

[REDACTED]

From: bob packham - [REDACTED]
Sent: 04 August 2014 16:42
To: Planning
Subject: Hampstead Dams

To whom it may concern

I wish to protest at Camden Council/ City of London's plans to create dams around the Heath ponds.

As a long time frequent user of Hampstead Heath, I not only enjoy the views and greenery but also the ponds. However, the proposals to build dams will significantly alter, if not completely destroy, that pleasure.

The proposals do seem to be rather excessive. Is there something about climate change we aren't being told? Why else would ponds that haven't caused problems for over 300 years and stand a 1 in 400,000 chance of causing a major problem be in need of such radical alteration? Surely there are more effective ways of spending the money?

The disruption and permanent changes to the Heath seem to be a very high price to pay for a project that can't promise to prevent flooding - and surely might make it worse if it allows even more water to be collected in one place before it floods!

The logic for such works seems to be rather unclear as indeed is the agenda which fuels the enthusiasm for this project regardless of its unpopularity and inability to guarantee its one *raison d'être*, to prevent flooding. Surely, if the Hampstead Heath ponds become a threat to life and limb it will be a part of a much larger catastrophe of which the ponds will be the least of everyone's worries.

There must be a more effective use of the money than this. Please, reject this plan.

Yours faithfully,
Bob Packham

[REDACTED]

From: Judy Sahm [REDACTED]
Sent: 04 August 2014 16:57
To: Planning
Subject: Application No. 2014/4332P

I wish to object to the application to build dams on Hampstead Heath.

The City of London has based its plans on unrealistic computer modelling that assumed: the collapse of **all** existing dams: no warning and no emergency services; and the very worst kind of storm ever possible-predicted to happen only once in 400,000 years. These plans would devastate this unique and beautiful natural environment vital to local wildlife and migrating birds, more than 160 trees would be cut down many of them mature. The City of London has relied solely on the advice of dam engineers who know little about wider flood considerations and moreover are likely to benefit from the £17 million project. The risk threshold is simply far fetched: Local sewers would fail in a flood event with a probability of once in 70 years, and even the Thames Barrier is only built to manage the sort of flood predicted to occur once in 1000 years. This must be reconsidered to save wildlife, the local eco system and the enjoyment of millions of visitor.

Judy Trott
96 Monarch Court
Lyttelton Road
N2 0RB

[REDACTED]

From: Adam Heuman [REDACTED]
Sent: 04 August 2014 17:04
To: Planning
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Application Ref: 2014/4332/P Hampstead Heath dams on the Heath

For the attention of Jonathan Markwell

As a resident of Oak Village 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.

This proposal is hugely important to stop a repeat of what happened in 1975, when 6 feet of sewage flooded the Gospel Oak area, from Julia Street to the railway line at the side of Oak Village East, and I urge the Councillors to support the planning application.

Kind regards,

Adam Heuman
44 Oak Village

[REDACTED]

From: Gillian Morris [REDACTED]
Sent: 04 August 2014 17:15
To: Planning
Cc: Markwell, Jonathan
Subject: Objection to work on Hampstead Heath ponds

Dear Sir or Madam,

I write to object to the proposed work on the Hampstead Heath ponds on the following grounds:

- (1) Legality: the Reservoirs Act 1975 does not require works on this scale to be conducted;
- (2) Modelling assumptions: the modelling is unrealistic and is based on a giant storm of a one in 400,000 probability with no prior warning
- (3) Damage to the heath: the works will disfigure the landscape of the heath
- (4) Unnecessary serious disruption: the works will lead to the closure of the swimming ponds and other popular amenities and will cause serious disruption to wildlife.

Yours faithfully

Gillian Morris

This email (including attachments) is confidential and may be privileged. If you have received this email in error, please notify Matrix immediately. You may not copy, forward, disclose or otherwise use any part of it. It is the responsibility of the recipient to ensure that this email is virus free and no responsibility is accepted by Matrix for any loss or damage arising in any way from receipt or use of it. Emails are susceptible to interference. The contents of this email may not have originated from Matrix, or be accurately reproduced. If verification is required, please request a hard-copy version.

Barristers at Matrix accept work under Bar Council Contractual terms. To find out more about our organisation, our service standards and your right to complain please visit our website at: <http://www.matrixlaw.co.uk/Information/Organisation.aspx>

[REDACTED] i

From: Jennifer Beaumont [REDACTED]
Sent: 04 August 2014 19:00
To: Planning
Subject: Hampstead ponds

I object, in the strongest possible terms, to the extent if the works to the ponds.

The plans are based on flawed assumptions, and the reports themselves are prepared by those with vested interests.

I love the ponds, and the unique and tranquil environment they provide. I hate the idea of 2 summers without them. My little boy was 8 last week: he has just had his first pond swimming experience and marvelled at the dragon flies and swooping birds. Is this it? The existing proposal will devastate the trees birds and habits which we love, and large parts if the Heath will be become a major construction site.

The extent if the works is excessive: unrealistic computer modelling, and provision for a once in 400,000 years event is preposterous. Care must be taken to balance the preservation of a natural place, with softer measures which would fulfil the city of London's legal obligations whilst preserving the ponds.

Certainly, independent reports must be commissioned to suggest what would be necessary to provide for a 1 in 250 year circumstance. This ought to be part of their instructions. Think what London was in 1764: how can we possibly look forward more than 250 years?

I urge you to reject the proposal, and send them away to think if something more sensible.

Yours faithfully
Jennifer Beaumont

Sent from my iPhone

[REDACTED]

From: Natalie Coury [REDACTED]
Sent: 04 August 2014 19:14
To: Planning
Subject: Application 2014/4332/P

App. no. 2014/4332/P

I would like to object to the heath ponds damming project.

I strongly believe that the project is unnecessary, and other low impact solutions would be dramatically preferable.

The proposed plans would destroy the natural environment forever, particularly the loss of over 160 trees.

For a tiny fraction of the proposed cost of the project, early warning systems could be installed, that in the very highly unlikely event of being used, would be effective.

Surely this huge budget could be better spent in this day and age.

Yours sincerely,

Natalie Coury

The Hampstead Heath Ponds Project is driven by the fact that the Corporation of London would be liable for the failure of any of the ponds as opposed to for flooding. This highlights a flaw in the law which should be addressed by changing the law, not by changing and damaging the Heath.

If the Corporation moves ahead with either of the options proposed, the risk of a failure will decrease from a small percentage to an even smaller percentage, but not go away. In other words, the changes proposed are the result of a subjective assessment of what is an acceptable level of risk as opposed to a legal requirement.

While the proposed works on the ponds may reduce the risk of flooding up to a point, they will not eliminate it. It would be a better use of money and less damaging to the Heath, to ask Parliament to change the law in return for the Corporation investing in or contributing to investment in downstream protecting against flooding through improvements i.a. in the sewer system.


Based on the information available to me, it seems that this opportunity has been overlooked.

As regards the proposed measures on the Heath, they involve massive works on at least seven ponds and excavation of materials from adjacent areas. It is inconceivable that these works should be able to be carried out over a 15-18 month time period without a very big part of the Heath becoming a construction site. The information provided on the project systematically underestimates the visual and general impact of these works on flora and fauna, and visitors. For example, what happens to and around the present borders of the ponds that will be raised? What works will be undertaken?

The Heath is too precious and sensitive for multiple, large scale works to be undertaken at all, and to be undertaken during a short period of time. Hampstead Heath is a treasure and a haven for Londoners and for many natural species and this project is frankly a huge and unjustifiable mistake that is likely to cause serious, irreversible consequences.

Together with many members of the Hampstead community, I urge you to refuse permission and seek less disruptive means to solve the so called "threat" posed by the ponds.

Mariana Winter
6g East Heath Road
London NW3 1BN



From: Chilli Reid [REDACTED]
Sent: 04 August 2014 19:27
To: Planning
Subject: app no.2014/4332/P

Application ref; 2014/4332/P

I would like to object to the plans to build dams at the Hampstead Heath Ponds. The plans are, fundamentally flawed in that they are totally unjustifiable. The chances of the dams being used in the future is so unlikely that the whole project is the dream of an engineering fantasist! Furthermore, not only would the 2 years of construction rule it a no go area but the lasting scars and loss of trees would actually destroy forever what makes this such a special place.

Chilli Reid | Head of Development and Policy | AdviceUK

Mobile: [REDACTED]

WB1, PO Box 70716
London EC1P 1GQ
Tel: 0300 777 0107
www.adviceuk.org.uk

Follow us on 

Find us on 

www.adviceuk.org.uk

We're hearing great things from members about AdvicePro 5

Contact sanja.gosnjak@adviceuk.org.uk for more details or go to www.advicepro.org.uk to register for an online demonstration.

Do you need to print this e-mail? Think Green!!!
AdviceUK holds the Green Mark Level 1

AdviceUK is authorised and regulated by the Financial Conduct Authority in respect of insurance mediation activities.

This email is confidential to the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient, do not disclose information contained within it and kindly delete the email and notify the sender. AdviceUK accepts no liability for contents of the message not relating to its official business.

Registered Charity No. 299342

VAT Registration No. 482936411

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.

[REDACTED]

From: Shane Gibson [REDACTED]
Sent: 04 August 2014 17:49
To: Planning
Subject: Dan work on the ponds

I am writing to object to the proposed dam work.

The ponds have never been a danger to flooding and public health. The removal of old growth trees and the environmental effects are contradictory to the philosophy of the Heath. This is the most natural Green space that has been preserved in London to start altering that is changing its beauty.

Shane Gibson
#4 Kemplay Road
Hamstead Nw3

Sent from my iPhone

The Hampstead Heath Ponds Project is driven by the fact that the Corporation of London would be liable for the failure of any of the ponds as opposed to for flooding. This highlights a flaw in the law which should be addressed by changing the law, not by changing and damaging the Heath.

If the Corporation moves ahead with either of the options proposed, the risk of a failure will decrease from a small percentage to an even smaller percentage, but not go away. In other words, the changes proposed are the result of a subjective assessment of what is an acceptable level of risk as opposed to a legal requirement.

While the proposed works on the ponds may reduce the risk of flooding up to a point, they will not eliminate it. It would be a better use of money and less damaging to the Heath, to ask Parliament to change the law in return for the Corporation investing in or contributing to investment in downstream protecting against flooding through improvements i.e. in the sewer system.

Based on the information available to me, it seems that this opportunity has been overlooked.

As regards the proposed measures on the Heath, they involve massive works on at least seven ponds and excavation of materials from adjacent areas. It is inconceivable that these works should be able to be carried out over a 15-18 month time period without a very big part of the Heath becoming a construction site. The information provided on the project systematically underestimates the visual and general impact of these works on flora and fauna, and visitors. For example, what happens to and around the present borders of the ponds that will be raised? What works will be undertaken?

The Heath is too precious and sensitive for multiple, large scale works to be undertaken at all, and to be undertaken during a short period of time. The Corporation should undertake any essential maintenance and improvement works over time and in a way which minimizes the impact on the Heath and visitors.

To the extent that any radical works are needed on the Highgate side, of which I am not convinced per se, it would seem a much better option to raise the Model Boating Pond only, and leave the ponds below unaffected. The Model Boating Pond is visually the least appealing of all the ponds, it is easily accessible from two different access roads and is quite far from any private property. It also has the largest surface area of any pond. In other words, it will be less intrusive and should save money to concentrate any work to be done here, if at all necessary. It is very hard to understand why the options presented for the Highgate ponds all involve major works on at least three different ponds instead of on the Model Boating Pond only.

Hakan Winter
6g East Heath Road
London NW3 1BN

