objecting to this planning application on the following grounds: 1. The proposed works are based on a totally unrealistic risk model. 2. The disruption to the heath users while works are undertaken would be unacceptable. 3. The resulting dams would be, in my view, unsightly and would change the topography in an unnatural and municipal way. 4. The works constiute a waste of money which the City of London could use in other more creative ways.
2014/4332/P	Andrew Fynn	5 KEMPE ROAD NW6 6SP	25/07/2014 14:02:49	COMMNT	This is unnecessary, follow the precautionary principle please.
2014/4332/P	Sheila Bull	27 Lyncroft Gardens West Hampstead London NW6 1LB	24/07/2014 16:11:46	PETITNSU PP	These works are too big. Too wide-ranging. They cater for an event that might only happen once in 40,000 years. We have had terrible rainfalls (2002, and last winter) which haven't resulted in the slightest flooding. It's a complete overkill. The idea should be abandoned at once. Then re-thought in a sensible, moderate way.
2014/4332/P	Susan Tegel	26 Crescent Road London N8 8AX	16/07/2014 12:21:35	OBJ	As a pond user and Heath walker I strongly oppose the proposed changes which are wholly unnecessary, given the statistical possibility of a flood. These changes would transform the look of the Heath and cost a great deal of money which could be put to better uses.
2014/4332/P	Ian Long	692A Finchley Road Golders Green London NW11 7NN	23/07/2014 14:20:47	OBJ	I wish to oppose these plans in the strongest possible terms. They entail an extreme and - in my view - completely unnecessary disfiguring of the Heath. Last year we had record rainfall at times and there was no sign of the catastrophic events predicted by the City of London. The original motive behind this proposal is unknown to me, but it seems to have taken on its own dynamic and grown to virtually megalomaniac dimensions, and taken on a sinister character which seems likely to damage irreparably this precious and much-loved area. Any inquiry into the proposal needs to trace exactly where it comes from and who stands to benefit financially from the large sums of money which, we are told, are required to carry it out.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Lauren Atherton	48 Beechwood Road Dalston E8 3DY	24/07/2014 15:07:13	PETITNOBJ E	Hampstead Heath and the bathing ponds remain, at present, unspoilt, unique and precious spaces of sanctuary for people living in one of the most congested and densely-populated cities in the country. Swimming in the ponds, walking on the heath, and enjoying the beauty of this area - a home to diverse wildlife - is a precious life-line for people having to work and pay highly to live in this expensive city. This is a space that is sadly all too rare - free, accessible to all, inclusive, and offering a place of peace, respite and tranquility. I often swim in the ladies ponds and for me it is simply a paradise - where women can just be in a space of trust, and cohesiveness. The unspoilt nature of the heath - the absence of 'landscaping' and 'redevelopment' are what make this place sacred. All of this would be utterly destroyed should the council go ahead with the plans to build a dam. I cannot state more emphatically what a loss it would be and how irrevocable the change. This is a special place - to go ahead with these plans would be to destroy it and to ruin forever one of the precious green spaces in the heart of the city.
2014/4332/P	Dr Lucy Gaster	Chedington Lynmouth Road London N2 9LR	23/07/2014 13:05:19	OBJ	Please add my name to those who are opposing this application. I am interested because I have known the Heath since 1945, and although I would never oppose change for the sake of it, this proposal is grossly out of proportion and has not, indeed, adequately demonstrated why it is thought necessary at all. It will clearly change the character of the Heath for the worse, both during the works and afterwards, and apart from some possible improvements to changing rooms (which could, of course, be done without this application), it is impossible to see what benefit would accrue. The flood risk seems minimal, and surely there are alternative ways of dealing with it. More

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Robin Mackay Miller	10 Constantine Road Hampstead London London NW3 2NG	25/07/2014 16:09:01	PETITNOBJ E	<p>Dear Sirs / Mesdames</p> <p>I have several objections to the proposed works on the various Ponds from my point of view as a Men's Pond swimmer for the last 30 years, being as follows :</p> <p>* My understanding from the meeting held in Parliament Hill School recently was that the works are in response to a floor risk situation that might occur in as little as every 400 years. Some areas of the UK get flooded every year and the monies would be better spent on them.</p> <p>* A lot of the trees that are described as lesser grade trees are in face stately specimens and to be preserved at all costs, rather than cut down to mitigate such a low risk of flooding.</p> <p>* I have been living in the supposed flood risk zone for the last 15 years and there's not been a suggestion of flooding, even after very exceptional rainfall.</p> <p>* When I did my conveyancing in 1999, flooding was not a risk that was mentioned and I can't believe that it's a risk that has suddenly come about. Indeed, my understanding is that the appropriate authority reduced the level at which flooding was considered to be a risk in the same way as the medical profession has reduced the levels of acceptable cholesterol and blood pressure and has then drawn the conclusion that a substantial number of people in the UK are at risk of strokes and heart attacks unless they take statins or ramipril, etc.</p> <p>I am hopeful that there will be a lot of comments made along similar lines that will enable you to decide whether there is a real risk involved, or merely creation of works for no good reason and whether the monies might be better spent elsewhere.</p> <p>Please let me know if you need any further information from me on any of the above points.</p> <p>With thanks in anticipation</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p> <p>Robin Mackay Miller</p>
2014/4332/P	Stephen Taylor FRSA	81 South Hill Park NW3	16/07/2014 10:32:01	OBJ	<p>The engineering necessity for these obtrusive works is disputed by competent experts. The legal requirement for them is being challenged in the High Court.</p> <p>Until both the legal and engineering requirements have been put beyond doubt, Council's duty under §15 and §16 of the Hampstead Heath Act 1871 is to refuse permission to proceed.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Cassie Werber	30 E Ickburgh Road, London E5 8AD 98103-7129	24/07/2014 10:19:54	PETITNOBJ E	<p>I'd like to query the wisdom of this plan and raise my objection to it.</p> <p>I have used these bathing ponds, and enjoyed the other ponds, for the past ten years since moving to London after finishing my education at Clare College, Cambridge. For about half of that time I lived in the borough of Camden.</p> <p>Over those years I have brought numerous visitors to the ponds and visited them with friends, colleagues and family. They have a completely unique character, bringing together a community of young and old that cuts across every kind of divide. They are probably the most beautiful place in the whole of London, and I have never found anything like them in any other city.</p> <p>The plans to build huge dams at the ponds will change the landscape irrevocably, and I am not satisfied that there is clear rationale for their build. Rather, it seems a reactive move based on vague worries sparked by recent flooding in other parts of the country.</p> <p>Furthermore, closing the ponds for two years will hurt the community which has gathered around them in a way from which it may not recover. There are many people, especially older people, who go to the ponds every day, and for whom the place provides a vital connection to their friends. It is where they exercise, relax and re-set, in a city that doesn't offer many places of true tranquility.</p> <p>I don't think it's possible to over-emphasise how much people love these ponds, how unique they are, and how high the cost will be of altering them beyond recognition.</p> <p>For me, a busy journalist at The Wall Street Journal in the City of London, they are a literal oasis of calm and beauty. They are my favourite place in the whole of London, one of the reasons I continue to live in the city rather than moving away. Long before this plan was formed, I had this conversation with many friends - we all agreed that the ability to go to the ponds was one of the things that made life in London bearable. I grew up in the countryside; the Heath as a whole, and the ponds in particular, are a way for me to still have the space, and the physical and spiritual nourishment, of living in nature.</p> <p>Please, please don't destroy that.</p>
2014/4332/P	Samuel Warwick	1 Northdene Gardens n15 6lx	15/07/2014 10:46:09	PETITNOBJ E	I oppose the planning application..

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Robin Mackay Miller	10 Constantine Road Hampstead London London NW3 2NG	25/07/2014 16:08:48	PETITNOBJ E	<p>Dear Sirs / Mesdames</p> <p>I have several objections to the proposed works on the various Ponds from my point of view as a Men's Pond swimmer for the last 30 years, being as follows :</p> <p>* My understanding from the meeting held in Parliament Hill School recently was that the works are in response to a floor risk situation that might occur in as little as every 400 years. Some areas of the UK get flooded every year and the monies would be better spent on them.</p> <p>* A lot of the trees that are described as lesser grade trees are in face stately specimens and to be preserved at all costs, rather than cut down to mitigate such a low risk of flooding.</p> <p>* I have been living in the supposed flood risk zone for the last 15 years and there's not been a suggestion of flooding, even after very exceptional rainfall.</p> <p>* When I did my conveyancing in 1999, flooding was not a risk that was mentioned and I can't believe that it's a risk that has suddenly come about. Indeed, my understanding is that the appropriate authority reduced the level at which flooding was considered to be a risk in the same way as the medical profession has reduced the levels of acceptable cholesterol and blood pressure and has then drawn the conclusion that a substantial number of people in the UK are at risk of strokes and heart attacks unless they take statins or ramipril, etc.</p> <p>I am hopeful that there will be a lot of comments made along similar lines that will enable you to decide whether there is a real risk involved, or merely creation of works for no good reason and whether the monies might be better spent elsewhere.</p> <p>Please let me know if you need any further information from me on any of the above points.</p> <p>With thanks in anticipation</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p> <p>Robin Mackay Miller</p>
2014/4332/P	Marlene Rolfe	12 South Villas London NW1 9BS	27/07/2014 18:05:25	COMMNT	<p>City of London is riding roughshod over the safer, more long-term and environmentally friendly soft engineering solutions which we urgently need to apply to the prevention of flooding in the 21st century.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Joanna Migodzinska	113 Mercers Road	27/07/2014 14:09:35	PETITNOBJE	<p>I would like to voice my objection to the proposed engineering works to the Hampstead and Highgate chains of ponds.</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>Hampstead heath is the only naturally preserved green space in the "concrete jungle" of the city of London. It acts like a natural sponge when floods occurs, so felling 200 trees and injecting yet more concrete to it is simply stupid.</p> <p>The proposed works would inevitable and irreversible damage the Heath and its wildlife, and there is no guarantee of eliminating the risk of downstream flooding.</p> <p>So it seems like a really pointless and costly damage of HH.</p>
2014/4332/P	Barry Fox	22 Holmefield Court Belsize Grove NW3 4TT	27/07/2014 12:20:32	COMMNT	<p>My concern is that Corporation of London cannot be trusted. In 2004/2005 they gave a variety of spurious reasons for closing swimming ponds on Hampstead Heath and only withdrew the plans when faced with public outrage. Why should they now be trusted on placing hugely expensive contracts to build dams to protect against statistically insignificant risks - when the work will be hugely disruptive to the Heath and surrounding area?</p>
2014/4332/P	Barry Fox	22 Holmefield Court Belsize Grove NW3 4TT	27/07/2014 12:20:31	COMMNT	
2014/4332/P	David Sinclair	19 Cornwallis Road N19 4LP	24/07/2014 10:21:34	OBJ	<p>I believe this work is unnecessary, will cause damage to the heath, and huge inconvenience to heath users throughout the construction.</p>
2014/4332/P	Madeleine Paxman	88 Umfreville Road London N4 1SA	14/07/2014 18:33:33	COMMNT	<p>The proposed works to the Heath are not only unnecessary but will most likely damage the infrastructure of the Heath and cause possible irreversible disruption to wildlife, as well as spoiling the environment for the many users, especially swimmers. The planned new dams are not in keeping with past human interventions designed to keep the Heath looking natural and preserving the wonderful views - they will be eyesores and change the landscape of the Heath forever. I am particularly concerned about the felling of so many trees, and the use of heavy machinery on such a vulnerable soft surface. The alterations in facilities at the Ladies Pond will give a narrower access point to the changing rooms which may cause overcrowding at peak times and the danger of someone falling in the water. It seems that alternative plans have been put forward to improve drainage on the Heath which have been ignored by the big contracting firms' interests in this scheme. On balance, I am convinced that works of such scale contravene the Hampstead Heath Act of 1871 and request that Camden Council deny this planning application.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Brendan Massam	Flat 3 1 Nehterhall Gardens Hampstead London NW3 5RN	23/07/2014 22:36:07	COMMNT	The scheme proposed is void of common sense. A lot of civil engineering mambo jumbo has been used to construct an argument to build these dams. I am a civil engineer, I know this. The sensible thing to do is to ensure that all the ponds have properly constructed spillways so that the water that is contained in the ponds will not be released in the event of a flood. That way the presence of the ponds will be no more of a flood risk than anywhere else in London. This is just common sense. I have tested this theory with a number of other well qualified engineers. They all get to the same conclusion, independently! Get a second opinion from Arup or another well regarded firm. Common sense will prevail here, it has to, the pond's beauty can not be allowed to be spoilt by this folly.
2014/4332/P	claire roche	victoria pk rd victoria park road e95dy	25/07/2014 17:58:10	PETITNSU PP	camden please dont let them do this xx
2014/4332/P	Dr K Vroobel	37 Ridgeway Gardens	18/07/2014 18:03:44	OBJ	I object to this application as it will create considerable disruption and ruin the aesthetics of the Heath despite the very low risk of any harm falling on Heath users in the event of this not going ahead. Additionally this plan is completely against the 1871 Hampstead Heath Act. Please do not ruin the Heath for current and future potential users of the Ponds.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Marlene Eleini	17 Lambolle Road London NW3 4HS	26/07/2014 11:19:31	OBJ	<p>I am writing to object to the above proposed plans.</p> <p>I feel very strongly that the building of these dams is totally unnecessary.</p> <p>Firstly it is the most serious threat to the wild and natural state of the heath for over 100 years old and I believe contrary to the Hampstead Haeth Acr 1871.</p> <p>Dams always have secondary repercussions; Building up of silt and water..if there is exceptional rainfall when the pressure created behind the dams and then the problems with the release of water. Flooding actually often occurs when this is done and I have seen this in many instances in France.</p> <p>I understand that in over 300 years there has not been any escape of water or danger . Most recently we have had the torrential rains and flooding this winter and there was no damage or flooding whatsoever from the ponds.</p> <p>Why has it suddenly been deemed necessary to build these dams..It would be far better if the money was spent on replacing old pipes and putting in better drainage for the land below the heath so that in the event of any excess water this could be drained away. I think this was a big problem in the recent floods elsewhere in England last and earlier this year.</p> <p>I don't believe that a good enough case has been put for the massive upheaval and in my view unnecessary work that is proposed.</p> <p>It is unacceptable that tree will be felled and the Heath will turned into a building site for at least two years. This disruption to this haven of natural beauty that thousands escape to and enjoy is criminal and appears to be motivated by money rather than the environment and true character of the Heath.</p> <p>The wild nature and character of the Heath is for foremost and the plans devastate this.</p> <p>The natural habitat of much wildlife that is fast disappearing is also at great risk and peril.</p> <p>It appears that Camden has ignored independent experts that the proposals are excessive The risk of flooding could be minimised in alternative ways such as improving the natural capacity to absorb excessive water and drain it off avoiding massive construction which could create other problems and impede the natural drainage of water.</p> <p>Why not improve the existing dams and ensure they are secure. They have held out in the worst ever storms and wttest winter on record in 2013.</p> <p>I strongly believe that alternative measures could be found to avoid the flood risk and protect downstream households. Investing in improving the sewer and drainage system of the downstream land would be a far better solution that would not damage the heath and preserve the beautiful ponds and the HEATH FOR ITS WILDLIFE AND THOUSANDS OF VISITORS THAT USE THE HEATH EVERY DAY, EVERY YEAR.</p> <p>Camden, you have the power to stop these plans and come up with alternative solutions. Please listen to the voice of the people and other experts.</p> <p>I hope you will do so and avoid this magical, haven that is a gift to so many of us.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Georgina Hovanessian	100 Sussex way	23/07/2014 14:33:57	OBJ	I oppose this very very expensive piece of construction. It will be highly disruptive, noisy, dirty and cause damage to wildlife. It is unnecessary especially in light of last years heavy rain which didn't cause local flooding. Why do something expensive and damaging to the environment if it is not needed? The end result is not desirable as it would change the landscape forever. Why is this being done and why has this been agreed? Money to construction companies? Do not go ahead with this! Fix the lido wAll instead!
2014/4332/P	John Weller	10 Red Lion Hill London N2 8ED	23/07/2014 10:08:16	OBJ	<p>The City of London's proposed dam works on Hampstead Heath will: 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> <p>Money would be better used advising local residents of potential flooding risks and supporting access to suitable insurance.</p>
2014/4332/P	Sophie Arditti	68d St Marks Road London W10 6NN	23/07/2014 23:20:22	COMMNT	<p>I strongly object to the proposed works to Hampstead Heath. As a regular user of the heath and women's pond for many years I feel this would be a devastating blow to the heath and London's recreational profile. I have many foreign friends whose first port of call when they come to London is the heath. London is famous for its green spaces and this is one of the best. In 2011 the risk of flooding was described as 'slim'. Alternative proposals have not been considered, a consultation process showed that 66% of people were against the proposals, under the Hampstead Heath Act of 1871 the City of London is required to preserve the heath in it's 'natural state and aspect' and any changes should be gradual and moderate.</p> <p>The works would be dramatic, entirely disruptive to humans and wildlife and could worsen soil compaction and thus increase flood risk. Hampstead Heath is extremely important to me and many other people I know. In summer in particular it's a highlight for me to go there as often as I can by bus to Kensal rise then the overground to Hampstead Heath station, a walk across the heath and a swim. I'll often have a coffee or something to eat on the way there or back in the village or at Kenwood. This year I went to the gardening show which I wouldn't have done had I not noticed it on my way across the heath. My point is that I spend money in the process of using the heath as it is now. If it changes for the worse I'll be much less inclined to visit. I'm sure there are hundreds of thousands of people like me who are willing to travel a considerable distance for the rare, raw beauty of the heath and the women's pond. Please preserve it, don't destroy it. I should add that the the proposals for the changing rooms & deck area at the women's pond seem dangerous and ugly.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Cordelia Mayfield	27A Mansfield Road London NW3 2JE	27/07/2014 13:48:45	COMMNT	<p>Independent experts have stated that the plans to create dams on the Heath are completely unnecessary and excessive.</p> <p>The City of London has based its' plans on unrealistic computer models that assumed</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) the collapse of all existing dams, 2) No warning and no emergency services, 3) The very worst kind of storm ever possible - predicted to occur only once in 400,000 years. <p>Houses and lives would be better protected by</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Improving the Heath's natural capacity to absorb water- this could easily be diminished by heavy construction! 2) Minor improvement to existing dams that have already proven safe through the wettest winter on record in 2013, and during the floods of 1975, 3) Investing in early warning systems that would also alert residents and workers to flood risks from elsewhere e.g. sewers and run-off heavy rain.
2014/4332/P	liz barker	flat 2a, 34 englands lane London NW3 4ue	27/07/2014 12:00:54	OBJ	<p>First up the Reservoirs Act 1975 does legally not require works to be carried out on this huge scale so why is this happening? the Likelihood of a huge storm of the scale you are suggestions is highly unlikely 1 in 400,000 year probability and assumes that with no warning or emergency services.</p> <p>And the most upsetting for me the heath will be disfigured and ruined by earthworks and excavations at the boating pond. A concrete wall to the mens pond and Highgate's No 1 pond that so many love will destroy its beauty and uniqueness.</p> <p>160 trees which have taken many years to grow will be felled to create a giant slipway?! And these works will take 2 years during which the heath will experience closures of the ponds which are used by myself and many other daily as part of our daily enjoyment and fitness in life. and it will damage the wildlife .. i swim every morning next to lucks, watch birds in the trees, fish and take in a slight escape fmor the london concrete walls whilst being on the heath and swimming on the ponds it seems so awful to do such disruptive works for unrealistic risks and at great cost. Im sure there is money better spent in other areas and projects which will enlighten and benefit peoples lives in a much more positive way.</p> <p>What are the real reasons behind this project I would like to understand more so would appreciate a call.</p>
2014/4332/P	Rachel Douglas	6 Bellgate Mews London NW5 1SW	15/07/2014 16:05:53	OBJ	<p>I strongly object to works being undertaken that will alter the appearance of the Heath for ever without doing anything significant to prevent flooding in areas south of the Heath in the event of a major flash storm. Inadequate sewerage and the fact that water will be pouring off the Heath in all directions, not only from the ponds, means that Gospel Oak will be underwater whatever. In the hugely unlikely event that ALL dams to the Heath ponds fail at once, that area will already be so saturated this will make little difference. No consideration has been given to early warning systems which should eliminate any potential loss of life if a storm of Biblical proportions should occur. I urge Camden to reject the application and to advise the City to take seriously the need to look again at its legal requirements as proposed by the Heath & Hampstead Society.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Barbara Gibbons	42 Brookland Rise NW11 6DS	21/07/2014 22:12:54	OBJ	<p>OBJECTION to Planning Application 2014/4332/P</p> <p>I would like to object to this planning application on the basis that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The computer modelling has assumed a storm, the like of which is predicted to occur only once every 400,000 years. The risk of such a storm is therefore extremely low; far lower than many risks which are considered acceptable. Useful comparison is provided by the Thames Barrier which was designed to cope with a flood event predicted to occur once in every 1000 years. 2. The computer modelling has unrealistically assumed the failure of all existing dams which is highly unlikely, and has therefore overstated the probable impact of any flooding. Again, useful comparison can be made with the Thames Barrier, the failure of which would cause a greater degree of devastation than that which would realistically caused by failure of some of the Heath dams. 3. The modelling has assumed that people in a few hundred possibly affected buildings would not leave, however it is probable that most people would leave their homes if instructed to do so by the emergency services. The probable impact of any flooding has therefore again been overstated. 4. The City of London has a duty to preserve the Heath in its semi-wild and natural state; the magnitude of the proposed works is in conflict with this duty. 5. The City of London appears to have based its application on the basis of advice from commercial entities that would benefit financially from carrying out the proposed works. There is therefore a clear conflict of interest which invalidates the proposal. <p>Given that the likelihood of a sufficiently serious storm is so low; that it is unlikely for all the dams to fail and it is probable that most people would leave their homes if instructed to do so by the emergency services, the proposed works costing an estimated £17 million are grossly disproportionate to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) the actual risk of any flooding and b) the probable impact of any flooding which might occur. <p>In short, the proposed works are totally unnecessary, would despoil a much loved public amenity and would be a gross misuse of public funds.</p> <p>The City of London's legal requirement to protect downstream households could be better met by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • minor improvements to the existing dams, which it should be noted were shown to be safe during the winter of 2013/14 which was the wettest on record • proper maintenance and possible minor improvements to the drainage and sewerage systems both on the Heath and downstream of the Heath • provision of a flood warning and evacuation protocol for the area most likely to be affected in the unlikely event of serious flooding.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Sophie Arditti	68d St Marks Road London W10 6NN	23/07/2014 23:20:16	COMMNT	<p>I strongly object to the proposed works to Hampstead Heath. As a regular user of the heath and women's pond for many years I feel this would be a devastating blow to the heath and London's recreational profile. I have many foreign friends whose first port of call when they come to London is the heath. London is famous for its green spaces and this is one of the best. In 2011 the risk of flooding was described as 'slim'. Alternative proposals have not been considered, a consultation process showed that 66% of people were against the proposals, under the Hampstead Heath Act of 1871 the City of London is required to preserve the heath in it's 'natural state and aspect' and any changes should be gradual and moderate.</p> <p>The works would be dramatic, entirely disruptive to humans and wildlife and could worsen soil compaction and thus increase flood risk. Hampstead Heath is extremely important to me and many other people I know. In summer in particular it's a highlight for me to go there as often as I can by bus to Kensal rise then the overground to Hampstead Heath station, a walk across the heath and a swim. I'll often have a coffee or something to eat on the way there or back in the village or at Kenwood. This year I went to the gardening show which I wouldn't have done had I not noticed it on my way across the heath. My point is that I spend money in the process of using the heath as it is now. If it changes for the worse I'll be much less inclined to visit. I'm sure there are hundreds of thousands of people like me who are willing to travel a considerable distance for the rare, raw beauty of the heath and the women's pond. Please preserve it, don't destroy it. I should add that the the proposals for the changing rooms & deck area at the women's pond seem dangerous and ugly.</p>
2014/4332/P	Sebastian Wocker	107-111 Heath Street Hampstead NW3 6SS	26/07/2014 18:05:31	OBJ	<p>Dear Camden, I strongly oppose these works being done. There is no reason for these works. They will destroy the natural untampered with beauty of Hampstead Heath for no reason whatsoever. It is utterly shameful that this is even being considered. I strongly urge Camden to refuse permission to save the last untouched land in the Borough. The re has not been one drop of over flow from the ponds in over 300 years since they have been there. The Heath is sacred and must be left alone.</p>
2014/4332/P	Paul Sparrow	91 Burghley Road London NW5 1UH	26/07/2014 01:45:50	OBJ	<p>I OBJECT strongly to the planning application:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.The City of London Corporation have failed to make a plausible case for the proposed works to the ponds. 2.The disruption to users of the Heath would be considerable and, in the case of wildlife, potentially irreversible. 3.The visual effect would be equally disastrous. 4. These works would be in contravention of longstanding regulations designed to protect the environment of the Heath. <p>I urge you to reject this highly inappropriate application</p>
2014/4332/P	Duncan Riley	7 Parkview Mansions Highgate High Street	26/07/2014 19:24:33	COMMNT	<p>Unnecessary other remedial work can be done to minimise the risk and maintain the beauty of the Heath.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Benedict Redgrove	27A St Johns Villas N19 3EE	26/07/2014 16:08:23	PETITNOBJ E	I object to these works on the grounds that they will ruin the natural feel of the area and this cannot be replaced once its has been taken away. They will disrupt the access and are there for commercial gain rather than out of necessity.
2014/4332/P	Sophie Arditti	68d St Marks Road London W10 6NN	23/07/2014 23:20:16	COMMNT	<p>I strongly object to the proposed works to Hampstead Heath. As a regular user of the heath and women's pond for many years I feel this would be a devastating blow to the heath and London's recreational profile. I have many foreign friends whose first port of call when they come to London is the heath. London is famous for its green spaces and this is one of the best. In 2011 the risk of flooding was described as 'slim'. Alternative proposals have not been considered, a consultation process showed that 66% of people were against the proposals, under the Hampstead Heath Act of 1871 the City of London is required to preserve the heath in it's 'natural state and aspect' and any changes should be gradual and moderate.</p> <p>The works would be dramatic, entirely disruptive to humans and wildlife and could worsen soil compaction and thus increase flood risk. Hampstead Heath is extremely important to me and many other people I know. In summer in particular it's a highlight for me to go there as often as I can by bus to Kensal rise then the overground to Hampstead Heath station, a walk across the heath and a swim. I'll often have a coffee or something to eat on the way there or back in the village or at Kenwood. This year I went to the gardening show which I wouldn't have done had I not noticed it on my way across the heath. My point is that I spend money in the process of using the heath as it is now. If it changes for the worse I'll be much less inclined to visit. I'm sure there are hundreds of thousands of people like me who are willing to travel a considerable distance for the rare, raw beauty of the heath and the women's pond. Please preserve it, don't destroy it. I should add that the the proposals for the changing rooms & deck area at the women's pond seem dangerous and ugly.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Robin Mackay Miller	10 Constantine Road Hampstead London London NW3 2NG	25/07/2014 16:09:22	PETITNOBJ E	<p>Dear Sirs / Mesdames</p> <p>I have several objections to the proposed works on the various Ponds from my point of view as a Men's Pond swimmer for the last 30 years, being as follows :</p> <p>* My understanding from the meeting held in Parliament Hill School recently was that the works are in response to a floor risk situation that might occur in as little as every 400 years. Some areas of the UK get flooded every year and the monies would be better spent on them.</p> <p>* A lot of the trees that are described as lesser grade trees are in face stately specimens and to be preserved at all costs, rather than cut down to mitigate such a low risk of flooding.</p> <p>* I have been living in the supposed flood risk zone for the last 15 years and there's not been a suggestion of flooding, even after very exceptional rainfall.</p> <p>* When I did my conveyancing in 1999, flooding was not a risk that was mentioned and I can't believe that it's a risk that has suddenly come about. Indeed, my understanding is that the appropriate authority reduced the level at which flooding was considered to be a risk in the same way as the medical profession has reduced the levels of acceptable cholesterol and blood pressure and has then drawn the conclusion that a substantial number of people in the UK are at risk of strokes and heart attacks unless they take statins or ramipril, etc.</p> <p>I am hopeful that there will be a lot of comments made along similar lines that will enable you to decide whether there is a real risk involved, or merely creation of works for no good reason and whether the monies might be better spent elsewhere.</p> <p>Please let me know if you need any further information from me on any of the above points.</p> <p>With thanks in anticipation</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p> <p>Robin Mackay Miller</p>
2014/4332/P	Lynne Zilkha	18 Kemplay Rd	18/07/2014 07:00:02	OBJ	I object to engineering works of building dams and spillways and culverts to the current Hampstead and Highgate ponds. They ve been there for generations and aside from sensitive repairs and silting, should be left alone. It's scope is ridiculous and large for this protected area, which is much loved by the all.
2014/4332/P	Mike Sands	42 Somerset Road New Barnet EN5 1RN	17/07/2014 11:17:47	COMMNT	These works are over-engineered and unnecessary. A waste of scarce resources that will have a detrimental affect on the 3 hidden jewels of London

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Isabel de la Cour	103 Holly Park	26/07/2014 16:07:20	COMMNT	I am against this proposal. I love Hampstead Heath and regularly use the ladies ponds. I believe this proposal will damage the Heath and ponds and will not prevent flooding.
2014/4332/P	Sophie Arditti	68d St Marks Road London W10 6NN	23/07/2014 23:20:00	COMMNT	<p>I strongly object to the proposed works to Hampstead Heath. As a regular user of the heath and women's pond for many years I feel this would be a devastating blow to the heath and London's recreational profile. I have many foreign friends whose first port of call when they come to London is the heath. London is famous for its green spaces and this is one of the best. In 2011 the risk of flooding was described as 'slim'. Alternative proposals have not been considered, a consultation process showed that 66% of people were against the proposals, under the Hampstead Heath Act of 1871 the City of London is required to preserve the heath in it's 'natural state and aspect' and any changes should be gradual and moderate.</p> <p>The works would be dramatic, entirely disruptive to humans and wildlife and could worsen soil compaction and thus increase flood risk. Hampstead Heath is extremely important to me and many other people I know. In summer in particular it's a highlight for me to go there as often as I can by bus to Kensal rise then the overground to Hampstead Heath station, a walk across the heath and a swim. I'll often have a coffee or something to eat on the way there or back in the village or at Kenwood. This year I went to the gardening show which I wouldn't have done had I not noticed it on my way across the heath. My point is that I spend money in the process of using the heath as it is now. If it changes for the worse I'll be much less inclined to visit. I'm sure there are hundreds of thousands of people like me who are willing to travel a considerable distance for the rare, raw beauty of the heath and the women's pond. Please preserve it, don't destroy it. I should add that the the proposals for the changing rooms & deck area at the women's pond seem dangerous and ugly.</p>
2014/4332/P	Jocelyn Kitsch	50 Camden High Street London NW1 OLT	21/07/2014 12:53:18	PETITNOBJ E	<p>This is a dreadful scheme and I encourage people to join the petition against it.</p> <p>https://you.38degrees.org.uk/petitions/stop-heavy-construction-on-hampstead-heath</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Robin Mackay Miller	10 Constantine Road Hampstead London London NW3 2NG	25/07/2014 16:09:21	PETITNOBJ E	<p>Dear Sirs / Mesdames</p> <p>I have several objections to the proposed works on the various Ponds from my point of view as a Men's Pond swimmer for the last 30 years, being as follows :</p> <p>* My understanding from the meeting held in Parliament Hill School recently was that the works are in response to a floor risk situation that might occur in as little as every 400 years. Some areas of the UK get flooded every year and the monies would be better spent on them.</p> <p>* A lot of the trees that are described as lesser grade trees are in face stately specimens and to be preserved at all costs, rather than cut down to mitigate such a low risk of flooding.</p> <p>* I have been living in the supposed flood risk zone for the last 15 years and there's not been a suggestion of flooding, even after very exceptional rainfall.</p> <p>* When I did my conveyancing in 1999, flooding was not a risk that was mentioned and I can't believe that it's a risk that has suddenly come about. Indeed, my understanding is that the appropriate authority reduced the level at which flooding was considered to be a risk in the same way as the medical profession has reduced the levels of acceptable cholesterol and blood pressure and has then drawn the conclusion that a substantial number of people in the UK are at risk of strokes and heart attacks unless they take statins or ramipril, etc.</p> <p>I am hopeful that there will be a lot of comments made along similar lines that will enable you to decide whether there is a real risk involved, or merely creation of works for no good reason and whether the monies might be better spent elsewhere.</p> <p>Please let me know if you need any further information from me on any of the above points.</p> <p>With thanks in anticipation</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p> <p>Robin Mackay Miller</p>
2014/4332/P	Nicole Gordon	flat 5 Rosebery Square West Rosebery Avenue London EC1R 4PT	20/07/2014 19:03:13	OBJ	<p>The environmental damage caused by this project will far outweigh any alleged benefits it will give. It will be an environmental and social catastrophe if this work is allowed to go ahead.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Nicole Gordon	flat 5 Rosebery Square West Rosebery Avenue London EC1R 4PT	20/07/2014 19:02:50	OBJ	The environmental damage caused by this project will far outweigh any alleged benefits it will give. It will be an environmental and social travesty if this work is allowed to go ahead.
2014/4332/P	Frances Heigham	133 Sydney Road London N10 2ND	20/07/2014 18:43:33	OBJ	As a regular daily or weekly user of Hampstead Heath and the Kenwood Ladies Pond I object strongly to the City of London Corporation's proposed works. The works are not necessary or a legal requirement as claimed, and will damage the Heath environment and its flora and fauna both in the short term, while the engineering works are in progress and in the long term. The estimated cost of £17 million would be a wasteful expenditure of public money which should be spent on more worthwhile and necessary projects. With particular reference to the works proposed at the Ladies Pond I object to the proposal to demolish the existing deck and changing rooms and replace them with facilities with much more restricted (dangerously so) access and egress leading to potentially dangerous congestion at busy times. I also object to the fact that there are proposed to be no alternative ladies' swimming facilities for 7.5 months while these unnecessary works are being carried out.
2014/4332/P	David Armit	40 Alconbury Road Clapton London E5 8RH	24/07/2014 10:49:18	PETITNOBJ E	This proposed work is totally unjustified and will ruin the Heath. The reasons for the proposal are alarmist in the extreme and this work should be rejected.
2014/4332/P	Regan Hardy	All Saints' Vicarage Twyford Avenue London N2 9NH	25/07/2014 17:44:26	OBJ	Please do not allow this to happen! I cannot believe that it is necessary to destroy so much natural beauty and 160 trees in order to prepare for an event which has only a one in 400,000 chance of occurring.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Robin Mackay Miller	10 Constantine Road Hampstead London London NW3 2NG	25/07/2014 16:09:17	PETITNOBJ E	<p>Dear Sirs / Mesdames</p> <p>I have several objections to the proposed works on the various Ponds from my point of view as a Men's Pond swimmer for the last 30 years, being as follows :</p> <p>* My understanding from the meeting held in Parliament Hill School recently was that the works are in response to a floor risk situation that might occur in as little as every 400 years. Some areas of the UK get flooded every year and the monies would be better spent on them.</p> <p>* A lot of the trees that are described as lesser grade trees are in face stately specimens and to be preserved at all costs, rather than cut down to mitigate such a low risk of flooding.</p> <p>* I have been living in the supposed flood risk zone for the last 15 years and there's not been a suggestion of flooding, even after very exceptional rainfall.</p> <p>* When I did my conveyancing in 1999, flooding was not a risk that was mentioned and I can't believe that it's a risk that has suddenly come about. Indeed, my understanding is that the appropriate authority reduced the level at which flooding was considered to be a risk in the same way as the medical profession has reduced the levels of acceptable cholesterol and blood pressure and has then drawn the conclusion that a substantial number of people in the UK are at risk of strokes and heart attacks unless they take statins or ramipril, etc.</p> <p>I am hopeful that there will be a lot of comments made along similar lines that will enable you to decide whether there is a real risk involved, or merely creation of works for no good reason and whether the monies might be better spent elsewhere.</p> <p>Please let me know if you need any further information from me on any of the above points.</p> <p>With thanks in anticipation</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p> <p>Robin Mackay Miller</p>
2014/4332/P	James Knowles	34 Parliament Hill	23/07/2014 16:50:19	OBJ	<p>Having lived on the Heath, used the ponds for 20 years, and attended all of the community consultations, I feel the standard of risk reduction ('virtually eliminate all risk to downstream inhabitants') which the City of London is being held to here is excessive. A legal opinion which holds the CoL to taking all "reasonable" precautions is more appropriate and realistic.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Steve Thomson	1 Balmore Street	23/07/2014 13:56:16	OBJ	<p>I recommend a public enquiry into this proposal if the amount of public reponse to this proposal dos not generate one anyway. The use of tax payers money for this scheme which is purely designed to generate income for the consultants and contractors in no way reflects the extent of the risk to the Authority. The whole scheme smacks of unlawful use of the public purse.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Legality Reservoirs Act 1975 does legally not require works to be carried out on this scale. 2. Unrealistic modelling: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > models for a giant storm with a 1 in 400,000 year probability; > assumes no warning and no emergency services. 3. Disfigurement of Heath landscape: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > new and unnatural huge earthworks and excavations at Catchpit and Model Boating Pond; > concrete walls at Men's Bathing Pond and Highgate No.1 Pond. 4. Tree loss: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > over 160 trees to be felled; > large tree loss at Stock Pond to create giant spillway. 5. Closure and disruption: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > 2 years of works requiring closure of popular parts of the Heath; > closure of bathing ponds; > heavy engineering plant and thousands of HGV movements; > damage to wildlife.
2014/4332/P	Karbanb	Flat 3 15 Alma Square London NW8 9QA	23/07/2014 13:37:27	PETITNOBJ E	<p>Reservoir act 1975 does legally not require works to be carried out on this huge scale. Unrealistic weather predictions. Concrete walls disfiguring landscape. TREE LOSS Closure of bathing ponds general disruption. Manipulating people with fear!</p>
2014/4332/P	John Dollar	47 Woodsome Rd. NW5 1SA	10/07/2014 11:44:18	COMMNT	<p>These works would be a monstrous and quite unnecessary disfigurement of our beloved Heath. They are not designed to reduce the risk of flooding in adjacent built up areas (a sensible aim), but to eliminate the risk of dam collapse in a 1 in 400,000 year extreme weather event. This is absurd. It is also absurd that the CoL has not factored into its model the events of 1975 when flooding occurred in Gospek Oak and Dartmouth Park after a 1 in 100 year storm which did no damage to the dams. Then LBC and Thames Water took remedial action and installed 2 huge storm drain traps and a number of smaller ones. Those vulnerable areas have not flooded since.</p> <p>Unlike the above example, this Plan does not address a realistic threat, or -- contrary to the CoL's stated belief -- one which they are obliged to address under reservoir legislation (1975 & 2010). It is a job creation scheme for dam builders that has no place on the Heath. Please save us the fight and kill it off NOW !</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Robin Mackay Miller	10 Constantine Road Hampstead London London NW3 2NG	25/07/2014 16:09:10	PETITNOBJ E	<p>Dear Sirs / Mesdames</p> <p>I have several objections to the proposed works on the various Ponds from my point of view as a Men's Pond swimmer for the last 30 years, being as follows :</p> <p>* My understanding from the meeting held in Parliament Hill School recently was that the works are in response to a floor risk situation that might occur in as little as every 400 years. Some areas of the UK get flooded every year and the monies would be better spent on them.</p> <p>* A lot of the trees that are described as lesser grade trees are in face stately specimens and to be preserved at all costs, rather than cut down to mitigate such a low risk of flooding.</p> <p>* I have been living in the supposed flood risk zone for the last 15 years and there's not been a suggestion of flooding, even after very exceptional rainfall.</p> <p>* When I did my conveyancing in 1999, flooding was not a risk that was mentioned and I can't believe that it's a risk that has suddenly come about. Indeed, my understanding is that the appropriate authority reduced the level at which flooding was considered to be a risk in the same way as the medical profession has reduced the levels of acceptable cholesterol and blood pressure and has then drawn the conclusion that a substantial number of people in the UK are at risk of strokes and heart attacks unless they take statins or ramipril, etc.</p> <p>I am hopeful that there will be a lot of comments made along similar lines that will enable you to decide whether there is a real risk involved, or merely creation of works for no good reason and whether the monies might be better spent elsewhere.</p> <p>Please let me know if you need any further information from me on any of the above points.</p> <p>With thanks in anticipation</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p> <p>Robin Mackay Miller</p>
2014/4332/P	Gad Hollander	Ground Floor Flat 139 Gloucester Avenue NW1 8LA	16/07/2014 12:56:39	OBJ	<p>I am a regular user of Hampstead Heath and the ponds. The proposed works do not offer any improvement to the Heath and its environment and, judging from the evidence presented by various groups, the claims made for these works on grounds of safety (flood prevention, etc.) are totally unconvincing. I therefore urge the committee to reject this application.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Deborah Shewell	Lady Margaret Road N19 5EX	25/07/2014 18:39:34	OBJ	<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>We 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. The works would contravene the Hampstead Heath Act of 1871 which requires that Hampstead Heath be preserved in its "natural aspect and state".</p>
2014/4332/P	Keren McConnell	76 Leicester Road London	27/07/2014 22:07:45	OBJ	<p>I strongly object to the unnecessary works. The Heath is a special haven for wildlife in London and the works and heavy machinery would permanently disfigure and disrupt this natural place. In addition I believe the digging and disruption caused by the heavy machinery would pose a far greater flooding risk than the risk which the works are supposedly averting. I am a regular user of the ladies ponds. I know first hand how beneficial a daily swim here is for health and wellbeing. Camden council have civil contingencies in place in the event of flooding so these works are completely unnecessary and a complete waste of money. The money would be put to far better use by alerting local residents of potential flooding risk and information and obtaining better insurance.</p>
2014/4332/P	Stephen Clarke	1a Lisburne Road NW32NS	26/07/2014 12:34:13	COMMNT	<p>I am opposed to this development on environmental grounds</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Cathy Owen	115 Torriano Avenue NW5 2RX	25/07/2014 18:25:46	OBJ	I have been a Camden resident all my life and and 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. 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 families 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 unecessary 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, colossol expense that will adversely effect many users and the natural environment.
2014/4332/P	Elle Holgate	10 Highgate Hill Archway London	25/07/2014 18:25:02	COMMNT	This is not acceptable and we the local community strongly oppose and will fight this proposal.
2014/4332/P	Kate Waine	13 Talbot RD	23/07/2014 21:29:48	COMMNT	please don't do this unnecessary work, the ponds are naturally beautiful and this will spoil them for ever.
2014/4332/P	Kate Waine	13 Talbot RD	23/07/2014 21:29:26	COMMNT	
2014/4332/P	Anthony Garland	Suite 127 464 Edgware Road W2 1AH	23/07/2014 20:34:29	COMMNT	Totally unwanted, ill-researched move. The ONLY people to benefit are the contractors who are obviously in cahoots with the Corporation of London. NOBODY wants these works except perhaps Bill Oddie and who thinks the wild life will benefit. The likelihood pf a fatality is infinitesimal
2014/4332/P	Emma Cullen	18 Highgate West Hill N6 6NP	23/07/2014 15:37:31	OBJ	I write to object to the proposals to affect the Heath. I refuse to accept that these works comply with the requirement in the Hampstead Heath Act 1871 to preserve the Heath in its natural state. Rather they will involve massive disruption to the hundreds of bathers who delight in using the ponds, and it will have a terrible detrimental effect on this glorious natural area. Moreover, it is very doubtful whether the work will, as proposed, eliminate the risk of downstream flooding – the City’s case is not made out. The Heath is a lifeline for so many people. Please refuse this application and keep the Heath intact.
2014/4332/P	Kate Smith	67 Parliament Hill	21/07/2014 11:37:34	OBJ	These will irreversibly destroy the special character of Hampstead Heath. They are disfiguring and entirely disproportionate, a vast waste of resources and based on a flawed rationale, including a dubious interpretation of the law, referring to 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”.
2014/4332/P	sarah	17 agar grove	24/07/2014 21:47:14	COMMNT	I strongly object to the proposed construction plans..... these ponds are the life and soul for many people. please dont do this..

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Juliet Rodgers	84 savernake road	24/07/2014 20:58:30	PETITNOBJ E	I am objecting to the application for work which are unnecessary and will cause damage to crucial elements of the heath.
2014/4332/P	Emma Cullen	18 Highgate West Hill N6 6NP	23/07/2014 15:37:27	OBJ	I write to object to the proposals to affect the Heath. I refuse to accept that these works comply with the requirement in the Hampstead Heath Act 1871 to preserve the Heath in its natural state. Rather they will involve massive disruption to the hundreds of bathers who delight in using the ponds, and it will have a terrible detrimental effect on this glorious natural area. Moreover, it is very doubtful whether the work will, as proposed, eliminate the risk of downstream flooding – the City's case is not made out. The Heath is a lifeline for so many people. Please refuse this application and keep the Heath intact.
2014/4332/P	Myra Farnworth	2c Lindfield Gardens	23/07/2014 11:23:00	OBJ	I write to object to the above planning application for the following reasons: *Legality the Reservoirs Act 1975 does legally not require works to be carried out on this enormous scale. *The unrealistic modelling, based on a model for a 1 in 400,000 year probability *The terrible disfigurement of Hampstead Heath, involving in some cases huge earthworks and excavations, and concrete walls at some of the ponds. *The loss of trees, inc large numbers of trees likely to have to be felled. *The closure and disruption of parts of the Heath for some considerable length of time, including the bathing ponds. *The damage to wild life *The possible thousands of heavy goods movements on and around the Heath, including the movement of very heavy engineering plant.
2014/4332/P	Myra Farnworth	2c Lindfield Gardens	23/07/2014 11:22:39	OBJ	
2014/4332/P	Milica Pesic	4B Kemplay Rd	20/07/2014 06:41:17	OBJ	Simon Jankins explained well why I should opt for OBJECTION!
2014/4332/P	michael smith	23 Woodfield Parkhill road Belisze park London NW32YA	23/07/2014 11:21:45	OBJ	I am opposed to these works on the basis that I consider them excessive and driven by criteria set at a level which is designed to guarantee work for civil engineers and related industries and not to take into account how to work within an ecologically balanced and realistic requirement .
2014/4332/P	Carole Cadwalladr	237 Girdlestone Walk London	16/07/2014 10:26:20	INT	I'm really concerned about altering what is a very delicate environment and ecosystem. This landscape is treasured and enjoyed by a huge amount of people and making substantive changes should surely only be undertaken if there is no other possible course of action. I am a regular user of the Ladies Pond and the simplicity of the environment and the historic nature of the structure is part of its appeal. Successful planning applications around the pond - notably The Water House - have already impacted negatively on the environment. And the rich cultural history of the pond, as well as the beauty of its natural environment is threatened by these proposed encroachments I would urge you to refuse this application.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Miles Capstick	71 South End road Hampstead London NW3 2RJ	24/07/2014 12:59:40	OBJ	<p>1. There is no legal requirement to build these dams and I wonder why users and those directly affected by the works will have to put up with the noise, debris and pollution for 2 years especially there is no legal requirement to proceed with construction.</p> <p>2. As a lifelong resident of Hampstead since 1961, it will spoil my personal enjoyment of the Heath as it will be visually less attractive to walk through.</p> <p>3. The proposal will make the Heath less safe for walkers as the paths will be obscured and walkers will be less visible and vulnerable to attacks especially in low light or poor weather conditions. The welfare of resident walkers and tourists must be of paramount importance.</p> <p>4. Risk of litigation from those attacked as a direct consequence of CoL making the victims more vulnerable following the completion of the proposed works.</p> <p>5. The proposed engineering works simply reduce the risk of an insurable event - insurance costs will be cheaper than building costs and in times of economic stringency, the cheaper options need to be considered. In any event the City of London admits the proposal will not guarantee that flooding will be prevented thus reinforcing the argument that the risk is an insurable event. Better to insure than build something that may as opposed to will prevent flooding.</p> <p>6. Why build, spoiling wonderful heritage views as captured on many famous paintings and photographers of the heath as once the view is lost it cannot be recovered - let sleeping dogs lie.</p> <p>7. Consideration for the residents of Hampstead and Highgate who are not users of the Heath who will have to put up with noise and traffic of heavy construction machinery and who will indirectly (via Camden) have to pay for the damage the machinery causes to the roads leading to the site.</p>
2014/4332/P	Edward Shellard	flat 1 31 de crespigny park	24/07/2014 12:35:39	OBJ	I object to these engineering works & do not want any building to occur on the heath.
2014/4332/P	Gillian Gould	38 Denman Drive South NW11 6RH	23/07/2014 16:59:52	COMMNT	I object to the application for this work, I think the disruption far outweighs the [proposed benefits, even long term, which are, I understand, to stop flooding in gospel oak. I have lived in the area for 60 years and have never known flooding.
2014/4332/P	Gillian Gould	38 Denman Drive South NW11 6RH	23/07/2014 16:59:38	COMMNT	
2014/4332/P	Gillian Gould	38 Denman Drive South NW11 6RH	23/07/2014 16:59:30	COMMNT	

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Sveinn Valfells	41A Primrose Gardens	16/07/2014 10:38:21	OBJ	<p>There is no proven need to undertake this work. The project is expensive and invasive, it is a waste of taxpayer money which will irreversibly change the surroundings of the ponds with unforeseen consequences. This planned work should under no circumstances be undertaken.</p> <p>Instead, the relevant municipalities, Camden and the City, should consider low cost, low impact measures for monitoring flood risk, charting areas which might be affected and alerting residents if waters rise to levels which might be considered dangerous.</p> <p>Please go back to the drawing board.</p>
2014/4332/P	fiona lafferty	5 south hill mansions 68-70 south hill park London NW32SL	16/07/2014 01:14:14	OBJ	<p>This proposed work is completely unnecessary. The ponds have never caused flooding in the history of london. Altering the sides of the ponds will have a detrimental affect on the aesthetics and wildlife. Only the engineering firms are making money out of this. No one wants it.</p>
2014/4332/P	fiona lafferty	5 south hill mansions 68-70 south hill park London NW32SL	16/07/2014 01:14:13	OBJ	
2014/4332/P	fiona lafferty	5 south hill mansions 68-70 south hill park London NW32SL	16/07/2014 01:13:52	OBJ	
2014/4332/P	andrew harris	4 old well house the grove	16/07/2014 07:01:08	OBJ	<p>I would like to add my voice to the many objecting to these clearly unwanted and unrequired works. I attended the recent public meeting where the case for spending millions disfiguring the Heath in order to accomplish some deeply spurious health and safety objective which apparently encompasses potential death and destruction on an epic scale, was not in any way made.</p> <p>In common with what appeared to be an almost total majority among fellow attendees, I came away from the meeting convinced that the proposals are a seriously misguided waste of money that will merely damage the landscape and cause years of disruption to hordes of hapless Heath users. I object to the proposals.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Penny Dale	112 Highgate Road London NW5 1PB	21/07/2014 08:32:01	OBJ	I strongly object to what independent experts say are unnecessary works and which the City of London Corporation say are based on a computer model of a 1 in 400,000 year “probable maximum flood”. This assessment and the works proposed are completely unrealistic and out of proportion to the actual risk. Moreover, the works would not even eliminate the so-called risk so why bother with what will only cause untold damage to the Heath, one of the most precious wild landscapes in the whole of London in direct contravention of the law that protects it. Camden Council has the power and authority to halt it in its tracks one of the most short-sighted, officious and ridiculous proposals and I, as a Heath lover, pond swimmer and Camden resident, call on you to reject this proposal.
2014/4332/P	lois darlington	flat 43 leyden mansions warltersville road n19 3aw	25/07/2014 16:45:01	COMMNT	We have just had one of the wettest winters in recent history and there were no floods on or around the Heath (while many places that have never flooded before , did flood). There is no need for this development to protect against flooding.It is well known that covering land with concrete actually increases the flood risk, as does cutting down trees - both of which are included in this proposal. If there is a worry about flooding (which I would suggest is unfounded) there are plenty of small scale and much less expensive measures which can be taken without damagaing one of London's prime natural sites, a valuable amenity to the local population and a necessity for stressed city dwellers' survival.
2014/4332/P	lois darlington	flat 43 leyden mansions warltersville road n19 3aw	25/07/2014 16:44:40	COMMNT	
2014/4332/P	Anita Dhillon	6J Stanley Terrace London N19 4JX	28/07/2014 08:54:13	OBJ	I object to the environmental damage that you may cause by doing this work.
2014/4332/P	nicole segre	1 Quadrant Grove	27/07/2014 20:00:12	OBJ	I strongly object to the proposed works on Hampstead Heath on the following grounds: 1. The estimation of risk seems hugely exaggerated and does not justify the enormous costs of the p[roject. 2. Hampstead Heath is a world renowned space, painted by Constable and others and enjoyed by countless visitors. It will be irrevocably altered and marred by the proposed dams and concrete embankments. 3. The Heath, vital for the mental and physical health of so many Londoners, will be off limits for an unacceptably long period. The ponds will lose their unique character and swimming will be seriously curtailed. 4. Other less disruptive and much less costly schemes, such as one to create shallow depressions to improve natural drainage of the soil, have not been properly considered in the rush to approve dam engineers over-ambitious plans.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Piotr Krauze	80 Huddleston Road N7 0eg	27/07/2014 19:54:19	OBJ	<p>I object to the above application for the following reasons:</p> <p>Nature and Wellbeing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The City of London is required under the Hampstead Heath Act of 1871 to preserve it in its “natural state and aspect”. · The City of London has been custodian of Hampstead Heath since 1989 · Hampstead Heath is world famous, freely available to all Londoners and visitors. · Used daily by wide variety of people; walkers, runners, swimmers, families with children. · Benefits to physical and mental health, in turn a wider economic benefit. · Works would take at least 2 years, massive disruption to the Heath. · Permanent disfigurement. Large areas inaccessible during works. · Wildlife will be disrupted, sensitive environment damaged by traffic and heavy machinery. <p>Scale of Works</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Heath a natural space, subject to gradual human intervention over hundreds of years. Proposed works would be sudden and dramatic. · Spillways proposed as a “soft engineering” option will still have significant impact. · Proposing to fell at least 160 mature trees as part of these works, to keep spillways clear. · Model Boating Pond to be enlarged, island created and 2.5m dam to south. · Men’s Bathing Pond 1m dam · Highgate No1 Pond 1.25m dam and wall · Catchpit Valley earth embankment, 5.6m high, up to 40m deep at base and 100m long · Mixed Bathing Pond 1m dam · Works over 2 year period, requiring use of heavy plant on the Heath. Likely to worsen the soil compaction and increase flood risks.

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

Comment: **Response:**

- Works would cost £17million, which is money which could be better spent elsewhere.

Risk model/Flooding

- 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).
- Based proposal on risk model of the 1 in 400,000 year "probable maximum flood" and seek to "virtually eliminate" the risk of dam failure. Unrealistic.
- Illogical approach and this work is not a requirement of the 1975 Reservoirs Act.
- Based this flood model on the number of additional people (300) who might be killed by the Probable Maximum Flood if the dams fail.
- Takes no account of the responsibilities of other bodies like Camden Council and Thames Water to reduce the impact of flooding.
- No consideration of civil contingencies measures e.g. early warning systems or evacuation procedures that Camden Council is required to have in place.
- Does not allow 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.
- Assumes the 300 additional people who might die in floods due to dam failure remain in their homes and take no action to leave.
- 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.
- Money would be better used advising local residents of potential flooding risks and supporting access to suitable insurance.

Consultation

- 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. Given limited options to comment on in first place.

Proposed works at Ladies' Pond

- Full Amenity Assessment (Appendix 10.1) states Ladies' Pond will be closed for 7.5 months and

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>there will be no alternative swimming facility for most of this period (October 2015-March 2016) as the Mixed Pond is closed for most of this time too. Needs to be clarified as assurances previously given about access to female only swimming facilities throughout the works i.e. access to the Mixed Pond as a substitute.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Furthermore, the builders (BAM Nuttall) indicated at Development Management Forum on 5 June 2014 that swimming would be restricted for a much shorter period, due to use of aqua-dam during work on Ladies' Pond. Indicated they would only need to restrict swimming during de-silting works and when changing rooms being rebuilt. · Proposed single narrow entrance to deck area and changing rooms will be much more congested than at present. Potential risk in emergency situation. · Single point of exit from proposed lifeguard facilities makes no provision for alternative emergency exit from long/narrow building. Also a "blind spot" from the back of the office area, no view of the south meadow. An emergency exit door here facing south meadow, with suitable glazed panel, would resolve both issues (instead of proposed window to side/gate).
2014/4332/P	Wanda Briggs	84 Barnet Grove London E2 7BJ	27/07/2014 19:49:28	COMMNT	<p>I would like to object to this planning application.</p> <p>This project will completely change the look of the ponds across the Hampstead and Highgate chains and possibly cause serious environmental damage. From the plans, it shows that over 160 trees are to be felled. Plus the unsightly concrete walls of the dam overpowering the natural current views from the boating pond and the men's swimming pond. Whereas the reason for building the dams has an extremely low likelihood of coming to pass. I believe this is in the region of 1 in 400,000 years. Overall, I think this is a waste of council tax and/or taxpayers money that could be better spent on improvements to the Heath.</p>
2014/4332/P	roger malbert	49 D Park Avenue London N22 7EY	27/07/2014 19:10:05	OBJ	<p>This is a unique area of quiet, unspoiled natural beauty enjoyed by many Londoners, and this scheme, based on ridiculously implausible hypotheses and calculations presented by an agency with a financial interest in seeing the scheme through, will destroy it forever. Like many others, I walk, read and swim here regularly. I cannot believe that after centuries of careful management of the Heath, a massive act of destruction will be inflicted. It should be subject to far more wide-reaching research, independent expert advice and a longer period of consultation.</p>
2014/4332/P	Anne Tallentire	27A Mansfield Road	27/07/2014 14:15:14	COMMNT	<p>Independent experts say this work is unnecessary. The city has relied solely on the advise of damn engineers. The character of the heath will be put in jeopardy. The City of London and has based it's plans on the worst kind of storm predicted to happen in 400,000 years. Lives could be better protected by improving the heaths natural capacity to absorb water.</p>
2014/4332/P	ruth novaczek	47 finsbury park road N4 2JY	24/07/2014 21:27:49	OBJ	<p>I strongly object to the proposed works to Hampstead Heath. It is an oasis of natural beauty and should be conserved as it is. These proposals threaten to destroy an area of outstanding natural beauty and peace at a time when all of London is massively overpopulated and over-built.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	PJ Solomon	27a denning Road London NW3 1ST	16/07/2014 10:19:41	COMMNT	I object strongly to this project and its application to the Council. it is completely unnecessary and will change the heath as we know and love it.
2014/4332/P	Maya Sendall	170 Chamberlayne Rd London NW10 3JT	16/07/2014 17:18:37	OBJ	The grounds upon which these works have been deemed neccessary have me asking myself whether I am living in Ghormenghast rather than a society run by reasonable human beings.I was born on the edge of Hampstead Heath and have loved it all my life.It is utterly unique and ancient heritage and of inestimable value to all who use it.I have folowed these proposals from the start and can see no genuine reason for them.Having attended the meeting at which the developers and Corporation of London were supposed to have justified these plans, I came away feeling more convinced than ever that there was no genuine reason for these dams to be built.I found the answers offered to everyone there, none of whom seemed to be in favour of these plans, including those local residents who had been told that the dams were to be built because their lives were in danger,were both evasive or not any kind of answer at all.I am sorry to have to conclude, along with everyone I have spoken to, that the whole thing smacks of corruption and the proposed sacrifice of our beloved heritage to be nothing more, or less, than an attempt by those who care nothing for honesty and decent values to make a huge profit.Not only will this affect the people who use the Heath, but it will decimate the wild life.These corrupt enterprises are often exposed in retrospect many years after the irreversible damage has been done.I refer you to the destruction of Deptford in South London, an intact area of historic architectural beauty and a large and thriving community stretching back many generations,which was lost for the same level of spurious reasons and turned into a hideous ghetto where noone would return to live and was instead offered to immigrants and refugees who had no choice but to take what they were offered.This corruption for monetary gain was demonstrated conclusively 40 years later when it was too late.I regret that I smell a similar rat in this case as nothing about it makes any sense, not even to the people who have been told it is for their protection.Thankyou for taking the time to hear my views.Please act to defend reason and true values when considering this application and deny permission for the scheme to go ahead
2014/4332/P	Ben Quarrell	193a Coldharbour Lane SE5 9PA	27/07/2014 13:51:12	OBJ	I would loike to object to this appolication. It will completely disfigure the Heath and seems totally unnecassary
2014/4332/P	Tom Munn	16 Bloomsbury Close Mill Hill NW7 2DT	27/07/2014 10:38:47	PETITNOBJ E	I wish to register my dismay at any plans to destroy and dismantle the Hampstead Heath Ponds. These ponds are a pleasure to enjoy and I attend the Heath and make use of the ponds as often as 3-4 times weekly. Please for the sake of pleasure and for the benefit of health and enjoyment do not allow planning applications for this destruction to be approved.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Caroline Dyott	Flat 7 3 Jamestown Road London NW1 7BW	27/07/2014 10:22:36	OBJ	<p>I am a regular swimmer at the Ladies Pond and walk on Hampstead Heath often. I am extremely concerned that the proposed engineering works will cause major disruption to the use and enjoyment of the Heath and the ponds for the millions of Londoners who use the Heath every week, and who desperately need a break from the noise and pollution that dominate their lives.</p> <p>I've lived in Camden for over 45 years, and witnessed the flooding in August 1975 when nearly 7 inches of rain fell in two and a half hours. However, this particular weather event was exceptional ("Weather, The Hampstead Storm - 17th August 1975", J. F. Keers and P. Wescott), and though there may be a need to improve flood defences on the Heath, I believe the proposed engineering works to be excessive and unnecessary.</p> <p>I sincerely hope Camden will not pass this planning application, and make the planners re-think the necessity for such extensive, disruptive and destructive works.</p>
2014/4332/P	Graham Black	80 Keslake Road nw66dg	24/07/2014 15:45:24	OBJ	<p>The works are unnecessary will cause huge disruption to wildlife habitat and untold damage to a beautiful environment enjoyed by thousands of Londoners and tourists.</p> <p>The money would be better spent creating rain gardens and natural area's where rain water can channel into, disconnecting domestic and commercial down pipes from the sewers as in Seattle would also help alleviate flooding.</p> <p>We need a plan for London to adapt to climate change building a damp is not the answer.</p>
2014/4332/P	philip craig	37 stoneyhill place edinburgh eh216tn	17/07/2014 07:46:05	COMMNT	<p>please don't destroy the heath with proposed construction work .</p>
2014/4332/P	Joanna Lim	Flat 5 13 Netherhall Gardens London NW3 5RN	16/07/2014 22:15:51	OBJ	<p>The plan is ridiculous and Historically, the City of London has been flooded badly from rising waters of the River Thames due to thawing snowfall upstream in the Cotswolds, NOT from water coming down from the Heath.</p> <p>Hampstead Heath is a London treasure and needs to be protected.</p> <p>Please do not destroy Octavia Hill's important work for all the people of London.</p>
2014/4332/P	Muriel Bouvier	23 Shakespeare Gardens London N2 9LJ	15/07/2014 16:29:36	OBJ	<p>I wish to oppose this planning application. The work would change Hampstead Heath for ever, in a negative way. We need to keep this fantastic open space as it is for the next generations to enjoy.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Pablo Uribe	110 HUddleston road London N70EG	15/07/2014 10:53:39	APP	I find it amazing that the council is thinking on spending £17 million on the disfigurement of the heath when this money could be used on education or health projects that need the money so badly. Apart from that, the works would contravene the Hampstead Heath Act of 1871 which requires that Hampstead Heath be preserved in its “natural aspect and state”
2014/4332/P	Ron Berglas	29378 Lochinvar Road Highland CA 92346	27/07/2014 05:24:50	COMMNT	<p>Don't do it, please. I'm not an engineer but I love the Heath and unless there is not a pressing need for a storm or meteor that is about to hit us at any moment, then there is no need to build this now or perhaps ever. It's hardly likely that, even if the ponds do flood, we won't need Noah to guide us out of what will be a rather distended mud patch.</p> <p>There are too many people who loathe what you want to do and they are eminently sensible and intelligent people so if I were you I would listen to them, please. Don't ruin our Heath to increase your chances of getting elected. I rather think that, if anything, it would hurt rather than enhance any chance of that happening if you were to proceed.</p>
2014/4332/P	Dr sarah wynick	21 pleasant place	26/07/2014 21:29:25	COMNOT	I use the ladies pond regularly and my son uses the men's and we both use the mixed,, so the ponds being closed would negatively impact our quality of life as well as destroying wildlife and their habitat, felling healthy mature trees, spoiling the view, causing noise and disturbance to people like me who walk regularly on the heath. the scheme is unecessary and and overreaction to the risk of some damp/minor flooding in local houses which could be solved much more cheaply and environmentally appropriatally by improving the run off/drains capacity in the area and using flood warning/surveillance.
2014/4332/P	kate suiter	128 crimsworth road sw8 4rl	24/07/2014 14:44:14	PETITNOBJ E	surely this is not necessary - this is one of the most beautiful spots in town and make London one of the most special cities in the world. Why needlessly destroy it?
2014/4332/P	David Chinn	66 Pilgrims Lane London NW3 1SN	24/07/2014 02:31:48	OBJ	<p>Nature and Wellbeing • The City of London is required under the Hampstead Heath Act of 1871 to preserve it in its “natural state and aspect”. • The City of London has been custodian of Hampstead Heath since 1989 • Hampstead Heath is world famous, freely available to all Londoners and visitors. • Used daily by wide variety of people; walkers, runners, swimmers, families with children. • Benefits to physical and mental health, in turn a wider economic benefit. • Works would take at least 2 years, massive disruption to the Heath. • Permanent disfigurement. Large areas inaccessible during works. • Wildlife will be disrupted, sensitive environment damaged by traffic and heavy machinery. Scale of Works • Heath a natural space, subject to gradual human intervention over hundreds of years. Proposed works would be sudden and dramatic. • Spillways proposed as a “soft engineering” option will still have significant impact. • Proposing to fell at least 160 mature trees as part of these works, to keep spillways clear. • Model Boating Pond to be enlarged, island created and 2.5m dam to south. • Men’s Bathing Pond 1m dam • Highgate No1 Pond 1.25m dam and wall • Catchpit Valley earth embankment, 5.6m high, up to 40m deep at base and 100m long • Mixed Bathing Pond 1m dam • Works over 2 year period, requiring use of heavy plant on the Heath. Likely to worsen the soil compaction and increase flood risks. • Works would cost £17million, which is money which could be better spent elsewhere.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Sheila Cohen	28c Barnsbury Park London N1 1HQ	15/07/2014 17:21:16	OBJ	The last thing we need on our peaceful, beautiful Heath is JCBs, churned-up mud and eventually hideous intrusion on a natural landscape. This is about favours to contractors, not 'safety'. Give up on this shambles now.
2014/4332/P	Maya Sendall	170 Chamberlayne Rd London NW10 3JT	16/07/2014 17:18:37	OBJ	The grounds upon which these works have been deemed necessary have me asking myself whether I am living in Ghormenghast rather than a society run by reasonable human beings. I was born on the edge of Hampstead Heath and have loved it all my life. It is utterly unique and ancient heritage and of inestimable value to all who use it. I have followed these proposals from the start and can see no genuine reason for them. Having attended the meeting at which the developers and Corporation of London were supposed to have justified these plans, I came away feeling more convinced than ever that there was no genuine reason for these dams to be built. I found the answers offered to everyone there, none of whom seemed to be in favour of these plans, including those local residents who had been told that the dams were to be built because their lives were in danger, were both evasive or not any kind of answer at all. I am sorry to have to conclude, along with everyone I have spoken to, that the whole thing smacks of corruption and the proposed sacrifice of our beloved heritage to be nothing more, or less, than an attempt by those who care nothing for honesty and decent values to make a huge profit. Not only will this affect the people who use the Heath, but it will decimate the wild life. These corrupt enterprises are often exposed in retrospect many years after the irreversible damage has been done. I refer you to the destruction of Deptford in South London, an intact area of historic architectural beauty and a large and thriving community stretching back many generations, which was lost for the same level of spurious reasons and turned into a hideous ghetto where no one would return to live and was instead offered to immigrants and refugees who had no choice but to take what they were offered. This corruption for monetary gain was demonstrated conclusively 40 years later when it was too late. I regret that I smell a similar rat in this case as nothing about it makes any sense, not even to the people who have been told it is for their protection. Thank you for taking the time to hear my views. Please act to defend reason and true values when considering this application and deny permission for the scheme to go ahead.
2014/4332/P	Joanne Trim	1B Wedderburn House 1 Wedderburn Rd Hampstead NW3 5QR	26/07/2014 17:24:47	OBJ	I live in Hampstead. I love the Heath, and I am concerned that its charm and character will be destroyed forever if these unnecessary works go ahead. All the information I have seen and read about these works confirms that they are not necessary, and therefore I am suspicious of some hidden agenda by the proposers. Such a dramatic change to the landscape with associated destruction of trees, wildlife habitats, let alone destroying my running path for the next two years, all on the basis of protecting against a 1 in 400,000 year flood is a total waste of time and money, and a total disregard of the efforts of all those who have loved and fought for the preservation of the Heath's natural state through the ages.
2014/4332/P	R. Farrell	24 Aylestone Avenue	26/07/2014 14:42:17	OBJ	The ponds are part of a landscape that has been untouched for generations. If this proposed development is allowed it will set a precedent and the rot will set in. Hampstead Heath is a facility that enhances quality of life for Londoners, and we need this relief from the urban sprawl. PLEASE DO NOT CHANGE IT, HACK AT IT, OR RUIN IT. KEEP OFF!!!

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Rob Humphreys	3 Kynaston Road	23/07/2014 13:39:01	COMMNT	I strongly object to the proposed works which are based on a model which is extremely unlikely. If the event were to take place, it would be much better to simply have a warning system in place, as exists for many other unlikely scenarios - foreign invasion, nuclear attack. I'm sorry to say it but it's a classic case of Health and Safety gone mad.
2014/4332/P	Joe Noar	10 Stanhope Gardens	15/07/2014 10:59:37	COMMNT	I think this development is unnecessary.
2014/4332/P	Joe Noar	10 Stanhope Gardens	15/07/2014 10:59:15	COMMNT	
2014/4332/P	Maya Sendall	170 Chamberlayne Rd London NW10 3JT	16/07/2014 17:18:39	OBJ	The grounds upon which these works have been deemed necessary have me asking myself whether I am living in Ghormenghast rather than a society run by reasonable human beings.I was born on the edge of Hampstead Heath and have loved it all my life.It is utterly unique and ancient heritage and of inestimable value to all who use it.I have followed these proposals from the start and can see no genuine reason for them.Having attended the meeting at which the developers and Corporation of London were supposed to have justified these plans, I came away feeling more convinced than ever that there was no genuine reason for these dams to be built.I found the answers offered to everyone there, none of whom seemed to be in favour of these plans, including those local residents who had been told that the dams were to be built because their lives were in danger,were both evasive or not any kind of answer at all.I am sorry to have to conclude, along with everyone I have spoken to, that the whole thing smacks of corruption and the proposed sacrifice of our beloved heritage to be nothing more, or less, than an attempt by those who care nothing for honesty and decent values to make a huge profit.Not only will this affect the people who use the Heath, but it will decimate the wild life.These corrupt enterprises are often exposed in retrospect many years after the irreversible damage has been done.I refer you to the destruction of Deptford in South London, an intact area of historic architectural beauty and a large and thriving community stretching back many generations,which was lost for the same level of spurious reasons and turned into a hideous ghetto where noone would return to live and was instead offered to immigrants and refugees who had no choice but to take what they were offered.This corruption for monetary gain was demonstrated conclusively 40 years later when it was too late.I regret that I smell a similar rat in this case as nothing about it makes any sense, not even to the people who have been told it is for their protection.Thankyou for taking the time to hear my views.Please act to defend reason and true values when considering this application and deny permission for the scheme to go ahead
2014/4332/P	Maya Sendall	170 Chamberlayne Rd London NW10 3JT	16/07/2014 17:18:16	OBJ	

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Gill Pulsford	Garden Flat 11 Carleton Road London N7 0QZ	25/07/2014 17:15:16	OBJ	<p>The simple fact is that there is no legal requirement for works on this scale to be undertaken.</p> <p>I completely understand and appreciate that the Heath is a managed environment and we can only enjoy what we do in 2014 because it has been so well managed over so many years, but the scale of this is just totally unnecessary.</p> <p>If there is such a very real risk that "people will die" if the work is not carried out (as we were reliably informed at a public meeting at Parliament Hill School on 5th June), why is this money not being spent on proper evacuation and warning resources? Or at the very least telling those who "will die" that they are in the line of disaster?</p> <p>For regular users of the Heath - swimmers, walkers, joggers, dog walkers, pram pushers - and those living nearby, this will be two years of misery with endless HGV and heavy engineering plant movements. The misery will then continue as we will all see the scars of what remains after 160 trees are felled, and our guilt will be that we allowed this to happen.</p> <p>The impact on the wildlife just doesn't bear thinking of. Have you ever stayed completely still and quiet, treading water in a pond and watching a kingfisher catching fish? Have you ever watched a pair of Canada geese teaching their precious offspring how to fly? Have you ever found yourself grinning from ear to ear when you are surrounded by ducklings and chicks as you swim along? Do you realise that all this happens on the Heath just 4km from Trafalgar Square? What does the responsibility of protecting that mean to you?</p> <p>What is worse is that we now discover that the assurances we had been given all along that two of the swimming ponds would be open at any one time is not true and we now learn that the Ladies" Pond will be closed for seven and a half months from October 2015, with the Mixed Pond also closed January to March 2016. Some of our community cannot swim with members of the opposite sex for religious reasons.</p> <p>I swim in Kenwood Ladies" Pond most days and continue swimming throughout the year. For me personally this would have a huge impact on my life. The health benefits are immense from general calmness and wellbeing to suppleness, fitness and keeping colds at bay.</p> <p>We have a very precious place in Hampstead Heath and all it has to offer. You don't need to destroy it so please don't.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Karbanb	Flat 3 15 Alma Square London NW8 9QA	23/07/2014 13:37:05	PETITNOBJ E	Reservoir act 1975 does legally not require works to be carried out on this huge scale. Unrealistic weather predictions. Concrete walls disfiguring landscape. TREE LOSS Closure of bathing ponds general disruption. Manipulating people with fear!
2014/4332/P	john kremer	35 ainger road london nw33at	15/07/2014 10:32:17	OBJ	First, the engineering case for the dams is ambiguous at best. Second, the work proposed will permanently disfigure an iconic and unique part of London. Third the conflict-of-interest inherent in the work being recommended by the same firm (or persons) who stand to benefit from it is outrageous.
2014/4332/P	Helen Lachmann	21 St Leonard's Square London NW5 3HL	27/07/2014 17:36:43	OBJ	I write to object to this application on the grounds of destruction of a precious environment and public amenity, tree loss, and the out of character and permanently visible nature of proposed changes. For what it's worth I also object to the waste of public money and the over defensive response of the City of London Corporation and failure to consider less destructive solution. I have lived and worked near the Heath for 15 years and am appalled and the proposed wanton damage to a much loved and widely used area of natural open space and beauty.

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

2014/4332/P	Teresa Carbajo Garcia	50 Algiers Road	18/07/2014 10:44:17	OBJ	
-------------	-----------------------	-----------------	---------------------	-----	--

Dear madam, dear sir,

I would like to register my opposition to the proposed engineering above. I am a user of the ladies ponds for ten years now and believe that the proposals will very adversely impact on the beauty and amenities of the Heath and ponds. The proposed works will cause great damage to the current landscape and flora of the Heath, and thus will contravene the requirement to the City of London under the Hampstead Heath Act of 1871 to preserve it in its “natural state and aspect”. The works will not only ruin the Heath for years to all walkers, runners, swimmers, families with children, it will irretrievably disfigure large areas and change the daily enjoyment possibly for ever. There does not seem to be much detail of the disruption to users, wildlife and the environment by traffic and heavy machinery.

The proposed works would like to make several meters of dams, changes to the shores and embankments, with what it seems the concern to make the heath into a managed parkland area and without due consideration to its wilderness appeal and function.

The works are predicated on a risk model of catastrophic flooding, but do not 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).

It also seems as if the current proposal works on a risk model of the 1 in 400,000 year “probable maximum flood” and seek to “virtually eliminate” the risk of dam failure. If that is the aim of the works then the City should drain the ponds, cement over and propose works to install a skater park instead.

The works, for example do not take into consideration that other infrastructures could also fail earlier than the proposed dams, and lead to flooding and deaths e.g. drains and sewers south of the Heath. This seems not particularly well presented specially in view of the fact 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. and supporting access to suitable insurance.

Furthermore, it seems as if 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.

Finally, as a user of the ladies pond, which has been a place of rescue in many difficult times, the proposal to close the pond for over half a year, is devastating, and no clear details have been given or any female only swimming facilities throughout the works.

I hope that you will consider my comments and amend what is a present a truly devastation programme of work, and quite possibly an ineffective plan to prevent flooding in the Heath.

Yours sincerely,

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					Teresa Carbajo Garcia
2014/4332/P	Mary Adshead	108 Brecknock road London N7 0DB	10/07/2014 18:59:03 INT		I am against this because it will damage the peace and beauty of the Heath, and I consider this scheme to be an unnecessary waste of money.
2014/4332/P	Ros Bayley	80 Parliament Hill Mansions Lissenden Gardens London NW5 1NB	22/07/2014 16:16:30 INT		I object to the plans put forward by the City of London as I don't believe that such large scale engineering is the best solution to the potential problem of flooding. I had previous of experience when the City of London wanted to turn the much used entrance to the Heath from the South into a vehicle only road. On that occasion they used the same arguments they are using about the ponds, that lives are at risk and an engineering solution is the only solution. The plans were eventually abandoned and no more was heard about the much trumpeted risk to life. In this case I believe that a more appropriate response would be to build areas that would naturally flood and to improve the permeability of the Heath where it has been overtrodden so that more rain water can be absorbed. Taken together I believe these measures could reduce the risk of the ponds rising to such a height that the dams would be at risk. I believe that the City is playing on memories of the floods in Gospel Oak which had nothing to do with the ponds to try to create a climate of acceptance for their plans. The Heath is a much used, much loved place and should not be subject to unnecessary interference both during construction and after the creation of these huge man made structures. I am a daily swimmer, through the year, in the Ladies and Mixed Ponds and regularly walk on the Heath.
2014/4332/P	Bruce MacRae	29 Roderick Road NW3 2NN	27/07/2014 16:28:24 APP		I whole heartedly oppose this proposal. The damage to the Heath is measurable and unnecessary. The applicants have made no efforts to explore other methods to address the extraordinary conditions being mitigated against. A engineer has recommended lots of work - £17million for his fellow engineers with no attempt by the corporation of London to question the need for the works in the first instance. Their arrogance and incompetence at the presentation at Parliament Hill School beggars belief. Unnecessary work being proposed by people who are gaining financially by their recommendations.
2014/4332/P	Barry Fox	22 Holmefield Court Belsize Grove NW3 4TT	27/07/2014 12:20:32 COMMNT		My concern is that Corporation of London cannot be trusted. In 2004/2005 they gave a variety of spurious reasons for closing swimming ponds on Hampstead Heath and only withdrew the plans when faced with public outrage. Why should they now be trusted on placing hugely expensive contracts to build dams to protect against statistically insignificant risks - when the work will be hugely disruptive to the Heath and surrounding area?

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Jennifer Gray	4 the grove	26/07/2014 11:12:45	COMMNT	<p>1. Legality</p> <p>Reservoirs Act 1975 does legally not require works to be carried out on this huge scale.</p> <p>2. Unrealistic modelling:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > models for a giant storm with a 1 in 400,000 year probability; > assumes no warning and no emergency services. <p>3. Disfigurement of Heath landscape:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > new and unnatural huge earthworks and excavations at Catchpit and Model Boating Pond; > concrete walls at Men's Bathing Pond and Highgate No.1 Pond. <p>4. Tree loss:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > over 160 trees to be felled; > large tree loss at Stock Pond to create giant spillway. <p>5. Closure and disruption:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > 2 years of works requiring closure of popular parts of the Heath; > closure of bathing ponds; > heavy engineering plant and thousands of HGV movements; > damage to wildlife.
2014/4332/P	E Bazalgette	64 fortis green	27/07/2014 10:09:57	PETITNOBJ E	<p>This project will permanently disfigure a site of natural beauty.</p> <p>The construction work will destroy the quiet enjoyment of this space for all. Look at all the benches with tributes to loved lost ones - imagine sitting there for 2 years having your thoughts and memories amidst a constant procession of 20 ton construction trucks.</p> <p>There can be no reliable measure as to how the disruption will affect the wildlife in the area, a key year round aspect of the heaths natural charm and beauty.</p> <p>Crucially there is absolutely no proof the works will remove threat of flood danger. We have experienced the heaviest rains in years the past 2 winters and the has been no flood.</p> <p>Proper maintenance and management will be effective and bring no disruption or destruction to this beautiful inner city sanctuary.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Audrey lovelock	1 Lansdowne house	27/07/2014 09:59:09	OBJ	I don't agree with this works there has never been any problem and the probability is too low to validate the works. Please don't do it the damage is too great
2014/4332/P	Audrey lovelock	1 Lansdowne house	27/07/2014 09:58:47	OBJ	
2014/4332/P	Carol Noakes	7 Parkview Mansions Highgate high street Highgate London N6 5jj	26/07/2014 19:11:36	COMMNT	This is unnecessary, damaging, and irrational. There is no evidence it will ever be needed and good alternatives that serve the current Eco system much better without spending a large amount of public money on a flawed project. Please have some wisdom.
2014/4332/P	Eleanor Arnold Pole	8 Gainsborough Gardens	26/07/2014 15:55:45	OBJ	I wish to add my voice to the objections to this proposal. The ponds didn't flood despite the recent deluges and these plans would disfigure a popular resource, spoil views of the Heath, and cause a great deal of disruption

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

2014/4332/P	Teresa Carbajo Garcia	50 Algiers Road	18/07/2014 10:43:55	OBJ	Dear madam, dear sir,
-------------	-----------------------	-----------------	---------------------	-----	-----------------------

I would like to register my opposition to the proposed engineering above. I am a user of the ladies ponds for ten years now and believe that the proposals will very adversely impact on the beauty and amenities of the Heath and ponds. The proposed works will cause great damage to the current landscape and flora of the Heath, and thus will contravene the requirement to the City of London under the Hampstead Heath Act of 1871 to preserve it in its “natural state and aspect”. The works will not only ruin the Heath for years to all walkers, runners, swimmers, families with children, it will irretrievably disfigure large areas and change the daily enjoyment possibly for ever. There does not seem to be much detail of the disruption to users, wildlife and the environment by traffic and heavy machinery.

The proposed works would like to make several meters of dams, changes to the shores and embankments, with what it seems the concern to make the heath into a managed parkland area and without due consideration to its wilderness appeal and function.

The works are predicated on a risk model of catastrophic flooding, but do not 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).

It also seems as if the current proposal works on a risk model of the 1 in 400,000 year “probable maximum flood” and seek to “virtually eliminate” the risk of dam failure. If that is the aim of the works then the City should drain the ponds, cement over and propose works to install a skater park instead.

The works, for example do not take into consideration that other infrastructures could also fail earlier than the proposed dams, and lead to flooding and deaths e.g. drains and sewers south of the Heath. This seems not particularly well presented specially in view of the fact 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. and supporting access to suitable insurance.

Furthermore, it seems as if 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.

Finally, as a user of the ladies pond, which has been a place of rescue in many difficult times, the proposal to close the pond for over half a year, is devastating, and no clear details have been given or any female only swimming facilities throughout the works.

I hope that you will consider my comments and amend what is a present a truly devastation programme of work, and quite possibly an ineffective plan to prevent flooding in the Heath.

Yours sincerely,

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
Teresa Carbajo Garcia					
2014/4332/P	Elisabeth Thom	11 Southwood Lawn Road Highgate London N6 5SD	22/07/2014 11:45:42	OBJNOT	The City of London is the "custodian" of Hampstead Heath. Since when has a custodian been an agent of destruction? I have swum in the Kenwood Ladies' Pond on and off since 1984, winter and summer, and consider it one of the glories of London. No other capital city has a place like it. How can it be rational or expedient to spend so many millions of pounds destroying something so rare and precious for fear of the tiny risk of flooding in the unknown future? The experience of the floods in the Somerset Levels this winter shows that human interference in managing floodwater has created problems, not prevented them. The dams will cause more problems than they (hypothetically) solve. Leave us to continue to enjoy the extraordinary natural beauty of the Heath and pour your concrete elsewhere.
2014/4332/P	Hagop Matossian	12 Glenilla Road NW3 4AS	26/07/2014 04:51:30	COMMNT	This development if approved will grossly impact Hampstead Heath. This dam expansion is not needed and are a huge expense. Building works on Hampstead Heath will negatively affect wildlife and people's enjoyment of the area. Please reject these plans.
2014/4332/P	jacquie richardson	6 winchester place Highgate N6 5HJ	25/07/2014 23:00:59	OBJ	I object to this whole project. It is unnecessary. It will cause irretrievable damage to this part of the Heath, destroy countless trees and affect the wildlife. The disruption will be unimaginable and the costs exorbitant. Flooding has not occurred during the recent torrential rain storms.
2014/4332/P	Katrin Wedepohl	13 Rona Road	25/07/2014 19:08:54	PETITNOBJ E	I live in an area that could be affected by potential flooding on Hamstead Heath. Nevertheless, I strongly object to the proposed building of dams on the Heath for the following reasons: I do not believe that the proposed extent of works is necessary to keep residential areas free from flooding. In fact I feel that the extent of works proposed is unreasonable and will hugely interfere with people's enjoyment of the Heath. I am also very concerned about the number of trees that are proposed to be felled to enable these massive works. The felling of trees is completely counterproductive in my mind, as they are absorbing moisture. Camden should stop these works as they are threatening to devastate the beautiful natural environment of Hampstead Heath.
2014/4332/P	Julietta Cochrane	6a Gillies Street Kentish Town NW5 4DL	26/07/2014 13:28:22	OBJ	The project is way way too expensive to be justified by the fact that flooding has never ever happened before . The beauty of Hampstead will be destroyed forever and the amount of destruction and disturbance will impair 100s of thousands of people. Its a monstrosity.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Judith Nasatyr	7 Akenside Court 26 Belsize Crescent London NW3 5QT	25/07/2014 20:14:25	OBJ	I urge the City of London to abandon their plan to build dams on the Heath. They are unnecessary - in the last 300 years there have been no destructive floods from the ponds; the wild and natural state of the Heath will be destroyed; hundreds of trees will be destroyed; the works will be detrimental to the environment with heavy traffic and disruption to the area and will seal off access to large areas of the Heath for at least 2 years. All for a dubious and unnecessary purpose.
2014/4332/P	Liz Inman	5 Litchfield Court Litchfield Way NW11 6NE	25/07/2014 18:50:50	PETITNSU PP	<p>I am opposed to this dams planning application for the following reasons:</p> <p>It does not appear to be a legal requirement under the Reservoirs Act 1975.</p> <p>It seems a huge destructive project based on a 1 in 400,000 probability of such a flood. What has changed?</p> <p>It will clearly disfigure our beautiful Heath heritage landscape with new and intrusive earthworks and concrete walls.</p> <p>Over 160 trees need to be felled - which will need over 100 years to be replaced by natural growth, disrupting precious wildlife.</p> <p>Disruptive closure over 2 years of work including the closure of the bathing ponds which are a historical source of leisure for generations of Heath users.</p> <p>Heavy engineering and HGV movements will clearly plough up the heath causing yet more damage to wildlife.</p> <p>It would appear this is a vanity project which will benefit the company tendering for the work at little demonstrated benefit for the public. On the contrary it seems the downsides for the public and wildlife heavily outweigh the putative flood protection,</p> <p>I am therefore as a frequent user of the ladies pond strongly objecting to the planned dams.</p>
2014/4332/P	Robert Powell	24 Millfield Lane N6 6JD	21/07/2014 21:40:06	OBJ	The experts who have been consulted about the Hampstead & Highgate Ponds belong to the very group who will profit considerably from the implementation of these absurd plans. That cannot be right. Gospel Oak is more likely to be flooded by a rise in sea level.
2014/4332/P	Mark Blackburn	97 St Johns Wood Terrace London NW8 6PP	20/07/2014 21:54:49	OBJ	I am a regular heath user (usually three times a week) and I object to this plan. The heath and ponds are one of the most natural places in London, and that is their attraction. Please keep them that way.
2014/4332/P	Melanie Peacock	1 West Hill Court Millfield Lane London N6 6JJ	17/07/2014 11:32:15	OBJ	<p>I do not believe the reasons for the work are valid - if the weather conditions predicted were to occur than most of London would likely be flooded with or without dams.</p> <p>These proposed works will permanently disfigure the Heath which was always intended to be a wild piece of land NOT a landscaped park.</p> <p>I also think the disruption that will be caused by the works in terms of volumes of traffic etc to be unacceptable both to residents and Heath users.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Kate Pahl	15 Albert Street	24/07/2014 22:33:53	OBJ	<p>I am writing to strongly oppose the above application. I am a frequent year-round swimmer in the ponds. I strongly believe the provision of outdoor swimming in a natural environment is one of the things which makes our local area special. I find it difficult to express just how important the ponds are to many, many people - to their physical and mental wellbeing.</p> <p>I urge you to rethink these major works and decide instead to follow the advice of independent experts who state that the ponds and the area around them would be equally well or better protected by taking less drastic measures. I object strongly to the building of new dams and the felling of trees around the ponds and to the closure of any of the ponds for any period of time.</p>
2014/4332/P	Sophia Flucker	53 Pember Road	27/07/2014 17:13:45	PETITNOBJ E	Works appear disproportionate to issue and likely to cause severe disruption to Heath users and wildlife
2014/4332/P	David Blank	69e Bartholomew Road NW5 2AH	26/07/2014 14:24:17	OBJ	<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
2014/4332/P	John	23 Mildmay Grove North	25/07/2014 19:14:27	COMMNT	This seems to be a totally disproportionate response which will cause all kinds of disruption and will ruin the heath for many years. The chances of the kind of flooding which are envisaged happening are so slim as to make this a total waste of time and money.
2014/4332/P	euan macdonald	31 mowbray rd london nw67qs	24/07/2014 11:29:25	COMMNT	the legality of the scale of the work is questionable and the devastation to tree population and wildlife is unmerited. interrupted use of the heath due to extensive building works is unreasonable.
2014/4332/P	Tom Mayhew	Hillcrest	15/07/2014 10:22:47	COMMNT	<p>This really just doesn't seem necessary. Even with proposed new dam the incredibly unlikely chance of max water height would still breach.</p> <p>Not just the locals but all Londoners and even further afield benefit from these rare a precious ponds. I suffered from arthritis and depression but now after regular walks and swims I'm healthy, happy and working again.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Maya Sendall	170 Chamberlayne Rd London NW10 3JT	16/07/2014 17:18:39	OBJ	The grounds upon which these works have been deemed necessary have me asking myself whether I am living in Ghormenghast rather than a society run by reasonable human beings. I was born on the edge of Hampstead Heath and have loved it all my life. It is utterly unique and ancient heritage and of inestimable value to all who use it. I have followed these proposals from the start and can see no genuine reason for them. Having attended the meeting at which the developers and Corporation of London were supposed to have justified these plans, I came away feeling more convinced than ever that there was no genuine reason for these dams to be built. I found the answers offered to everyone there, none of whom seemed to be in favour of these plans, including those local residents who had been told that the dams were to be built because their lives were in danger, were both evasive or not any kind of answer at all. I am sorry to have to conclude, along with everyone I have spoken to, that the whole thing smacks of corruption and the proposed sacrifice of our beloved heritage to be nothing more, or less, than an attempt by those who care nothing for honesty and decent values to make a huge profit. Not only will this affect the people who use the Heath, but it will decimate the wild life. These corrupt enterprises are often exposed in retrospect many years after the irreversible damage has been done. I refer you to the destruction of Deptford in South London, an intact area of historic architectural beauty and a large and thriving community stretching back many generations, which was lost for the same level of spurious reasons and turned into a hideous ghetto where no one would return to live and was instead offered to immigrants and refugees who had no choice but to take what they were offered. This corruption for monetary gain was demonstrated conclusively 40 years later when it was too late. I regret that I smell a similar rat in this case as nothing about it makes any sense, not even to the people who have been told it is for their protection. Thank you for taking the time to hear my views. Please act to defend reason and true values when considering this application and deny permission for the scheme to go ahead
2014/4332/P	Jamie Forsyth	12 holly park road london n113hd	15/07/2014 16:19:25	COMMNT	i object to the planned works, i am a long time heath swimmer and do not believe this is a worthwhile scheme
2014/4332/P	John Mann	109 Chatsworth Road	26/07/2014 07:31:35	COMMNT	Fully support Heath and Hampstead Society's cogent objections to this proposal
2014/4332/P	Fiona Curtin	28 Constantine Road NW3 2NG	25/07/2014 17:49:21	OBJ	I am entirely and strongly opposed to this proposed project. It is unnecessary, unwanted and will damage our beautiful heath and involve a huge amount of disruption/traffic/pollution etc while it is being carried out, and harm wildlife and hundreds of trees. The reasons presented by the City of London have been widely and convincingly disproved. Please listen to both the experts and the 1000s of local people who are opposing this proposal and cancel this scheme. Spend the money on measures that will enhance and not damage our heath and its value to the public.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Maya Sendall	170 Chamberlayne Rd London NW10 3JT	16/07/2014 17:18:38	OBJ	The grounds upon which these works have been deemed necessary have me asking myself whether I am living in Ghormenghast rather than a society run by reasonable human beings. I was born on the edge of Hampstead Heath and have loved it all my life. It is utterly unique and ancient heritage and of inestimable value to all who use it. I have followed these proposals from the start and can see no genuine reason for them. Having attended the meeting at which the developers and Corporation of London were supposed to have justified these plans, I came away feeling more convinced than ever that there was no genuine reason for these dams to be built. I found the answers offered to everyone there, none of whom seemed to be in favour of these plans, including those local residents who had been told that the dams were to be built because their lives were in danger, were both evasive or not any kind of answer at all. I am sorry to have to conclude, along with everyone I have spoken to, that the whole thing smacks of corruption and the proposed sacrifice of our beloved heritage to be nothing more, or less, than an attempt by those who care nothing for honesty and decent values to make a huge profit. Not only will this affect the people who use the Heath, but it will decimate the wild life. These corrupt enterprises are often exposed in retrospect many years after the irreversible damage has been done. I refer you to the destruction of Deptford in South London, an intact area of historic architectural beauty and a large and thriving community stretching back many generations, which was lost for the same level of spurious reasons and turned into a hideous ghetto where no one would return to live and was instead offered to immigrants and refugees who had no choice but to take what they were offered. This corruption for monetary gain was demonstrated conclusively 40 years later when it was too late. I regret that I smell a similar rat in this case as nothing about it makes any sense, not even to the people who have been told it is for their protection. Thank you for taking the time to hear my views. Please act to defend reason and true values when considering this application and deny permission for the scheme to go ahead
2014/4332/P	Gideon Wood	19 Parliament Hill NW3 2TA NW3 2TA	16/07/2014 17:17:05	OBJ	An utterly ridiculous proposal, an incredible expense and an ever-lasting blot on the heath's landscape. Unforgivable if this is allowed
2014/4332/P	Gideon Wood	19 Parliament Hill NW3 2TA NW3 2TA	16/07/2014 17:16:44	OBJ	
2014/4332/P	Catherine Blackmore	Flat 8 Merchon House Anson Road London N7 0RG Flat 8 Merchon House	15/07/2014 08:19:17	PETITNOBJ E	Whilst protection of peoples' residences in the locale against possible future flooding is essential this project appears to be so vast in its scale as to appear an exercise in civil engineering vanity. Smaller, more realistic measures would be preferable on both a social and environmental level - for the Heath itself, the people and wildlife who currently enjoy it and the future generations who will seek to do so.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Maya Sendall	170 Chamberlayne Rd London NW10 3JT	16/07/2014 17:18:38	OBJ	The grounds upon which these works have been deemed necessary have me asking myself whether I am living in Ghormenghast rather than a society run by reasonable human beings. I was born on the edge of Hampstead Heath and have loved it all my life. It is utterly unique and ancient heritage and of inestimable value to all who use it. I have followed these proposals from the start and can see no genuine reason for them. Having attended the meeting at which the developers and Corporation of London were supposed to have justified these plans, I came away feeling more convinced than ever that there was no genuine reason for these dams to be built. I found the answers offered to everyone there, none of whom seemed to be in favour of these plans, including those local residents who had been told that the dams were to be built because their lives were in danger, were both evasive or not any kind of answer at all. I am sorry to have to conclude, along with everyone I have spoken to, that the whole thing smacks of corruption and the proposed sacrifice of our beloved heritage to be nothing more, or less, than an attempt by those who care nothing for honesty and decent values to make a huge profit. Not only will this affect the people who use the Heath, but it will decimate the wild life. These corrupt enterprises are often exposed in retrospect many years after the irreversible damage has been done. I refer you to the destruction of Deptford in South London, an intact area of historic architectural beauty and a large and thriving community stretching back many generations, which was lost for the same level of spurious reasons and turned into a hideous ghetto where no one would return to live and was instead offered to immigrants and refugees who had no choice but to take what they were offered. This corruption for monetary gain was demonstrated conclusively 40 years later when it was too late. I regret that I smell a similar rat in this case as nothing about it makes any sense, not even to the people who have been told it is for their protection. Thank you for taking the time to hear my views. Please act to defend reason and true values when considering this application and deny permission for the scheme to go ahead
2014/4332/P	Elena Moynihan	18 Christchurch Hill	19/07/2014 10:30:08	OBJ	The Corporation's consultation was deeply flawed as they gave no 'do nothing' alternative. These works are utterly unwanted, the only people who want them are the interested parties who are going to make money from the project.
2014/4332/P	Julia Oertli	46 Burmarsh 71 Marsden Street NW5 3JA	21/07/2014 20:01:55	OBJ	As a very frequent visitor to Hampstead Heath and the swimming ponds, I strongly object to the Council's dam construction proposals. These dams correspond to a highly improbable scenario, and, as has been admitted, would not fully guarantee security from flooding in case of a torrential storm in the Heath. Their construction is very intensive in terms of economic, environmental and social costs and they do not correspond to a felt need by the communities that use the ponds and the park. I urge the Council to rethink its plans to construct dams in the Heath, seriously evaluate the appropriateness and necessity of such construction and consider investing the predicted sum in other, more pressing projects in the Borough, such as tackling homelessness and supporting social care.
2014/4332/P	Talia Cohen	15 shepherds close london n6 5ag	21/07/2014 19:19:51	OBJ	I object to these proposals. The scarring and disfigurement of our heathland is totally unjustifiable, and the proposals would do nothing to stop imagined flooding anyway. The scale of these proposals are in ludicrous disproportion to the actual risk, which needs to be dealt with by efficient land drainage.
2014/4332/P	Talia Cohen	15 shepherds close london n6 5ag	21/07/2014 19:19:50	OBJ	

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Talia Cohen	15 shepherds close london n6 5ag	21/07/2014 19:19:50	OBJ	I object to these proposals. The scarring and disfigurement of our heathland is totally unjustifiable, and the proposals would do nothing to stop imagined flooding anyway. The scale of these proposals are in ludicrous disproportion to the actual risk, which needs to be dealt with by efficient land drainage.
2014/4332/P	Talia Cohen	15 shepherds close london n6 5ag	21/07/2014 19:19:28	OBJ	
2014/4332/P	Richard Melman	27a Roderick Road London NW3 2NN	24/07/2014 12:31:36	OBJNOT	I do not believe that this project is necessary nor required by law.
2014/4332/P	Charles Mattison	Flat 22 Westside 68 Fortis Green London N2 9ES	24/07/2014 12:06:11	OBJ	<p>I strongly object to the proposals, on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The works are unnecessary. There has been no overtopping or dam-failure in all the 300 years since the ponds were constructed. The 400,000 year event scenario is completely unrealistic. 2. The works will provide no protection against flooding for the households and businesses below the ponds. Past floods (the last in 1974) were caused by the drainage system being inadequate. Undertaking the proposed works will give residents and statutory authorities a false sense of security. 3. The proposals will dramatically alter the historic scene at the ponds, breaking the sense of continuity and link with the past that is so important to preserving our valuable communal assets. 4. The works themselves will cause unacceptable disruption to wildlife and heath users for a considerable time. 5. The scheme is a huge waste of public funds, at a time when other, justifiable projects have been shelved. The money should be transferred to the water authority and ringfenced to improve the drainage capacity for the area purported to be at risk from the ponds' overtopping. 6. The scheme has been justified and designed by a company that has an interest (directly or indirectly) in the scheme going ahead. Alternative, independent expert advice flatly contradicts that 'justification'.
2014/4332/P	Robert Smart	27 highgate west hill	19/07/2014 20:56:46	INT	The engineer's recommendations are not in accordance with the requirements of the Act. The risk assumed by the engineers is grossly exaggerated. An event which would be expected to happen only once in 400,000 years is effectively a nil risk. The cost of £15 million (£17 million?) as well as the concealed overhead of supporting these works is completely out of proportion to this and is not an expense to which public funds should be committed in these still straitened economic times in priority to much more urgent projects which need funding.
2014/4332/P	Robert Smart	27 highgate west hill	19/07/2014 20:56:25	INT	

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Tim Ruffles	Flat 2 Prince Arthur Court Prince Arthur Mews NW3 1RD	19/07/2014 16:23:22	OBJ	This application will have very obvious concrete harms to the enjoyment of the heath, on the grounds of entirely specious models of imagined ones. The heath is one of the most loved sites in the ward and I believe the council has a duty to protect everyone's ability to continue to enjoy it.
2014/4332/P	Keith King	22 Millfield Lane Highgate London N6 6JD	18/07/2014 15:33:10	OBJ	I object to this building /destruction on Hampstead Heath.
2014/4332/P	Richard Melman	27a Roderick Road London NW3 2NN	24/07/2014 12:31:15	OBJNOT	I do not believe that this project is necessary nor required by law.
2014/4332/P	susan hellard	52 mount pleasant crescent london n4 4hp	24/07/2014 12:25:51	COMMNT	I am a regular pond and Heath user.The flood risk projections are over exaggerated.In 300 years of existence the ponds have not caused flooding, in spite of last winters wettest record. The 1871 Heath Act requires City of London to preserve it in "Natural state and aspect". The proposed works would not.It would be a desecration of trees and wildlife. Why are not camden Council and Thames water looking at their responsibilities to ensure sewers etc are properly maintained ? There will be flooding and loss of life through that long before the ponds cause problems.two years of 'heavy plant' on the heath will impact the soil and increase flood risk. The risk model assumes there would be no flood warnings. There is no provision of alternative swim facilities for ladies Pond as was originally mooted. Over 160 mature trees will be felled.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Maria Lancaster	19 Davina House 59a Fordwych Road London NW2 3TW	23/07/2014 14:51:45	OBJ	<p>I object to this planned development for the following reasons:</p> <p>Legality Reservoirs Act 1975 does legally not require works to be carried out on this huge scale.</p> <p>2. Unrealistic modelling: > models for a giant storm with a 1 in 400,000 year probability;</p> <p>> assumes no warning and no emergency services.</p> <p>3. Disfigurement of Heath landscape: > new and unnatural huge earthworks and excavations at Catchpit and Model Boating Pond;</p> <p>> concrete walls at Men's Bathing Pond and Highgate No.1 Pond.</p> <p>4. Tree loss: > over 160 trees to be felled;</p> <p>> large tree loss at Stock Pond to create giant spillway.</p> <p>Closure and disruption: - 2 years of works requiring closure of popular parts of the Heath;</p> <p>- closure of bathing ponds;</p> <p>- heavy engineering plant and thousands of HGV movements;</p> <p>- damage to wildlife.</p>
2014/4332/P	Penny Tompkins	104 Eton Hall Eton College Road London NW3 2DN	16/07/2014 09:53:42	OBJ	I am against the proposed engineering works to the Hampstead and Highgate chains of ponds
2014/4332/P	Erik de Haan	2 West Hill Court	15/07/2014 13:03:05	OBJ	I have been swimming in the men's pond since 2000, on a very regular basis, and I have never seen the water level rise beyond the lowest fence/pier level. Draining is entirely adequate. A project like this strikes me as absurd, wasteful, and damaging to the landscape and nature. If more safety is needed it would be easy to create an overflow basin lower down, next to parliament hill busstops. At the very least alternatives should be considered.
2014/4332/P	Deborah Picker	8 Chanin Mews	17/07/2014 11:35:10	PETITNOBJ E	I am given to understand that this proposed work is not only unnecessary but also potentially damaging to the heath and it's environment. I am also given to understand that the heath should legally be preserved in it's natural environment. Therefore I object to this proposal as it will be damaging to the heath and it's natural environment. And there is apparently no need for these 'dam' works. So please heed the views of the thousands of heath-lovers who do not wish to see the last bastion of natural environment in the area damaged.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Joanna Goldsworthy	12 Willoughby Road London NW3 1SA	16/07/2014 12:38:10	OBJNOT	These proposed engineering works will not only alter the character of the Heath but appear from reliable evidence to be unnecessary. As a long-time resident of Hampstead and user of the Heath and the swimming ponds for thirty years, I object very strongly to the proposal. PLEASE INFORM ME OF THE COMMITTEE DATE
2014/4332/P	Andrew Cullen	21 Lyndhurst Gardens	16/07/2014 04:26:17	COMMNT	I object to the proposed works because it is a manifestly unnecessary and disfiguring alteration to Hampstead Heath to deal with a very remote risk.
2014/4332/P	Peter Sussmann	33 Northway NW11 6PB	18/07/2014 12:42:23	COMMNT	As a user of Hampstead Heath and the amenities thereon, strongly object to proposals under application 2014/4332/P Peter Sussmann 33 Northway NW11 6PB
2014/4332/P	Steve Barber	Sunbury Fitzroy Park London N6 6HX	24/07/2014 19:37:18	OBJ	I have to comment against these proposals which I see as a massive over reaction to a massively remote possibility. I have lived by the Heath for over 60 years and have seen the heaviest of downpours - and they have not led to flooding. One has to have a very vivid imagination and very little common sense to envisage water pouring from one pond to another and then down towards Highgate Road, Swains Lane and St Albans Road. There is a very large flat run-off area before a tsunami would reach that point and then start its way down Highgate Road. In fact, the scenarios being painted are ridiculous and this whole exercise is a panic reaction. Life always has risks and people are insured against them. This is hardly a flood plain. For people to be injured by this envisaged wall of water is just not realistic. The plans should be put back where they belong - and rejected.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Emma Clark	Flat 15 12 Shepherds Hill Highgate London N6 5AQ	23/07/2014 11:58:22	OBJ	<p>I feel very strongly that this application should be rejected for the following reasons.</p> <p>Firstly, the modelling used as the basis for these works is unrealistic. The models use a 1 in 400,000 giant storm with the assumption of no warning and no emergency services. There is also no legal requirement for such huge scale works.</p> <p>Secondly, the disruption to so many Londoners, for whom the Heath is an essential sanctuary, would be huge and long lasting. There is no real alternative to the Heath within walking distance for many of the people that walk, swim and exercise there daily. The use of heavy engineering and HGVs would also severally disrupt the areas surrounding the heath for a number of years.</p> <p>Lastly, the cost to the environment of the Heath, both in terms of tree and wildlife loss and the disfigurement of it's natural landscape, is too high a price to pay for works that are clearly unnecessary.</p> <p>Thank you for your time.</p>
2014/4332/P	Kevin Vose	594	15/07/2014 11:22:08	COMMNT	I object to the planned works on the Hampstead Heath ponds.
2014/4332/P	Edwin Henshaw	147 Widdenham Road London N7 9SF	15/07/2014 11:05:14	OBJ	<p>I object to the proposed plans on grounds of the damage it will cause to the natural look of the heath, and of excessive and unnecessary expense. I am an almost daily visitor to the heath and a user of the Men's Bathing Pond facilities. The proposed plans to raise the dams on the ponds will adversely affect the natural look and feel of these areas of the heath, and cost an enormous amount of money. The necessity from a flood prevention point of view is extremely dubious, and I question the interests and motivation of those who have made the assessment (who I understand are also likely get the work if the plans go ahead.). With all the rain that cause so much damage in many parts of the country in January 2014 there was no problem with flooding with the current dams. Previous historical flooding problems have been due to inadequate drainage in the lower levels in Gospel Oak/ Kentish Town - not with the dams around the ponds. I urge Camden Council to reject this planning application.</p>
2014/4332/P	katherine	7 Leighton Grove	20/07/2014 22:10:44	PETITNOBJ E	As a regular user of the health and the ladies pond, having look at the available research, I think the proposed plan is unnecessary and highly disruptive and should not be approved.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Ben Brown	49 Claremont Road London N6 5DA	23/07/2014 09:46:49	OBJNOT	<p>At the public consultation evening at Parliament Hill School on 5th June 2014, the Corporation of London admitted that it would "welcome" a legal ruling that it did not have to build the dams and would not be found guilty of manslaughter if the one in up to four hundred thousand chance of a flood killed someone.</p> <p>It follows that the Corporation would also welcome their application for Planning Permission being rejected, as the highest legal authority assures me that this would also discharge their legal responsibility if the one in four hundred thousand chance came off (without requiring them to appeal either, which, by definition, they would not wish to do, since they would "welcome" the decision).</p> <p>Neither though would Camden Council become liable if the one in four hundred thousand chance came off since the law recognises that it is not reasonable to plan for such vanishingly small improbabilities.</p> <p>It follows that Camden Council should exercise common sense and reject the Corporation's application, thereby ending the farcical situation of a public body applying for planning permission to build fifteen million pounds worth of dams it does not want to build, but is driven by fear and fear only to ask for.</p> <p>So let us liberate the Corporation from its fear by rejecting the application, whilst saving fifteen million pounds and the beauty of the Heath the Corporation is meant to be preserving.</p> <p>If the Heath was still run by Camden Council, rather than the super-rich Corporation, this issue would never have arisen and, at a time when there is a real need for flood defences in other parts of the country, it is frankly in bad taste that it has got as far it has.</p> <p>Please notify me of the Committee Date, as I would like to attend and speak.</p>
2014/4332/P	Jane Northcote	162 Cromwell Tower Barbican LONDON EC2Y 8DD	09/07/2014 17:45:42	OBJ	<p>I object to this application. The proposed works are unnecessary, costly and will damage the nature of the Heath.</p> <p>There has been no flooding due to the ponds, even in the recent heavy rains of this winter. The Heath earth absorbs the water. The cost of this work is an unnecessary drain on the City's resources. Do something more useful instead! The Heath is an outstanding natural resource for Londoners like me. I use the swimming ponds and want them left as they are. I object to this application which will damage the nature of the ponds, and change their character.</p>
2014/4332/P	Jane Leggett	2 Cholmeley Crescent Highgate London N6 5HA	22/07/2014 16:01:40	OBJ	<p>I fully support the Heath and Hampstead Society's decision to seek a judicial review of the City's decision to proceed with the Ponds Project. The massive spending required seems completely out of proportion to any conceivable risk. The ponds have held despite record levels of rainfall. The arguments in favour of the dams have been thoroughly discredited.</p> <p>Also it seems patently obvious that decisions have been made without taking notice of the views of those who use the facilities. I regularly swim at the Ladies Pond. Everybody I have spoken to agrees that we do not support the proposed works.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Silvia Bardoni	Flat 2 10 Minster Road	26/07/2014 21:40:51	PETITNOBJ E	It would permanently disfigure the Heath
2014/4332/P	Kate Pahl	15 Albert Street	24/07/2014 22:34:15	OBJ	<p>I am writing to strongly oppose the above application. I am a frequent year-round swimmer in the ponds. I strongly believe the provision of outdoor swimming in a natural environment is one of the things which makes our local area special. I find it difficult to express just how important the ponds are to many, many people - to their physical and mental wellbeing.</p> <p>I urge you to rethink these major works and decide instead to follow the advice of independent experts who state that the ponds and the area around them would be equally well or better protected by taking less drastic measures. I object strongly to the building of new dams and the felling of trees around the ponds and to the closure of any of the ponds for any period of time.</p>
2014/4332/P	Eamon	47 burghley road NW5 1UH	17/07/2014 19:15:38	OBJ	<p>As a regular Heath user and one who greatly appreciates it, I must strongly object to these proposals which are based on a completely false and illogical justification. IF the reason for it all were the risk of dam collapse, then the solution would be to reinforce the dams and definitely NOT to build them up and hold more water, as that might actually increase the risk of collapse-related flooding in the future. Please Camden Council do not consent to these awful proposals. There is nothing to stop them from reinforcing the dams if necessary. Please do not allow them to build the dams up or any other needless alterations to the Heath. Thank you.</p>
2014/4332/P	Mrs Roberts	17 South Hill Park NW3 2ST	17/07/2014 17:11:20	OBJ	<p>We have lived in this area for 30 years and walk each day on the Heath . At no period during this time have we seen the ponds come within any danger of flooding over. During periods of heavy rain when the heath becomes saturated ponds develop at the bottom of hills. Raising dam walls would not help that condition .</p> <p>Dredging the ponds would seem sensible but we are opposed to the proposed engineering works as unnecessary and waste of money .</p> <p>Far more worrying is the risk of flooding from all the basements being allowed to be built in this catchment area. They are raising or displacing the ground water levels and diverting underground streams . Springs are bubbling up in unexpected places. This can only get worst if basements are continuing to be allowed to be built.here.Please allow sense to prevail.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Peter Jacobs	10 Langbourne Avenue London N66AL	23/07/2014 12:00:47	OBJ	<p>I urge the council to reject the application on the following grounds:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The basis of the application is heavily flawed. It is predicated on a risk assessment modelling an extreme storm on a one in 400,000 years probability. This is utterly unrealistic, The probability at this risk level of global warming raising the sea levels so that Gospel Oak is under water is far higher.. 2) It is similarly flawed in that the basis for linking the ponds to such flooding is false; the flooding that happened a few years ago was the result of overloaded drains, not overflowing ponds and resultant run-off. 3) The risk to life assessment does not take account of any public services warnings or support. 4) Legally, the Reservoirs Act 1975 does not require works to be carried out on this huge scale. 5) The environmental loss from the implemenation of the ponds, on the other hand, is enormous and has a 100% probability - loss of trees, introduction of unnatural earhworks and concrete barriers that can not be disguised as heath landscape, loss of views from paths, major disruption to users of the Heath (access, paths, grass, use of the bathing ponds (all of which I use) and disruption to wildlife for the period of construction and for a while afterwards, plus the risk of some unforeseen permanent damage caused by the work. 6) The cost is enormous, diverting City funds from more needed and socially/environmentally worthwhile uses. 7) The 'green' implications of the thousands of truck journeys (pollution) are unacceptable..
2014/4332/P	Anna Fairbank	47 Fairmead Road London N19 4DG	27/07/2014 20:13:18	OBJ	<p>The City of London is required under the Hampstead Heath Act of 1871 to preserve it in its “natural state and aspect”.</p> <p>The proposed works will have a huge and permanent detrimental effect on the natural state and aspect of the Heath- as well as an even more devastating impact for several years. The removal of trees and shrubs from the dams and the slipway areas will make the ponds look like artificial reservoirs instead of looking like natural ponds. The kingfishers will probably not survive the process and will probably never nest in the nature pond again. The meadow west of the ladies pond will no longer be a calm and tranquil area but will have an access road bringing heavy vehicles to the works at the ladies' pond. The ladies' pond will be out of use for months and once back in use will never regain its present beautiful tranquility and natural appearance.</p> <p>The suggestions made which purport to improve the environment all seem to involve further loss of trees (apparently to improve water quality or increase viewing opportunities) which will in fact spoil the natural charm of the ponds and the size of areas of natural habitat at present not overlooked by or traversed by humans.</p> <p>I swim in the ladies pond and walk to and around the Heath several times a week and it keeps me happy and healthy. There are likely to be years of depression for the many people who rely on the Heath and will be deeply upset at such a scale of loss of amenity.</p> <p>And all of this is unnecessary. The case for any major works on the Heath has not been made out to the satisfaction of the majority of Heath users. The case for this particular scheme is flawed and controversial. Camden should not take the risk of approving such a devastating scheme which will result in permanent damage to a world famous and much loved open space and the equally famous and loved swimming ponds</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Michael Fleming	26 Station Road Fulbourn Cambridge CB21 5ES	23/07/2014 11:08:24	OBJ	Outrageous manipulation of data by engineering firm to fabricate a fictitious threat. No doubt for an exorbitant fee. Council probably feel they can't back out, now they are so far down the line, but urge them to do the right thing and refuse permission before they ruin one of London's most sublime assets forever.
2014/4332/P	Neil Jones	216 St John's Way	23/07/2014 11:03:46	OBJ	Please reject this planning application. I am a regular user of the Heath and the bathing ponds. I think that this work is unnecessary and overly disruptive. The heavy machinery and large vehicles will cause an unacceptable disruption to the tranquility and wildlife. The closure of the ponds for 2 years to bathers is unacceptable and unnecessary. The likelihood of 1 in 400,000 year storm, without warning, is unrealistic. The proposed changes will damage the natural look of the Heath. The damage that will be caused to wildlife and the loss of trees proposed is unacceptable. These works are unnecessary and will not enhance the natural appearance of the Heath - a legal requirement. Please reject planning permission for these works.
2014/4332/P	Oliver Senton	31 Kimberley Gardens N4 1LB	23/07/2014 10:58:35	OBJ	Dear Camden Council, I'm sure you've heard these objections many times now (which is surely the point) - but the proposed building work on Hampstead Heath is not only unjustified and unsightly, but is not being carried out within the proper channels for planning permission. It ignores many details of the Reservoirs Act (1975), fails to include normal warning and emergency provisions, and makes no plans for the impact on the surrounding environment and community of the work itself. Its climatic predictions are utterly unrealistic, preposterous even - and all in all it is a scheme which should be rejected.
2014/4332/P	Ruth Gibson	Top Floor Flat 5 Mackeson Road NW3 2LU	23/07/2014 10:52:18	OBJ	This proposed work on the heat is totally unnecessary and will be changing a beautiful part of London that has not been changed for hundreds of years! The chance of the ponds flooding is negligible, it being a 1 in a 400,000 year probability. Please leave it alone!!!
2014/4332/P	Anita Dhillon	6J Stanley Terrace London N19 4JX	28/07/2014 08:54:26	OBJ	I object to the environmental damage that you may cause by doing this work.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Anna Fairbank	47 Fairmead Road London N19 4DG	27/07/2014 20:12:56	OBJ	<p>The City of London is required under the Hampstead Heath Act of 1871 to preserve it in its “natural state and aspect”.</p> <p>The proposed works will have a huge and permanent detrimental effect on the natural state and aspect of the Heath- as well as an even more devastating impact for several years. The removal of trees and shrubs from the dams and the slipway areas will make the ponds look like artificial reservoirs instead of looking like natural ponds. The kingfishers will probably not survive the process and will probably never nest in the nature pond again. The meadow west of the ladies pond will no longer be a calm and tranquil area but will have an access road bringing heavy vehicles to the works at the ladies' pond. The ladies' pond will be out of use for months and once back in use will never regain its present beautiful tranquility and natural appearance.</p> <p>The suggestions made which purport to improve the environment all seem to involve further loss of trees (apparently to improve water quality or increase viewing opportunities) which will in fact spoil the natural charm of the ponds and the size of areas of natural habitat at present not overlooked by or traversed by humans.</p> <p>I swim in the ladies pond and walk to and around the Heath several times a week and it keeps me happy and healthy. There are likely to be years of depression for the many people who rely on the Heath and will be deeply upset at such a scale of loss of amenity.</p> <p>And all of this is unnecessary. The case for any major works on the Heath has not been made out to the satisfaction of the majority of Heath users. The case for this particular scheme is flawed and controversial. Camden should not take the risk of approving such a devastating scheme which will result in permanent damage to a world famous and much loved open space and the equally famous and loved swimming ponds</p>
2014/4332/P	Mary Cance	80 Burghley Road London NW5 1UN	21/07/2014 18:11:15	OBJNOT	<p>The proposed engineering works are primarily contrary to the 1871 Hampstead Heath Act that seeks to protect the landscape of Hampstead Heath from major alteration. The proposed works are major engineering and will not only change the landscape permanently (contrary to the act) But disrupt public access to a much used and loved public open space for a significant period.</p> <p>A event public consultation by the CoL about the works revealed widespread. Disapproval of the works and has been ignored.</p> <p>Promises to keep a swimming facility for women only open have been reneged on. Proper, effective public flood warning systems have not been Put in place. The proposed works are extraordinarily disfiguring disfiguring of our well loved landscape.</p>
2014/4332/P	Ruth Evans	24 Falkland Rd	16/07/2014 11:35:07	OBJ	<p>These plans would disfigure the natural beauty of the Heath, causing untold misery to the thousands of people who use the Heath as a free recreational space. The decision is not evidence based and is a disproportionate measure that would not provide value for money, and would cause considerable aesthetic harm to the environment.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4332/P	Camilla Scaramanga	142 Makepeace Mansions Makepeace Avenue London N6 6ER	25/07/2014 16:59:30	APP	I am writing to ask you to reject the City of London's planning application which will cause severe disfigurement of the landscape on Hampstead Heath, including tree loss. There would be damage to wildlife, closure of bathing ponds, and heavy engineering work/lorries that would disrupt the peace of the place. The Reservoirs Act of 1975 does not require work to be carried out on this huge scale. There is a 1 in 400,000 year chance of the giant storm they are preparing against, and the proposal also assumes no warning and no emergency services. It is completely unnecessary.
