

[REDACTED]

From: Helen Sheehan <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 06 August 2014 10:26
To: Planning
Subject: Re the Ponds in Hamstead.

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to raise my objection to the proposed scheme to build dams on the Heath. I do believe that a less invasive option is in the interests of all concerned.

yours faithfully,

Helen Sheehan (pond user women's pond)

From: Michael Hammerson
Sent: 06 August 2014 10:45
To: Markwell, Jonathan; Planning
Cc: Siân Berry
Subject: FW: Hampstead and Highgate Chain of Ponds - 2014/4332/P



10A SOUTH GROVE
HIGHGATE
LONDON N6 6BS

Attn. Jonathan Markwell,
Development Control Team,
London Borough of Camden

6th August, 2014

Hampstead and Highgate Chain of Ponds - 2014/4332/P

We write to register the Highgate Society's objection to this application.

The Highgate Society has, for the past 18 months, been a member of the Stakeholders' Group established by the City of London to discuss the proposals and seek the community's views and input into ensuring that the proposals have the minimum possible impact on the landscape of Hampstead Heath. However, while these meetings and discussions have been open and constructive, and some of the modifications sought by the Stakeholder members to lessen the impact of the works have been taken into account to varying extents, the transactions of the Group have proceeded throughout on the basis that the main work must and will go ahead, and that the necessity for it cannot be questioned by the Stakeholder members.

The Highgate Society has a number of concerns about the likely physical impact on Hampstead Heath - in particular, the necessity for, and long-term impact on the Heath landscape of, the proposals to extend the Model Boating Pond, raise its dam by over 2 metres, and carry out extensive excavations into the adjacent hillside to increase its storage capacity. However, our overriding concern is that the justification for the work, under the legislation which has prompted it, has not been conclusively demonstrated by the City to the satisfaction of the Stakeholder Group or the wider public.

The City of London has stated that it has a Counsel's opinion which confirms them in their belief that they are interpreting the legislation correctly, and that they are obliged to implement the works as recommended by the Independent Panel Engineer in order to comply with the legislation.

The Heath and Hampstead Society have obtained their own Counsel's opinion, which we understand is from an expert in the field, and which takes the opposite view - namely, that the City are not interpreting the Reservoirs legislation correctly and that the work proposed is therefore excessive and in conflict with the 1871 Hampstead Heath Act. They will presumably be explaining this in detail in their own objection.

It is further our understanding that the Heath and Hampstead Society have shared their Counsel's opinion with the City of London, but that the City have declined to share theirs with the Society. They have certainly not shared it with the Stakeholders' Group, merely stating that they consider they are interpreting the law correctly. This is in itself regrettable, and patently counter-productive if the City's intention is to demonstrate to the wider public that

the work is necessary.

Under these circumstances, and given the wide range of reservations expressed throughout by the Stakeholder Group and minuted in the records of their meetings with the City, the City have not, in our view, demonstrated that the work proposed is either necessary or justified, and are requiring Camden and the wider public to accept it without question. Given the implications, both in terms of cost (to the City of London themselves), disruption to the public use of Hampstead Heath, and adverse long-term impact on the landscape of the Heath, this is clearly unacceptable.

The Heath and Hampstead Society is now in the process of seeking a Judicial Review of the proposals, to determine whether the legislation is being interpreted correctly or excessively.

In our view, therefore, Camden's conclusion must be that, since the legal justification for the work, on Metropolitan Open Land protected by its own separate legislation limiting strictly what works may be carried out thereon, has not been satisfactorily, clearly and conclusively demonstrated, permission must be refused. Indeed, we submit that, until the outcome of the Judicial Review is known, it would be premature to make any other decision.

We are, finally, encouraged by the understanding that Camden intend to seek their own independent assessment of the proposals. However, to accomplish this, Camden must, as a matter of urgency, require the City of London to provide them with a copy of their Counsel's Opinion in order to enable them to compare it with the opinion received by the Heath and Hampstead Society and hence to make an informed decision as to the necessity and justification of the work.

Indeed, this would seem essential in view of the comment by Philip Everett, Director of the Built Environment for the City of London, in overall charge of the project, at the Development Management Forum held by Camden on June 5th. When pressed to say whether the City would in fact welcome a decision by the Court which established that their interpretation of the legislation was excessive and incorrect, and that it was not therefore necessary to carry out the extent of work proposed, potentially saving the City a significant proportion of the proposed £17 million project cost, his simple answer was "Yes."

We trust, therefore, that Camden will do all in their power to help the City achieve this outcome.

Yours sincerely

Michael Hammerson
Planning and Development Group,
The Highgate Society

Disclaimer:

The Highgate Society is an unincorporated association established for the public benefit. It endeavours to ensure that the information it provides as a free service is correct but does not warrant that it is accurate or complete. Nothing in this correspondence constitutes professional or legal advice and may not be relied on as such. In no event will the Society be liable for any loss or damage including without limitation indirect or consequential loss or damage or any damage whatsoever arising from any objections criticism advice and information it provides.

[REDACTED]

From: Alan Gillie [REDACTED]
Sent: 06 August 2014 10:56
To: Planning
Subject: objection to applicaion 2014/4332/P (Hampstead Heath)

Dear Sir or Madam,

I am writing, as a regular user of Hampstead Heath, to object to the above application.

Incidentally, I think you would receive more objections if your notices on the Heath had been more prominently displayed (and more numerous).

I attended the on-site exhibition organised by the Corporation of London, where the plans were explained in detail from their point of view, and I've also considered the points advanced by Lord Hoffman in his talk against the plans. Looking at both sides of the case, as it were, it seems clear that the proposals in the application are an irrational response to an unrealistic scenario.

The result of the proposed works would most seriously damage the Heath's amenity for local residents and other Heath users, particularly around the model boat and swimming ponds but also in other locations, while providing no benefit which could not be obtained by more appropriate and less disruptive measures.

For those reasons, I trust that this planning application will be rejected.

Yours faithfully

Alan Gillie
19 Huddleston Road
N7 0AD

From: Isabelle Cook
Sent: 06 August 2014 11:41
To: Planning
Subject: Against the Hampstead development

Dear Camden Planning,

I am writing to object, in the strongest possible terms, to the Dam proposals on Hampstead Heath. I think their impact on the Heath will be damaging and destructive - in the

short and in the long term. Importantly, I consider the proposals do not take into consideration the reality that the assumed floods are *highly* unlikely to happen. I believe the

proposed scheme is a *seriously bad idea* for all of the reasons below:

1. The plans have been modelled on hyperthetical flooding - highly unlikely to occur - *even with changing weather patterns*. The scale of the proposals are therefore:

- both disproportionate and environmentally damaging in relation to the problem
- *extremely poor use of public funds* for which Camden is accountable - a massive £17 million which could be far better spent, and used for environmental conservation not destruction
- lacking any serious consideration of alternatives that are less costly, in true proportion to needs, and less environmentally damaging

2. The impact on the whole Heath environment and its wild-life will be seriously damaging:

It will take many many years to 'recover' from the works - and I do not believe it will fully, because so much of the Heath's valuable *natural* resources will be lost, such as around 150 mature trees - an irreversible and totally indefensible loss - and replaced with artificial constructions.

3. The impact of the works, on all users of the Heath and on those living / working nearby, will be seriously compromising and detrimental.

There will be massively reduced access for all Heath users for two years, with noise pollution, diesel pollution, disruption and noisy, unsightly destruction.

The Heath is an extremely important 'fresh air space' - not only for north Londoners to use and enjoy, but for many, many more people who find its natural setting invaluable - this means that health and well-being will be adversely effected during works.

And this is not to mention the impact on local traffic of a huge number of trucks and plant exiting and arriving at the Heath daily.

4. The wider impact on health and well being includes the many pond swimmers who will not be able to access the ponds - notably the Ladies pond for at least nine months - and when they can, it will be very limited, increasing health and safety risks.

5. And the effect on *morale* must not be left unconsidered - the Heath is a *lifeline* for many, many people who depend on its uplifting environment to keep them feeling well on all levels, in a city and in a world where too much is being ravaged and destroyed.

In the light of the *unlikelihood* of a major flooding ever happening, I do wonder for whom and for what the massive and detrimental scale of these works is proposed.

For all the reasons above, I object to the proposal in the strongest possible terms.

I ask you not to destroy this wonderful natural space, and to reconsider the proposal on all levels.

Yours sincerely

Isabelle Cook

From: Kate Harding <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 06 August 2014 12:48
To: Planning
Subject: Dam proposals on Hampstead Heath

Dear Camden Planning,

I am writing to object, in the strongest possible terms, to the Dam proposals on Hampstead Heath. I think their impact on the Heath will be damaging and destructive - in the short and in the long term. Importantly, I consider the proposals do not take into consideration the reality that the assumed floods are *highly* unlikely to happen. I believe the proposed scheme is a *seriously bad idea* for all of the reasons below:

1. The plans have been modelled on hypothetical flooding - highly unlikely to occur - *even with changing weather patterns*. The scale of the proposals are therefore:

- o both disproportionate and environmentally damaging in relation to the problem
- o *extremely poor use of public funds* for which Camden is accountable - a massive £17 million which could be far better spent, and used for environmental conservation not destruction
- o lacking any serious consideration of alternatives that are less costly, in true proportion to needs, and less environmentally damaging

2. The impact on the whole Heath environment and its wild-life will be seriously damaging: It will take many many years to 'recover' from the works - and I do not believe it will fully, because so much of the Heath's valuable *natural* resources will be lost, such as around 150 mature trees - an irreversible and totally indefensible loss - and replaced with artificial constructions.

3. The impact of the works, on all users of the Heath and on those living / working nearby, will be seriously compromising and detrimental. There will be massively reduced access for all Heath users for two years, with noise pollution, diesel pollution, disruption and noisy, unsightly destruction. The Heath is an extremely important 'fresh air space' - not only for north Londoners to use and enjoy, but for many, many more people who find its natural setting invaluable - this means that health and well-being will be adversely effected during works. And this is not to mention the impact on local traffic of a huge number of trucks and plant exiting and arriving at the Heath daily.

4. The wider impact on health and well being includes the many pond swimmers who will not be able to access the ponds - notably the Ladies pond for at least nine months - and when they can, it will be very limited, increasing health and safety risks.

5. And the effect on *morale* must not be left unconsidered - the Heath is a *lifeline* for many, many people who depend on its uplifting environment to keep them feeling well on all levels, in a city and in a world where too much is being ravaged and destroyed.

In the light of the *unlikelihood* of a major flooding ever happening, I do wonder for whom and for what the massive and detrimental scale of these works is proposed.

For all the reasons above, I object to the proposal in the strongest possible terms.

I ask you not to destroy this wonderful natural space, and to reconsider the proposal on all levels.

Yours sincerely

Kate Harding
Kharding@phf.org.uk
Special Initiatives Assistant (Arts) Monday - Thursday
Special Initiatives Assistant (Education and Learning) Friday
(020) 7812 3352

Paul Hamlyn Foundation

5-11 Leake Street
London WC1X 9HY

Follow us @phf_uk

[REDACTED]

From: Jack Turner [REDACTED]
Sent: 06 August 2014 12:56
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application ref.2014/4332/P

Dear Sir or Madam

I would like to strongly oppose planning application ref.2014/4332/P. My main reasons for objecting to the application are:

1. The need for the dams is based on an extreme 1 in 400,000 worst-case storm / flooding scenario. It is unrealistic to try to eliminate all risk. There has been no serious flooding or dam collapse in over 300 years.
2. There is no legal requirement for the building of these 'Nanny State' dams.
3. There should be more study on other ways of dealing with a 'worst-case' scenario, which would not impact so greatly on the beauty of the Heath, which once lost is gone forever. Early warning and evacuation procedures need to be in place, alongside preventative anti flooding measures that are the responsibility of Thames Water and Camden Council. The money would be much better spent on improving the drains and sewers and measures taken for the Heath to absorb more water.
4. Hampstead Heath is world famous and a great asset available to all Londoners and visitors. It's natural beauty need to be preserved and the City of London is required under the Hampstead Heath Act of 1871 to preserve it's 'natural state and aspect'. The building of the proposed dams would be a blatant violation of this duty.
5. The loss of 160 mature trees and the sudden impact of such a massive engineering project, would have a devastating impact on the ecology of the Heath, which has been allowed to adapt to human intervention on a small and manageable scale over many years. The loss of trees at Stock Pond to create a spillway is nothing short of vandalism.
6. The proposed earthworks, excavations and concrete walls associated with the dam project, ruin the natural beauty of the Heath and must not be allowed to happen.
7. The use of heavy plant and machinery on the Heath over a 2 year period is likely to compact the soil and actually increase the risk of flooding and of course deny the use of the Heath in all it's beauty during this long construction period.

I trust that my strongly held objections will be taken into account in judging this planning application, which I hope will be refused.

Yours faithfully

Jack Turner

18 Hampstead Hill Gardens

London NW3 2PL

[REDACTED]

From: Harding, Eleanor F E [REDACTED]
Sent: 06 August 2014 13:49
To: Planning
Subject: RE: Urgent! Your turn now

Dear Camden Planning,

I am writing to object, in the strongest possible terms, to the Dam proposals on Hampstead Heath. I think their impact on the Heath will be damaging and destructive - in the short and in the long term. Importantly, I consider the proposals do not take into consideration the reality that the assumed floods are *highly* unlikely to happen. I believe the proposed scheme is a *seriously bad idea* for all of the reasons below:

1. The plans have been modelled on hypothetical flooding - highly unlikely to occur - *even with changing weather patterns*. The scale of the proposals are therefore:

- o both disproportionate and environmentally damaging in relation to the problem
- o *extremely poor use of public funds* for which Camden is accountable - a massive £17 million which could be far better spent, and used for environmental conservation not destruction
- o lacking any serious consideration of alternatives that are less costly, in true proportion to needs, and less environmentally damaging

2. The impact on the whole Heath environment and its wild-life will be seriously damaging: It will take many many years to 'recover' from the works - and I do not believe it will fully, because so much of the Heath's valuable *natural* resources will be lost, such as around 150 mature trees - an irreversible and totally indefensible loss - and replaced with artificial constructions.

3. The impact of the works, on all users of the Heath and on those living / working nearby, will be seriously compromising and detrimental. There will be massively reduced access for all Heath users for two years, with noise pollution, diesel pollution, disruption and noisy, unsightly destruction. The Heath is an extremely important 'fresh air space' - not only for north Londoners to use and enjoy, but for many, many more people who find its natural setting invaluable - this means that health and well-being will be adversely effected during works. And this is not to mention the impact on local traffic of a huge number of trucks and plant exiting and arriving at the Heath daily.

4. The wider impact on health and well being includes the many pond swimmers who will not be able to access the ponds - notably the Ladies pond for at least nine months - and when they can, it will be very limited, increasing health and safety risks.

5. And the effect on *morale* must not be left unconsidered - the Heath is a *lifeline* for many, many people who depend on its uplifting environment to keep them feeling well on all levels, in a city and in a world where too much is being ravaged and destroyed.

In the light of the *unlikelihood* of a major flooding ever happening, I do wonder for whom and for what the massive and detrimental scale of these works is proposed

For all the reasons above, I object to the proposal in the strongest possible terms.

I ask you not to destroy this wonderful natural space, and to reconsider the proposal on all levels.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

From: PATRICIA CARVIS [REDACTED]
Sent: 06 August 2014 14:57
To: Planning
Cc: Markwell, Jonathan
Subject: Objection to Dams for Hampstead ponds

Re: Planning ref.2014/4332/P

I object to the proposed building of the dams for the following reasons:

1.Aesthetic

The heath and its ponds afford Camden citizens the opportunity to visit a place of great natural beauty. The proposed imposing earthworks and excavations at Catchpit and the Model Boating Pond would have a detrimental effect on that landscape. The concrete walls at the Men's Bathing Pond and Highgate No.1 Pond are totally incongruous with the landscape.

2. Loss of Trees

Camden, quite rightly and for reasons that shouldn't need re-stating here, has a policy to preserve trees wherever possible and yet the proposals include the felling of over 160 trees. There is to be an indefensible large tree loss at Stock Pond to create a spillway.

3. Disruption

The works would take 2 years to complete necessitating closure of popular parts of the heath and the bathing ponds. Movement and usage of heavy engineering plant and HGV vehicles would cause noise, dust and disruption. The wildlife of the heath would be negatively affected.

4. Lack of Necessity

The models employed hypothesise storms with a 1 in 400,000 year probability and do not investigate the actions of emergency services or monitoring/early warning systems.

5. Legal Obligations

Camden is not obligated to carry out works on this massive scale by the Reservoirs Act 1975.

Pattie Carvis
18 Hampstead Hill Gardens
NW3 2PL

From: Fiona Unsworth
Sent: 06 August 2014 15:31
To: Planning
Subject: Application Number 2014/4332/P

Dear Sir/Madam,

I would like to register my objection to the plans to build dams in Hampstead Heath that would destroy the bathing ponds which seem to be based on unrealistic fears over wether conditions that are predicted to happen only once in every 400,000 years and which seem only to benefit the bank balance of the construction companies and not the community or wildlife.

Please do not destroy the ponds – they are the Eight Wonder of the world and will be sadly missed by thousands and thousands of Londoners and visitors alike.

Please acknowledge receipts of this.

Best wishes,

Fiona Unsworth
Business Development
Household

household-design.com
twitter.com/householddesign
135 Curtain Road
London EC2A 3BX
Tel: +44(0) 20 7739 6537
Mob: +44(0)7958 747 976



DISCLAIMER: This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to which they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please contact the sender, do not disclose its contents to others and delete it from your system.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>