75 Parliament Hill
London NW3 2TH

4/08/14

Development Management Team
LBC
Town Hall Extension
Argyle Street
London WC1H 8ND

Hampstead Heath Dams and Ponds Project Ref 2014/4332/P

I object to this project on the following grounds:

1. The damage it will do to the landscape and character of the heath. The huge and unnatural earthworks will destroy the present atmosphere of natural countryside.

2. The lack of need for changes on this scale. The present dams have never flooded. And, as a statistician, I find the claim that we need to be protected from the risk of a storm likely to occur once in 400,000 years absurd.

3. The detrimental effect it will have on many people's health. This will happen in two ways:

a) The heath provides opportunities for many forms of exercise – walking, swimming, cycling, playing games etc.. But it attracts people to do these things on the heath because it is a natural, wild and beautiful place. If this project goes ahead it will become a reservoir park. People will not come any distance to do these things on it and people nearby are likely to stop doing them altogether. This will lead to increases in obesity, heart disease, stroke and other conditions related to lack of exercise.

b) More importantly, the heath has an atmosphere which eases stress and creates a sense of well-being and relaxation. This will be destroyed by the high dams and commonplace ambience they will create. Many people will feel a sense of desecration as something they value is violated. These feelings will lead to an increase in depression and other mental health problems.

Inevitably there will be increased costs for the National Health Service.

4. The spurious legality claimed to necessitate the changes. The 1975 Reservoirs Act does not require works on this scale and the 1871 Hampstead Heath Act outlaws the exploitation of Hampstead Heath for commercial purposes.

5. On a personal note. I live very near the heath and am already feeling depressed at the prospect of the mutilation of a place I have come to love. I know the changes will curtail my swimming – the currently idyllic walk to the pond will be marred by concrete. And I will no longer walk to South End Green by the ponds but take the much shorter route straight down the road.

In sum, this proposal would seriously disfigure the heath and cause major distress and ill-health to many for no reasonable purpose. And it is of questionable legality.

[redacted]

Ann Cartwright

44 South Hill Park

London NW3 2SJ

5 August 2014

[redacted]

Dear Mr Markwell

Planning reference 2014/4332/P

Hampstead and Highgate chains of ponds Hampstead Heath

I am writing to object to the planning application proposed by the City of London for work on the dams on Hampstead Heath, and ask that the application be refused.

This is objection is on a personal basis, as a resident of nearly 30 years, but I am also a member of the Heath and Hampstead Society Heath Sub-committee.

The works proposed would have an adverse effect on the houses in South Hill Park which adjoin ponds No 1 and No 2. The spillways presented in the application will be unsightly and, combined with raising the height of the dams, will spoil the relatively "rural" effect of the area.

There will be a loss of trees, including some of considerable age (eg some of the planes between Ponds 1 and 2).

These are changes which will have an immediate effect in my locality, but the proposals for work further up the Hampstead chain, and on the Highgate chain, would have the same results but on a larger scale.

I believe that the City of London has not adopted a sensible balance between the various engineering assumptions underpinning its plans and the requirements of the original 1871 Hampstead Heath Act, which dictates the preservation of the Heath's "wild and natural state".

The works proposed do not pay sufficient attention to the 1871 Act, would disfigure the Heath and would be detrimental to the areas surrounding the Heath, many of them Conservation Areas.

While the proposed works address overtopping of dams and dam collapse, any application should demonstrate fully how flood water could better be drawn away by the sewerage system; the present plans focus on the integrity of the dams rather than what happens to any water which flows down the spillways in an extreme storm after it leaves the Heath.

In addition there should be further assessment of early warning systems to alert those downstream who would be affected by a severe flood on the Heath. This would mitigate the extent of work required on the dams themselves.

John Beyer [redacted]

W.S. Solman, Architect
99B Hornsey Lane
London N6 5LY

30/07/14.

London Boro. of Camden
Planning Department
Development Team
Town Hall Extension
Argyle Street
London W.C.1H 8ND

Dear Sirs,

Re Hampstead & Highgate Chain of Ponds., Hampstead Heath
Application ref. 214/4332

With regard to your planning notice, I enclose 2 copies of my letter dated 11/04/12 which sets out my objection to this proposal. Before public consultation got into full swing, however nothing that has been subsequently been revealed by the City of London has changed my ~~opinion~~ opinion of this proposal and thus my objection remains and I am fully in support of the Heath & Hampstead Society objection as outlined in the attached 'Dam Nonsence' brochure which I'm sure & hope you are also considering.

[redacted]

W Solman ARIBA
99B Hornsey Lane
London N65LW

11/04/2012

Michael Welbank
Chairman Hampstead Heath
Management Committee
City of London 270 Guild Hall
EC2P2EJ

Dear Sir

Hampstead Heath new proposals for damming the ponds!

This is my own recollection as a long term resident and user of the area of an event that occurred in 1976 causing a flood of water to inundate properties on the south side perimeter of the Heath, which is now again relevant to the most recent proposals by the city of London.

In mid August 1976 (i.e 36 years ago) after a severe period of drought several hours of continuous rain fell on the Heath and adjacent local area amounting to 6 inches in one half hour. This is was totally exceptional and unprecedented, in every sense of these words. This caused flooding to some adjacent properties notably on the south side of the Heath.

As a result, extensive anti-flooding works to prevent a future reoccurrence were carried out including, alteration to the public sewers on the perimeter and anti-flood works on the Heath notably on the North of the Lido. The ponds themselves where reinforced with sheet pilling on the embankments and other measures. I also believe that routine maintenance of the public sewers and road gullies were given more priority and continues to this day in insuring that the public sewer outfalls can function adequately with the water run off from the Heath, not necessarily directly from the ponds themselves. These measures have clearly been successful since there has been no further problem in 36 years! A phrase comes to mind which might be "if it isn't broke, why fix it?" especially after if it has already been fixed and proven.

With reference to this background information I and other users of the Heath are extremely concerned about the nature of the City of London's new proposals.

There seems to be a dearth of details information to the public on these proposals, although I understand that Consultants have been appointed to meet the City of London's Brief, and are no doubt pleased to be involved in what must be a lucrative exercise in preparing contracts and designs for £12 million plus of work.

I am frankly dismayed by these proposals which could cause interruptions in the public activities, not least of all in the swimming fraternity and potentially detrimental to the natural beauty of the Heath by the construction of concrete dam structures turning areas of the Heath into and engineering building site possibly for many years.

I would ask therefore that…

1) A forum for public discussion to be established to seek proper public views for these proposals.
2) That the extent of the works to be clearly explained in detail at a public forum, e.g. how many ponds will be effected.
3) The source of funding to be enumerated and whether any public monies are involved.
4) That transparency and proper public consultation be observed, barring in mind that the Stewardship of the Heath has largely benefited form the City of London's involvement, since it would not be productive to alienate the public at large of this matter and at this stage.
5) That the solution you propose be reconsidered whether there might be less disruptive and cheaper solutions, i.e. 1 or 2 pumping stations (on standby) at strategic points on all outfalls into the public sewer, which would require consultation with Thames Water to whom we all subscribe in our rates.

These views are my own but also reflect the views of many in the local community and beyond who have expressed concern about the expense, appropriateness and disruption of your current proposals.

You are no doubt aware about the representations made in the local press about the unlikely statistical occurrence of a similar event which occurred 36 years ago, views which I share.

I also note that you are currently cutting down trees on the embankments of the ponds which could have the effect of destabilising the embankments.

Your current proposals for the damming of the Heath ponds under your Stewardship could be of concern to all Londoners since the Heath has been there for their many passed years and hopefully for many years to come.

I would very much appreciate a response from you to these matters.

Yours sincerely

William Solman

Copy to: R.Sutherland Smith
Chairman USA

Hampstead Heath Ponds
Facts and Myths about the dams

www.heathandhampsteadsociety.org.uk Reg. Charity No. 261782

The City of London intend to build huge new 'flood defences' on the Hampstead Heath ponds. **They offer a 'choice'** between two unacceptable and legally unnecessary sets of works that will permanently disfigure the familiar and much loved Heath landscape.

Municipal water works or 'wild and natural'?
The City's 'before' and 'after' photographs are misleading. They do not truly show the serious and harmful visual changes these works will cause. **Here are more realistic photographs** of the Boating Pond before, and after, mocked up from the City's measurements.

Now you see it..... Now you don't: how it will look when the engineers have finished - even this does not show the full extent of this new dam which continues in a curve half way up the hill on each side of the pond.

- **The DamNonsense campaign**, supported by the Heath & Hampstead Society, the Highgate Society, swimmers' and anglers' organisations and many other Heath users, is aimed at persuading the City not to proceed with these works unless confirmation is obtained from the court that the City is legally obliged to address the extreme and fanciful risks for which the works are designed, all based on computer-modelling.

For more information about our campaign and our objections see
http://www.DamNonsense.org.uk www.heathandhampsteadsociety.org.uk

Camden

Comments Form

Name. Mollie BARGER, Kirsten BARGER, Clive BARGER

Address. Flat 3, Southill Mansions, 68 Southill Park NW3 2SL

Email address. [redacted]

Telephone num[redacted]

Planning application number. 2014/4332/P

Planning application address. Hampstead and Highgate chains of ponds Hampstead Heath, London.

I support the application (please state reasons below) ☐
I object to the application (please state reasons below) ☐

Your comments

We wish to object to the Dam Schemes for the following reasons;

- Though inexpert ourselves as far as complex engineering considerations are concerned – we are sufficiently informed about the schemes from a variety of sources to disbelieve the contention that dams are necessary or that the existing flooding prevention will not withstand future rainfall or consequent inundation. And in any case, experts proposing the new dams do not themselves appear to be sufficiently convinced that the proposed changes will prevent future flood damage.
- Our mother, Mollie Barger, has inherited a flat at Southill Mansions, Southill Park, overlooking Hampstead Pond I for 35 years. The proposals entail draining her wildlife (No I) pond and hereby the enjoyment of her view of it and the Heath meaningless for the time left available to her – she is aged 94, and thus, moreover, the reverence and enjoyment of this pond by anyone else or who visits it including all her neighbours.
- The proposals are therefore a complete waste of time, money and resources which will adversely affect the beauty of this environment and leave its enjoyment by everyone who visits it entirely open to question for a prolonged, actually unknown period of time.
- So to conclude, in objecting to the dam proposals, we wish to draw attention to the devasting and prolonged effect of noise pollution, dirt and dentitus and all the other aspects of building works on this scale. And draw attention to the drastic loss of amenity, including Swimming facilities, much loved and appreciated, and everything else consequent on these developments which will be so considerable and adversely affecting that we can only give a resounding NO !! to

Please continue on extra [redacted]

Camden

Comments Form

Name....Colin Cooper.....

Address..Apex Lodge, Fitzroy Park, London N6 6JA

Email address....[redacted].....

Telephone numbe[redacted].....

Planning application number...2014/4332/P.....

Planning application address..Hampstead & Higgate main ponds..

~~I support the application (please state reasons below)~~ ☐
I object to the application (please state reasons below) ☑

Your comments

The proposed works on the ponds would cause permanent damage to the natural landscape, disturbance of plant and animal wildlife and destruction of the mature ecosystems within the ponds. This seems contrary to the legal obligation of the City Corporation to maintain the natural aspect of the Heath.

In the event of an unprecedented rainstorm, the Heath, with its absorbancy, undulating surface and lack of entering watercourses, would be least affected by flooding in the area - it is an example of an area of natural flood resistance. Flooding in Tuthall Park or Gospel Oak would not arise from the Heath and would not be avoided by these works.

Please continue on extra sheets if you wish

Last winter saw record rainfall but no flooding on the Heath and no excessive flow in its streams or rise in pond levels. There was no runoff except from hard surfaced paths.

I have walked dogs daily on the Heath in all weather for more than 30 years and never seen significant flooding there. During exceptional heavy rain I have experienced flooding on the roads nearby when water falling on the roads exceeding the capacity of the drains.

The ponds were created more than 2 centuries ago and the existing dams have contained them. If they need repair or strengthening this could be done by strengthening the foundations of existing paths that cross them without increasing their height.

It seems the proposals have been based on data collected from sites which are not applicable to the unique environment of Hampstead Heath. I hope the Council will agree with me.

Camden

Comments Form

Name... MRS ELIZABETH GRAY

Address... FLAT C SOUTH HILL MANSIONS, 68/70 SOUTH HILL PARK NW3 2SL

Email address... [redacted]

Telephone nun[redacted]

Planning application number... 2014332/P

Planning application address... HAMPSTEAD AND HIGHGATE CHAIN OF PONDS HAMPSTEAD HEATH, LONDON

I support the application (please state reasons below) ☐

✓ I object to the application (please state reasons below) ☐

Your comments

- I understand that the work proposed is unlawful,
- The scale of the proposal is Enormous.
  It would destroy the natural beauty of the heath.
  It would damage the Ecology, and plants and animals on the heath.
  The proposed work, ~~which~~ involving large earth-moving trucks, would seriously damage the heath and would disrupt life on the heath for years.
- It would altogether be an immense act of vandalism, altering ~~an~~ a unique place of natural beauty to a municipal park.

[redacted]

Please continue on extra sheets if you wish

42 SOUTH HILL PARK LONDON NW32SJ

[redacted]

18 July 2014

Jonathan Markwell
Regeneration and Planning
Development Management
London Borough of Camden
Town Hall
Judd Street
London WC1H 8ND

Sir, Madam

Re. Application 2014/4332/P

As a resident who has known and regularly used the Heath for more than 50 years, I have generally been impressed by the City of London's management since they assumed responsibility recently. I have however been left bemused and suspicious at the proposed plans to raise the dams beween several of the ponds and write to object most vociferously to urge you to refuse planning permission.

If there is a desire to provide Gospel Oak residents with additional protection against flooding, investment in improving sewers should be made. The expenditure of £15 million on Heath works to guard against an admitted one in 400,000 year event will not protect those at actual and regular risk of flooding from inadequate sewerage.

Furthermore, if the dam works are not required by the Reservoirs Act 1970, they are forbidden by the Hampstead Heath Act 1871. In any event Camden should refuse permission to proceed until this question is considered and resolved in the High Court.

Yours sincerely

[redacted]

Alex Finer

Camden

Comments Form

Name LORD & LADY MUSTILL

Address Flat 28, Broomfield Mansions, Highgate West Hill, N6 6AT.

Email address [redacted]

Telephone numb [redacted]

Planning application number 2014/4332/P

Planning application address Hampstead & Highgate ponds

I support the application (please state reasons below) ☐
I object to the application (please state reasons below) ☐

Your comments

As residents of a block of flats in the pathway of overspill from the proposed dams we would be glad of your assurance that whatever solution is reached, the outcome will be to the benefit of these flats, and to greater safety of residents & buildings, and not affect us adversely. ~~Should an artificial be forgotten~~.

[redacted]

Please continue on extra sheets if you wish

63 Parliament Hill
London NW3 2TB
27/7/14

Jonathan Markwell
Development Management Team
London Borough of Camden
Town Hall Extension
Argyll St.
WC1H 8ND

Dear Jonathan Markwell

I am writing to object to the Planning Application 2014/4332/P made by the City of London.

I am a regular swimmer in the Ladies Pond, an occasional one in the Mixed Pond and a regular, almost daily walker on the Heath, both for pleasure in walking and as a preferred or indeed necessary route to various places nearby; these include my allotment in Fitzroy Park.

It really is impossible to describe the enormous pleasure the Heath gives to those, like myself who use it regularly, particularly the enjoyment of a large open space which, if not natural is as near as that can be in an urban environment. Despite my current great concerns re this application I would want to register my appreciation of the way in which the City of London has managed the Heath in recent years, encouraging actively more natural areas of planting.

The scale of the works proposed on the new dams will necessarily involve heavy construction traffic which must damage if not destroy some areas in their path (quite apart from the new dams themselves), and will cause enormous disruption to those using the areas involved. It is also incidentally likely to cause considerable noise. This will affect not only those of us who live nearby, but the many thousands who come to the Heath from other parts of London and indeed the globe to find pleasure and relaxation in the green surroundings. As you must be aware the Heath has been a cherished "green lung" for Londoners for at least 2 centuries. The benefits to physical and mental health of having such a facility cannot be over-estimated.

Wildlife too is likely to be affected both by the actual construction and by the felling of a large number of trees which provide habitat for many creatures.

The works proposed will alter irrevocably the aspect and landscape in at least 2 areas - between the Mens' Pond and the Boating Pond and in the Catchpit area above the Mixed Pond. These changes are not of the kind which would occur by natural means (other than an earthquake) or by ordinary human intervention in the landscape. Indeed what is proposed is most closely resembles the enormous damage and impact caused by a major earth quake not, I believe, something which mankind has ever wished for anywhere.

Even the softer option of spillways will alter the landscape.

I have attended a number of meetings on these proposals including a consultation meeting. In none of them was I seriously impressed by the need for such a major building

task. I have not heard the City mention anywhere the possibility of considering other measures to lessen the risk of flooding by other measures, such as increasing the Heath's own capacity to absorb more water. While I appreciate the need for them to try to avoid loss of life in a major flood, the possibility of this appears to be so remote as not to be within the parameters of normal planning. It is also documented that the flooding which has occurred in Gospel oak, Kentish Town and S. End Green in recent decades has been attributable to very heavy rainfall and the lack of capacity of the sewers to cope. Surely the sewers are the responsibility of either Camden or the water Board? In their various meetings the City of London has stated many times that even these projected dams would not save all lives. In a recent consultation meeting they initially refused even to consider the question put about early warning systems and finally to say that these were the responsibility of Camden Council without clarifying how they would link with Camden.

The final application gives a very different timescale for the works at the Ladies Pond from those discussed with the Pond committee. It also states that for a period of 5 months only one pond will remain open, despite repeated assurances to us that there would always be 2 open at a time, allowing one to be dedicated to women. Although they have corrected that to us recently I cannot be impressed by an application which makes errors of this nature in an area with which I am very familiar. It leaves me to have even greater doubts about the City's clarity about the whole project

I am also concerned that the City refused a proposal from the Hampstead and Heath Society to put the whole matter before a judge together and not in the context of judicial review, a considerably more expensive proceeding. One appreciates the legal problem which the City perceive themselves to be in, but surely requesting legal advice could have been a way of clarifying the real meaning of the laws. Their refusal to do this would suggest that they are taking a rather blinkered view of the whole problem and are unable to see outside a box called "big dam building."

For these reasons I wish register my strong opposition to this whole proposal.

Yours sincerely

[redacted]

Anne Elton

2014/4332/P

Development Management & Building Control Service
Building 4, North London Business Park
Oakleigh Road South,London, N11 1NP
Contact Number: [redacted]

London Borough of Camden
Town Hall Extension
Argyle Street
Euston Road
LONDON
WC1H 8EQ

Application No: **F/00026/14/CNA**
Registered Date: 08/07/2014

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

ADJOINING BOROUGH CONSULTATION RESPONSE

TAKE NOTICE that the Barnet London Borough Council, in exercise of its powers as Local Planning Authority under the above Act, hereby:

RAISES NO OBJECTION TO THE FOLLOWING PROPOSAL for: -

Proposed engineering works to the Hampstead and Highgate chains of ponds comprising dam raising at Model Boating pond (2.5) and Mixed Bathing Pond (1m), new walls along dam crest to increase the height of the dams at the Men's Bathing Pond (1m) and Highgate No.1 Pond (1.25m), a 0.19m kerb along part of the crest at Hampstead No.2 Pond, a new flood storage dam (5.6m) in the catch pit area, grass-lined spillways at most ponds, dam crest restoration, pond enlargement at Model Boating Pond, a replacement changing room building at Ladies Bathing Pond and associated landscaping, habitat creation and de-silting. This application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement.

At:- Hampstead and Highgate chains of ponds, Hampstead Heath, London

as referred to in your application and shown on the accompanying plan(s):

Date of Decision: 30 July 2014

[redacted]

Acting for Joe Henry
Assistant Director - Development Management & Building Control

24 North Grove, Highgate, London N6 4SL

[redacted]

Development Management team
L.B.C.
Argyle St,
LONDON WC1H 8ND

31st July

to whom it may concern:.

With reference to application number
2014/4332/P

I would like to protest in the strongest possible terms about the proposed dam building scheme. I have lived in Highgate for nearly forty years, and one of the reasons I stay here is the beauty of the Heath and its ponds. The extent of the scheme seems entirely disproportionate to the supposed risk. There must be a better solution than the potential eyesore proposed.

Yours Sincerely,

[redacted]

23A South Hill Park
Hampstead
NW3 2ST
3.8.2014

Dear Sir

Re ~~Objection to~~ Damson Hampstead Heath Ref. 2014/4332/P.

There is so many objections Disfigurment of the Heath Landscape for ever, New and unnatural huge earth works and excavations at Catchpit and Model Boating Pond

Concrete Walls at new Mens Bathing Pond No 1 Pond.

The huge loss of Trees for ever.

Huge disruption for Two years and closure of Popular Parts of the and Bathing Ponds. Damage to Wildlife. Heavy engineering and thousands of HGV. Movements, Unknown Disruption to Local Area All the Neighbours has the same Objections.

[redacted]

Camden

Comments Form

Name..... ANNA NYSH .....

Address..... 13 MILLFIELD LANE (1st Floor Flat) .....

Email address.....

Telephone number... [redacted]

Planning application number..... 2014 / 4332 / P .....

Planning application address.....

RECEIVED
07 AUG 2014
Culture & Environment

~~I support the application (please state reasons below)~~
I object to the application (please state reasons below)

Your comments

- DESIGN + LAYOUT —
THESE PROPOSED ENGINEERING WORKS ARE THE GREATEST THREAT TO THE HISTORIC LANDSCAPE OF THE HEATH SINCE THE LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL TRIED TO TURN IT INTO A PARK IN THE 1890's.
- EXTERNAL APPEARANCE + MATERIALS
SPOILING THE NATURAL BEAUTY OF THE PONDS + THEIR UNIQUE HABITS FOR WILD-LIFE + PEOPLE BECAUSE OF AN EXTREME + IRRATIONAL APPROACH TO FLOOD RISK.
- NOISE NUISANCE - TWO YEARS OF A NIGHTMARE OF TRUCKS + NOISE
- LOSS OF A PARTICULAR TYPE OF USE OF I
I GREATLY FEAR THE RARE SIGHTINGS O KINGFISHER + HERON WILL DISAPPEAR + - NATURAL PONDS WILL RESEMBLE A MO

107, South Hill Park,
Hampstead,
NW3 2SP
020 7794 172

1.8.14

Planning
application
2014/4332/P

Dear Simon Nadan,

It is of
vital importance that you
do not allow the destructive
plans of these unnecessary
dams to go ahead.
Hampstead Heath is too
precious to millions of Londoners
to allow it to be destroyed in
this manner DO NOT ALLOW IT!

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]

10 MIDDLETON ROAD, LONDON NW11 7NS
[redacted]

6 August 2014

By email

Mr Jonathan Markwell
London Borough of Camden
Regeneration & Planning (Development Management)
6th Floor, Camden Town Hall Extension
Argyle Street
London WC1H 8EQ

Dear Mr Markwell

Planning Reference 2014/4332/P: Hampstead and Highgate chains of ponds, Hampstead Heath, London N6 and NW3

I wish to object most strongly to these damaging and unnecessary proposals.

It is not a matter of dispute that the City of London, as the responsible land owner, needs to carry out some overdue work in strengthening the dams that support those ponds that fall within the scope of the Reservoirs Act 1975. But the scale and extent of the proposed works is grossly disproportionate in relation to the risks and are based on incorrect interpretation of the legal requirements.

My objections to the proposals fall under five headings:

1. **Incorrect interpretation of the law**
   The City have refused to consider arguments that the 1975 legislation does not impose on them a duty to carry out works on anything like the scale proposed. As a result they now face a legal challenge from the Heath & Hampstead Society, with the support of other interested parties.

2. **The proposals are based on unrealistic modelling**
   The arguments here are highly technical and I would urge the Council to pay particular attention to the submission of 23 July 2014 by Mr Jeremy Wright MICE, in which he concludes – on the basis of detailed study of all technical aspects of the dams project for over three years – that the proposals, being derived from a flawed interpretation of risk, safety and the law, have led to grossly excessive designs that do not in themselves provide the required level of safety for residents downstream of the ponds.

22 Bigwood Road
LONDON NW11 7BD

Development Management Team
Camden Town Hall Extension
Argyle Street
LONDON
WC1H 8EQ

3 August 2014

Dear Sir or Madam,

RE : 2014/4332/P Hampstead and Highgate chains of ponds, Hampstead Heath, London

I am writing to oppose the above planning application submitted by the City of London Corporation for the following reasons :

1. the City of London Corporation may have a legal duty to ensure health and safety by ensuring that the ponds are properly maintained. This, however, is not synonymous with building 2 to 2.5 metre high defences on the basis of a freak weather event, the odds of which are somewhere in the region of one in 400,000 years and presumes total collapse of all dams and massive loss of life. The professional guidance behind these extreme calculations is still being questioned within the engineering profession.

The City has already admitted that "Extreme storms will still cause floods in the area downstream after the work is complete": *ergo*, they will not solve the perceived problem

2. the application is based on a mistaken view of reservoir law and an extreme and irrational approach to flood risk. The Reservoirs Act stipulates only "measure in the interests of safety".

3. If I have understood correctly, the report concerning the need for the dams in question were prepared by an engineering company connected with the future building works, hence it cannot be considered independent. Indeed it gives the impression of vested interest.

4. in their current form, the ponds have been coping with rainfall for 300 years. During that same period, there has been no collapse of any dams, no uncontrolled escape of water and no deaths in any storm.

14 B, Lady Somerset Rd.
NW5 1UP
6th August 1214

The Chief Planning Officer
London Borough of Camden
Judd St.
WC21H 9JE

Dear Sir,

I write to protest against the scheme proposed under:
Application 2014/4332/P

While the City of London generally does a fine and much valued job in maintaining Hampstead Heath and its facilities, this scheme appears so seriously inappopriate that it is suggestive of such recent impropriety as the huge pay off for the man who brought Northern Rock to its knees.

The flood conditions to be guarded against have a less than 4,000 year likelihood. Correspondingly, last winter's heaviest rainfall in recorded history did not cause danger of flooding.

The building works would severely limit the use of the ponds they are supposedly designed to support and deprive the hundreds of Camden community charge payers who use it.

The only beneficiaries would appear to be the firm to be paid 17 million for so seriously damaging one Camden's finest set of amenities.

Yours faithfully

George Appleb[redacted]

APPLICATION 2014/4332/P

PROPOSED DAM WORKS TO HAMPSTEAD &HIGHGATE PONDS

WE THE UNDERSIGNED OBJECT STRONGLY TO THE PROPOSED WORKS THAT ARE THE SUBJECT OF AN APPLICATION TO CAMDEN COUNCIL .

SOME OF OUR OWNERS HAVE BEEN LIVING IN HIGHGATE FOR OVER 50 YEARS AND HAVE NEVER EXPERIENCED OVERFLOW TO THE PONDS IN QUESTION AND ARE OF THE OPINION THAT ANY FUTURE PROBLEM COULD BE RESOLVED BY MINOR IMPROVEMENTS TO THE EXISTING DAMS INCLUDING ADDITIONAL DRAINAGE TO DIVERT THE FLOW AWAY FROM POSSIBLE FLOOD AREAS.

THIS IS UNECESSARY WASTE OF MONEY ON WORKS THAT WILL DESTROY THE NATURAL BEAUTY OF THE PONDS AND PROTEST AGAINST THE PROJECT WHICH CAMDEN COUNCIL SHOULD REFUSE .

ON BEHALF OF THE 17 RESIDENTS OF BROADLANDS LODGE, BROADLANDS ROAD, HIGHGATE N6 4AW.

COLIN KERR FRICS.

SIGNED [redacted] 10/08/2014

[redacted]

[redacted]

RECEIVED
15 AUG 2014
CULTURE & ENVIRONMENT