

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Markwell, Jonathan  
**Sent:** 07 August 2014 08:43  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** FW: Heath dams: objection

Please log as an objection to 2014/4332/P from South End Green Association

The contact address according to cindex is:

South End Green Association  
c/o  
34 Parliament Hill  
London  
NW3 2TN

<http://search3.openobjects.com/kb5/camden/cd/service.page?id=2t3F2w8ltKU>

Jonathan Markwell  
Principal Planning Officer

Telephone: 0207 974 2453

---

**From:** David Kitchen [mailto:[REDACTED]]  
**Sent:** 06 August 2014 22:06  
**To:** Markwell, Jonathan  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Heath dams: objection

Dear Camden Planning

I am writing on behalf of the South End Green Association (SEGA) which is a representative organisation for the local area of South End Green on the south western edge of Hampstead Heath. The residents of the area are extremely concerned as to the works which are proposed as they live in close proximity to the dams.

As with the majority of the local residents, SEGA is against the works proposed to be carried out under the application. The grounds for this objection are as follows:

1. the works proposed are not necessary or desirable on any grounds as the basis for the applicant's application is founded upon an entirely erroneous assessment of the risk of overtopping of the dams.
2. The reason given by the applicants for the work to the dams is that they must comply with the Reservoirs Act 1975 however if work was required to be carried out under this Act (which it is not) then this Act is in conflict with the Hampstead Heath Act 1871 which says "[The Greater London Council] shall at all times preserve as far as may be the natural aspect and state of the Heath and to that end shall protect the turf gorse heather timber and

other trees shrubs and brushwood thereon." The proposed works are directly in contravention of this Act by the cutting of trees and failure to protect the "natural aspect and state of the Heath".

3. The works are not necessary on a common sense basis in that there has been only one (minimal and harmless) overtopping of one dam in about 300 years and the likelihood of a serious overtopping in the future which could cause damage is so vanishingly small that to act upon this remote risk in the manner proposed would be beyond all reason.

4. If the applicants wished to assure residents in the locality that there was no danger (or a highly remote danger) of flooding of their homes, then there are other ways of doing this without disfiguring the Heath for generations to come.

5. The land, the subject of the application, is classified as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL) and as such is protected from inappropriate development and any adverse impact. The works would constitute "inappropriate development" and would have an adverse impact on the openness of the MOL.

Yours

David Kitchen

Chair, South End Green Association