

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** David Drake <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** 06 August 2014 20:07  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** PLANNING APPLICATION OBJECTION (2014/4332/8)

When changes are proposed that would affect a beauty spot, it is easy to react with a knee-jerk gesture of opposition.

My objections, on the other hand, are a result of having read and thought a lot about the proposed dams on Hampstead Heath and having looked at the arguments for and against.

I have concluded that there is no legal requirement to engage on a project of this size and that the *minute* risk of flooding is not a good enough rationale to justify the enormous upheaval and inconvenience to users of the Heath, the destruction of trees and wildlife habitats, and the disfigurement of the landscape that it would involve .

I strongly urge you not to approve this expensive and unnecessary project.

David Drake (Dr)  
73, Cheter Road  
London N19 5DH

**From:** Naomi [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 06 August 2014 20:39  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Application number 2014/4332/P

Dear Sir or Madam,

I am writing to register my horror and dismay at the proposed plans for building dams on Hampstead Heath. The Heath is one of the few remaining truly wild places in London, and its alteration in this manner would serve not only to deprive current Heath visitors of many of its charms and attractions, but also to rob future generations of Londoners of the chance to enjoy this wonderful place for themselves.

As a child born and raised in inner city London, visits to the Heath gave me opportunities to experience nature in ways otherwise impossible in the middle of a city - the possibility of being surrounded by a natural and old environment, one that does not need to submit to the will of people in the way smaller parks need to. And beyond this - the opportunity to enter the habitat of birds and other creatures on their terms: seeing nests made in those tall, mature trees; watching the ducks build their nests in the ponds, foraging for food the way ducks should, rather than being fattened and made ill by the white bread ubiquitous to other park ponds.

This semi-wilderness, so unique within London, has a psychological as well as aesthetic value. As an ill teenager, partially housebound due to agoraphobia, the Heath was one of the very few places I could be persuaded to visit. Its tranquillity traverses into its visitors, and touches and soothes a place unreachable to much of the city. I write passionately of my love of Hampstead Heath, and I know I am not alone. This is a place to which people return year after year, decade after decade: retracing steps they walked as a child with their own children and grandchildren. And it holds such a place in the hearts of thousands because it is different to other parks the city has to offer: it has retained some of its untouched quality, it does not feel tamed.

The plan to build these dams was proposed with honourable intentions, of that I have no doubt. But its fulfilment would be the least honourable thing that could possibly be done. It would result in the destruction of some of the few remaining areas of this city that are not moulded and sculpted beyond recognition of their natural and original form. It would deprive current and future Londoners of the indescribably wonderful experience of swimming in a natural environment. It would destroy the homes of countless birds and animals that are of such fascination and intrigue to toddlers, children and adults alike.

Instead of building upon this natural beauty, trying to bend it to human purposes, why not capitalise on its natural advantages? Devise ways of enhancing its water catchment capacities through the planting of more trees and other approaches which support the natural environment. Make improvements to existing dams, reducing the need for more to be built. Invest in early warning systems which would reduce the impact future flooding may have. Follow the advice given by independent experts.

My message is mainly concerned with the impact these plans will have on Hampstead Heath; however, the plans themselves are representative of a dangerous approach to dealing with future weather and climate difficulties. As a council, I implore you to take a stand and choose the route of sustainable, sensible planning, enhancing the natural capacities of the wonderful environments that remain to us Londoners.

I hope the message reaches open and creative minds - the words are spoken from the heart.

Yours sincerely,

Naomi Wright

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** isabel wright [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 06 August 2014 20:55  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Hampstead Heath planning application

Dear sir or madam

I am writing to ask you in the strongest possible terms to reconsider your plans for water/flood control on Hampstead Heath and to choose the methods that will cause the least disruption to wildlife of all kinds and leave this wonderful place in its natural state as far as possible.

I have visited and loved the Heath from my earliest childhood and swum in the Women's Pond for the last 40 years. It is the place I have come to in order to recover from the stresses of life and work and, at times, to deal with more serious anxiety and depression. London is so crowded and fast-moving and the Heath offers a place of tranquillity and nature that is rare in the big city. We need it!

I understand that you have options that would make use of the land's natural ability to absorb and direct water and that one of the proposals from your own consultants is considerably less disruptive than your current proposal; and would leave the Heath much closer to its natural state. It would leave the ponds looking much as they do now and involve the minimum of tree-loss - something we can ill-afford in this polluted city.

What you do to the Heath now will be the legacy we leave to future generations. Of course we need to protect people from the possibility of flooding but it seems as though this would be possible without the drastic and irreversible work you are proposing. Please think of the children of the future and their need for a natural environment in what is likely to be an increasingly stressful and over-crowded city.

I have signed the petition on-line but wanted to make this personal appeal to you because it is so important for me and many thousands of others that the Heath is left as far as possible in its current beautiful state.

With best wishes for your decision

Isabel Wright

### **Objection to proposed dams**

Living almost opposite the lower ponds on Hampstead Heath for just on 30 years, along with my also having been familiar with this vicinity for over 50 years, my husband and I wish to object strongly to this ridiculous proposal to install these (unnecessary) dams.

Just last week, delighting in the natural beauty of these ponds, on a wondrously beautiful summer day, I became fully aware of how destructive this proposal would be.

The proposal is a ludicrous one, being based on a 1-in-400,000 chance of flooding, for which no sane person – certainly not anyone inclined to betting – would put even a fiver on. The eventuality of this beyond-the-limits-of-probability torrential (and apocalyptic) deluge really is not going to occur.

Yes, the Heath has complicated geology and is, due to the many underground water courses, continually on the move, but this deluge ain't going to happen. Furthermore, the Heath does not sit near a volcano, nor is it situated on an earthquake-prone fault line.

Limited and localized flooding of nearby homes, within their basements and sub-basements, does indeed occur, but very infrequently, just once every ten or so years, being due to home-owners having over-extended their properties at ground level, to the increased usage of water within our homes then leading to our aging drains and sewers not being able to cope, and with far too many new subterranean basements having been built, besides the concreting over of former gardens, so that hard surfaces have replaced ground through which rainfall could be absorbed.

To destroy a centuries-old landscape, to fell beautiful mature trees (along with their ability to absorb Co2,) and to destroy wildlife so wilfully, should not be permitted.

It goes without saying that the proposed works would mean not just destruction and disruption, with countless lorry movements during the time of the proposed construction, must not be allowed to eventuate.

Hampstead Heath 'belongs' to people, to *the* people, and should be retained in its current form for their pleasure, enjoyment and benefit.

We must, therefore, ask you to listen to us and help us to see off this ridiculous and nonsensical proposal.

Penelope Martin

06.08.14

**From:** Melissa Fairbanks [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 07 August 2014 00:03  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** re 2014/4332/P Hampstead Heath Dams

You have already received many letters from people far more knowledgeable than myself - on the legality (or not) and the efficacy of these planned works on Hampstead Heath. I will not need to repeat all the reasons why this plan is not only illegal but also erroneous in its presumptions.

So I am writing from one who has lived most of my life on or near the Heath. I know all the pathways, the trees, the woods and the ponds. I am nearing 70 years old and I have never known a pond to be anywhere near dangerously overflowing.

That is my experience - and I reiterate that you have had many experts giving you good reason why this is so - and why it is so unlikely that it should ever flood in the preposterous proportions that your computer model suggests.

I want to tell you that these plans will devastate one of the most extra-ordinary gifts of London. There is no where else with the mixture of wildness and yet beautiful order - a natural and most perfect idyll. The ponds are home to so much wonderful wildlife - I have followed the families of swans on the ponds for many years - and before them, all the other ducks and geese and moorhens. I am appalled that in your reasoning you do not show any care about this. You say you are improving the natural environment - but that is extremely unlikely.

The trees that are due to be felled - CoL says they are just immature unimportant trees...this remark could only be made by someone with very little care for the Heath itself.

The bottom line is that this is going to DEVASTATE the Heath.

Is that what you want?

I for one, will most certainly have to move away. I can not bear to see the destruction, listen to the machinery, and think of the financial greed and dubious reasons that have led to this work being carried out.

I will leave the area -and you can be sure that many others if they in the past visited the Heath - will choose to go elsewhere.

Why come to a plot of land with bulldozers and cement mixers for the next few years - and then to a place with cement spillways and 'manufactured' views and treeless areas?

For those that use the ponds to swim ( I refer to the human swimmers - but equally I could speak for the feathered ones) - their joy and pleasure in using the ponds is going to be devastated.

All in all - I beg of you to refuse permission for this most destructive plan.

If it goes ahead you must take responsibility for ruining not only the most beautiful area of London but forever changing the history of such a beloved part of London.

Yours

Melissa Fairbanks

Melissa Fairbanks R.S.Hom  
76 South Hill Park, Flat C  
London NW3 2SN

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Ruth Jackson <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** 07 August 2014 00:46  
**To:** Planning  
**Cc:** Revah, Lorraine (Councillor); Blackwell, Theo (Councillor); [REDACTED]  
Gimson, Sally (Councillor)  
**Subject:** City of London's Planning Application No: 2014/4332/P

For the attention of Jonathan Markwell

As a resident of Oak Village/Elaine Grove/Julia Street I firmly support the City of London's Planning Application No: 2014/4332/P (and the Associated Applications, Refs:- 2014/2149/PRE, 2013/7231/P, 2014/0320P).

I believe it complies with Camden's Core Strategy, Development Policy 23 and will provide increased protection against flooding for much of our community and other downstream communities in certain circumstances. I fully support the City of London's proposals to strengthen the dams associated with Hampstead Heath Ponds and since I live downstream of these ponds believe there is a significant risk of flooding as was the case in 1975 when Oak Village was submerged under 5 ft of water and sewage.

Yours faithfully,

Ruth Jackson (45 Oak Village)

Planning Reference 2014/4332/P  
Consultation on the Corporation of London's Proposed Dam Project

Submission from a Camden resident: Joyce E. Glasser  
14 Savernake Road, London NW3 2JP

August 7, 2014

1. I, Joyce E. Glasser, have lived at the foot of Parliament Hill (Hampstead Heath) for 23 years. I might be considered in the 'flood path' of any act of god. Nonetheless, I strongly object to the proposed dam project. I know that it will destroy the delicate fabric of a park that is already overused and abused due to a growing population and the selling off of school playing fields. Hampstead Heath is struggling to maintain its natural beauty and the greenery that millions of people enjoy every year. If you allow the above planning application to proceed you will be allowing the destruction of the only real 'Heath' land we have left in London.
2. I object to the works proposed because the Reservoirs Act 1975 does not require a disproportionate response to a legal obligation that is still questionable. **The model is disproportionate to the alleged risk:**
  - The ponds are tiny and have never flooded;
  - The risk of flooding is so negligible no one has even looked into insurance for the few homes at risk – surely a cheaper and more proportionate option to the £15 million for the dams. Moreover, a multi-million pound new home has just been built next to the Ladies Pond. The owners are clearly not worried about flooding nor are their insurers or mortgage lenders;
  - The works proposed at a community meeting are designed for a huge reservoir (we saw the photos) that provides water to a large city. The ponds have not served as reservoirs for centuries.
  - The model assumes that homes will have no flood insurance and that no form of radio/internet/television warning will be available so that any one in their home will die. This is ridiculous. A storm so prolonged and severe that it could cause a pond to flood (if one exists) would be easy to forecast days ahead of time.



3. I object to the works proposed because **the Heath will be permanently disfigured and species of plants and wildlife will be endangered if not killed off.**

- Because I have brittle bone disease, running and swimming are the two most important forms of exercise I can do. I jog five times a week on the Heath and, for four months of the year, I swim in the Ladies Swimming Pond. I have been doing so for 23 years. As a result, I know every blade of grass on the Heath, south of Kenwood House. I know that our Heath cannot sustain the planned assault and only Camden now can intervene to protect this community asset and tourist attraction, this sports ground for schools, this lung for a large population.

Even a single cross country race, such as was organised last February 2014, can uproot the grass and erode the soil permanently.

After a photo of the Heath looking like the aftermath of the Battle of the Somme was published in the Camden New Journal, the Heath conservation staff listened to my objections and replanted part of the devastated areas. But the grass has never recovered, and once grassy paths are now new dirt paths. Over a short time, the clay hardens and it becomes impossible to plant new grass. Every year, more grass is eroded by running groups, exercise clubs, cross country runs, school groups playing rugby and football and individuals. The wear and tear from these ordinary users is a threat the Corporation is struggling to deal with. The Corporation does not have the budget to deal with the aftermath of the proposed dams.

Two years of heavy machinery travelling back and forth on the same area will destroy it in two years forever. The Heath is too fragile to withstand the abuse that the engineers proposed at a community meeting earlier this summer and that described on the planning application.

- **Unnatural and hideous earthworks and concrete walls have no place on a Heath:** Specifically: the earthworks shown to us in illustrations at the Boating Pond are huge and unnatural; The concrete wall at the Men's Pond (and another pond on the Highgate Side) will ruin the wonderful view while swimming from the pond and the view of

the pond from the surrounding area. It will look like a sink.

- **Felling of trees:** Camden has a statutory duty to protect trees due to their ecological importance, to their function in the supply of oxygen, shade, food and habitat for animals and their beauty. Most importantly, the roots of trees help prevent erosion and flooding. Removing trees in an alleged flood defence scheme is absurd and counter-productive. I understand that over 150 trees, some large and most around the very ponds they have protected for decades, are to be felled.

**4. Unnecessary and unacceptable disruption to our lives, fitness routines and leisure:**

- After the community meeting, a representative from Bam Nuttall told me the Ladies Pond would **not** be closed at all except for a short period for the rebuilding of the Ladies' changing room. However, he said that there are no plans for improving the plumbing of the showers which is the only part of the changing rooms that needs improvement.
- **BAM NUTTALL NOT TRUSTWORTHY:** Judging from the planning application, this statement from the representative of Bam Nuttall appears, to be a lie. It appears the ponds will be closed for long periods, and probably over an entire summer, leaving people nowhere to swim. Like many swimmers, I do not like the confinement of pools and am allergic to the chlorine. After my belongings were stolen at the serpentine, I no longer go there. I do not have a car and cannot afford the trains to the coast every day, even if I had the time to make the journey, so if the ponds are closed, I will not be able to swim.
- **BAM NUTTALL NOT THE RIGHT FIRM:** The representative from BAM Nuttall also promised to send me photos of less invasive and large scale destructive engineering projects done by the firm. I requested these as the photos shown to the Community at the meeting earlier this summer caused gasps of horror and even Nuttall agreed that, due to their scale and the degree of destruction, they were not appropriate photos. I gave the representative my card and he promised to send examples of park schemes, similar to the Heath's fragile ecosystem, but he failed to do so. Nearly two months later, I still await evidence that this firm is the right firm to carry out any work on the Heath at all.

- **Disruption not only to swimmers, but all Heath Users.**


**Who will want to picnic in the fumes of the engineering works, or even walks through the Heath which will be a big building site?**

**It will be dangerous for children and dogs to use the Heath. Throwing a ball while the heavy trucks travel across the Heath will be too dangerous as the child or dog might run into the path of the truck and get run over. If there are 10,000 journeys planned, the likelihood of serious injury is greater than the likelihood of a flood. Will Camden be liable for law these law suits or the Corporation of London or their contractors?**

On all of the above grounds, I, and the thousands of residents of London who love and value Hampstead Heath, appeal to Camden to stop this irrational unintended consequence of the 1975 Reservoirs Act, an absurdity that all those who care about the Heath must unite to oppose. The Corporation of London's planning application shows them to have a serious conflict of interest as they have relinquished their responsibility for preserving the Heath. If the Corporation of London does not have the money to replant grass or put on more patrols to put out fires or stop illegal, dangerous cyclists, or clean the ponds on a regular basis as they have neglected to do (and not wait for a dam to be built), where are they getting £15 million to build dams?

**Yours faithfully,**

**Joyce Glasser  
14 D Savernake Road  
London NW3 2JP**



David Lewis  
www.ProtectOurPonds.org.uk  
483 Green Lane  
London N13 4BS

7 August 2014

Jonathan Markwell  
Principal Planning Officer  
London Borough Planning Consultation  
planning@camden.gov.uk

Dear Mr Markwell

Comments on Planning Application: Reference: 2014/4332/P

I am writing to object to the above planning application by the City of London regarding Hampstead Heath.

#### **1. Hampstead Heath Act 1871**

1.1 The application does not show proper regard to the protection given to Hampstead Heath by the Hampstead Heath Act 1871 as amended. The application claims to be concerned with public safety but many of the proposals are unconnected to this purpose. The application includes so called environmental proposals which are intrusive and damaging and inconsistent with the 1871 Act which requires that the City of London "shall at all times preserve as far as may be the natural aspect and state of the Heath". For this reason alone LB Camden should refuse consent.

#### **2. Metropolitan Open Land**

2.1 The land which is the subject of the planning application is protected by the designation Metropolitan Open Land. In 2008 the Court of Appeal upheld a decision quashing the planning consent given by LB Camden in 2006 on the Garden House in the Vale of Health on the grounds that LB Camden had not properly considered the protection given by Metropolitan Open Land. The judgement stated that the new building "had a materially greater impact than the existing building" and concluded that the development therefore should not have been given consent.

2.2 A number of the parts of the application, each individually and as a group, exceed the scale of development permitted on Metropolitan Open Land. In particular the new dam proposed in the Catch Pit and the additional dam and island proposed for the Model Boating Pond are in conflict with this Metropolitan Open Land restriction. LB Camden therefore has sufficient grounds alone to refuse consent because the scale of the proposals at these two locations .

#### **3. LB Camden Core Strategy Policy CS15**

This policy states that LB Camden "will preserve and enhance the historic, open space and nature conservation importance of Hampstead Heath and its surrounding area by...protecting the Metropolitan Open Land, public and private open space and the nature conservation designations of sites ... taking into account the impact on the Heath when considering relevant planning applications ... protecting views from Hampstead Heath and views across the Heath and its surrounding area." The planning application does not conform to this policy.

#### **4. Effect on the setting of a listed building - The Viaduct**

The character and setting of the Grade II listed Viaduct on Hampstead Heath rising above the Viaduct Pond will be detrimentally affected by works proposed to the dam to that pond which lies in the foreground and below the Viaduct and is a vital and attractive part of Hampstead Heath.

#### **5. Mixed Bathing Pond**

There is a proposal for the dam to this Pond to be raised by one metre. This proposal is unjustified as evidenced by the comment in a report by dam engineers Aecom Hampstead Heath Reservoirs Peer Review 2010 which states that the Hampstead Mixed Bathing Pond and the Bird Sanctuary

Pond "...appear to pose a low risk by virtue of their abnormally high width in relation to their height." The works on the Mixed Bathing Pond would arguably make no difference to safety but would have a devastating impact on the character, historic views on this part of the Heath and to the amenity of swimmers, visitors and anglers and is also in breach of the London Plan, the Camden Core Strategy Policy CS15 and the 1871 Act.

#### **6. Bird Sanctuary Pond**

In the document submitted with the Planning Application in the folder *Planning Drawings and Design*, the file named *C Bird Sanctuary Pond.pdf* at page 3 there are three items under the title "mitigation". However in this pond no other work is being carried out and there is no explanation as to why mitigation is required. This "mitigation" work itself will cause significant damage to the Bird Sanctuary Pond and its birds and has no purpose. It is a clear breach of the 1871 Act and must be refused. The work proposed is quite extensive comprising two separate parts and is shown on the plan on page 5 (proposed work):

6.1 The digging of a new channel, pretentiously called "biodiversity channel", is in the middle of the pond and will be 46 metres long and 0.75 metre deep but with sloping banks and a width of up to 3.8 metres. This will cause huge disturbance to wildlife; it has no safety or water quality purpose; and will be changing the wild and natural state of the pond contrary to the 1871 Act.

6.2 There are also marked on this plan extensive areas which are to be "scraped". No explanation is given as to why this should be done or what it involves but it is certain to cause harm to wildlife and it will be changing the wild and natural state of the pond contrary to the 1871 Act.

6.3 These proposals show the bad faith of the consultants in so far as the revised plans were supposed to leave the Bird Sanctuary Pond untouched. If planning consent is given to the current proposals for the Bird Sanctuary Pond, the LB Camden is likely to find itself facing another judicial review as the proposals are clearly in breach both of the 1871 Act and the Metropolitan Open Land rules. I urge LB Camden to take specialist legal advice on this outrageous part of the proposal.

#### **7. Conflict with Camden planning policy of works to the Model Boating Pond**

The erection of a new higher dam will obstruct existing historic views from several directions and the proposed change in the dimensions to the pond including the construction of an artificial island, which is not an existing feature on the Heath, are in conflict with the LB Camden Core Strategy Policy CS15. It is also detrimental to views from, the setting of and the character of the Men's Bathing Pond which will be below it and is a second reason why this part of the proposal is in conflict with policy CS15. The construction of an Island and changing the shape of the Pond would also be in conflict with the Hampstead Heath Act 1871.

#### **8. Conflict with the London Plan: Policy 3D.10 Metropolitan Open Land**

This policy states that: "The Mayor will, and boroughs should, maintain the protection of Metropolitan Open Land (MOL) from inappropriate development." The proposed development is inappropriate in this respect.

#### **9. Is there a legal obligation to do this work?**

Lord Smith, the then Chairman of the Environment Agency, stated on 15 October 2011 that: "There is no enforceable legal requirement on the Corporation to carry out any work on the Hampstead Heath dams." In an E mail to Protect Our Ponds, dated 6 September 2013 Tony Deacon, the Reservoirs Manager at the Environment Agency, stated: "I can confirm that our position has not changed, and that my emailed correspondence dated 19 October 2011 is still valid and correct."

## 10. Public safety

10.1 The City of London claims that its motivation is to protect the public from a possible dam breach and consequent flooding. This is not based on any weakness or deficiency in the existing dams which are inspected every six months and are well maintained. Every report on the dams has given them a clean bill of health and recommendations have only been for routine maintenance.

10.2 The campaign in favour of the works has been pitched in sensational terms concentrating on incredible figures for loss of life and property damage. The current proposals make a number of unlikely assumptions which have already been outlined to you by the Heath & Hampstead Society and others.

10.3 Not one person has been killed in the UK from any dam breach or overflowing since 1925. Regulation was first introduced for large dams in about 1935 under the Reservoirs (Safety Provisions) Act 1930. This Act was superseded by the Reservoirs Act 1975. Only three of the 18 dams on Hampstead Heath are regulated although new legislation passed in 2010 may at some date in the future bring others into regulation. New legislation cannot make the dams more dangerous which the City of London's propaganda sometimes seems to imply.

10.4 The Flood Risk Assessment provided by the City of London's consultants shows that the proposed works will not prevent flooding in the areas downstream of the ponds in the extreme weather event assume. That being the case, it is clear that the whole project is futile as lives would still be at risk from surface water flooding which the project does not address. There may even be an added danger in such an event if members of the public gain the impression that all the downstream flood dangers from a rare event "have been fixed" and consequently ignore an evacuation call by Camden.

## 11. Camden Flood Risk Management Strategy states the following:

Under paragraph 6.3.4 Hampstead Heath Ponds

*"As identified in the Flood Risk in Camden section, the Hampstead Heath Ponds pose a small risk to residents south of the Heath. While the impact of the Hampstead Heath Ponds breaching could be extremely severe, this event is unlikely."* It would be irrational for LB Camden to grant planning consent for a huge development on Hampstead Heath for an eventuality which it has assessed as being "unlikely".

12. **The City of London carried out a consultation of Heath users** between November 2013 and February 2014. *Sixty six per cent of those asked said they were strongly against the project.* At the time of writing 11,256 people have signed a petition at 38 Degrees urging LB Camden to refuse this planning application; by the time LB Camden Planning Committee considers the application, the numbers are likely to be higher.

## 13. Protection of Wildlife

There is evidence that the so called "environmental improvements" proposed as part of the project, but which have no relevance whatsoever to public safety, will be detrimental to the natural environment. Disturbance to birds during the nesting season and disturbance to bats and other endangered species are criminal offences but no coherent explanation has been given as to how such damage will be mitigated. Similarly de-silting will have an intrusive and detrimental effect on wildlife. These effects are described in the environmental reports appended to the planning application but the claimed mitigation, where described, is unlikely to be effective.

13.1 **Bats:** The conclusions of the document **Hampstead Heath Ponds Project, Greater London - Phase 2 Bat Survey** states at paragraph 4.4 that:

*"It is recommended that any works to waterbodies are carried out during the period from November-February when bats are hibernating. Consideration should be given to the cumulative impact of carrying out works on multiple ponds at any one time."*

### **13.2 Birds during the nesting season**

It is probable that a Swan on the bird sanctuary pond may have abandoned its nest and eggs because of drilling work carried out nearby in the Spring of 2014 in preparation for the project. The scale of the work is such that it will be impossible to prevent similar damage occurring again over an extended period.

### **14. Conclusion**

There is no evidence that any of the dams are in any way defective. On the contrary the City of London has an exemplary record on maintenance. Camden Council has emergency contingency plans in the event of flooding which could occur, not as a result of overflows from the Heath ponds but from rainfall run off down the hilly streets, whether or not these misguided proposals are put into effect.

We urge the Camden Development Control Committee to refuse the application and request that I or another member of the Protect Our Ponds campaign be allowed to speak at the Planning Committee meeting.

You are welcome to take a look at our web site **[www.ProtectOurPonds.org.uk](http://www.ProtectOurPonds.org.uk)** where we reproduce dozens of letters and articles in the national and local media giving reasons why this planning application should be refused.

Yours sincerely

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of David Lewis.

David Lewis  
Co-ordinator

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Penny Cloutte [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 07 August 2014 10:18  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** The proposed dam works on Hampstead Heath (application 2014/4332/P)

Dear friends, I wish to register the strongest possible objections to the proposed dam works on Hampstead Heath.

I have been a user of the Heath for nearly 50 years, and a swimmer in the Ladies' Pond for 40 years. I support the arguments of the Heath and Hampstead Society, as follows: 1) The proposed works are unnecessary, based on a computer model of risk which bears no relation to the facts. No amount of dam building on the Heath will remove the risk of flash floods in the streets to the south of the Heath. There has been no death associated with failure of the dams since the ponds in the Highgate chain were constructed. If the Corporation is really concerned about the risk to life and property of such floods, they should direct their attention to the state of the much-neglected drainage system under these streets. I know that this system is not within the responsibility of the Corporation, but they could use their influence to encourage the authorities who are responsible to improve the situation.

2) The proposed work will destroy the amenity value of the Heath, in contradiction to the terms on which the land was bequeathed to the people of London - not only during the period while the construction work is going on, but in the loss of views, risk to wildlife habitats and destruction of the unique character of the land. This amenity value is immensely important to many of us and to our physical, mental and spiritual wellbeing.

3) In addition, and as a swimmer, I note that the proposals will lead to the closure of the Ladies Pond for a much longer period than the closure of the Men's and Mixed Ponds. This feels like **discrimination against women swimmers**, contrary to anti-discrimination legislation. The Ladies' Pond is a much-valued local resource and its unique character is at risk also from the proposals.

Please turn down the planning application!

Yours sincerely, Penny Cloutte



[REDACTED]

---

**From:** irene zalewska [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 07 August 2014 10:26  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Hampstead Bathing Ponds

Dear Sir/Madam

I am emailing you to object to the planning of the proposed City Of London's planning application to do works on this natural beauty spot that are not wholly necessary.

There are softer measures that would fulfil the City Of London's legal obligations to protect downstream households and preserve the beautiful ponds and the Heath for its wildlife and many visitors for years to come.

Yours sincerely,  
Irene Zalewski