[redacted]

From: sybilla wilson <[redacted]
Sent: 03 August 2014 22:49
To: Planning
Subject: 2014/4332/P

Dear Sir/Madam,

I'd like to lodge my objection to the planning application to construct dams on Hampstead Heath, in particular because of the following:

- I am not convinced by the arguments the City of London has made to justify the building of dams
- The building work will result in the destruction of the natural environment (in particular mature trees) and threat to local wildlife

I would like to see serious consideration given to the advice of independent experts.

Yours faithfully,
Sybilla Wilson

[redacted]

From: alison <a[redacted]
Sent: 03 August 2014 23:45
To: Planning
Subject: FW: Hampstead Heath dams project

From: [redacted]
To: c[redacted]
Subject: FW: Hampstead Heath dams project
Date: Sun, 3 Aug 2014 23:41:29 +0100

I am resending this as it failed to send yesterday.

> Date: Sat, 2 Aug 2014 23:21:11 +0100
> Subject: Hampstead Heath dams project
> [redacted]
> [redacted]
>
> I object to this project -no to the proposed 170 trees cut down when one of the most polluted capital cities in Europe has experienced the wettest winter on record in 2013 and 1975 but this has posed no threat as far as flooding to the local residential area is concerned .So many alternative less destructive and intrusive measures can be put in place to remedy unlikely potential hazards due to weather. No to hundreds of trucks on Hampstead Heath and the unnecessary estimated two year closure of the ponds and whole swathes of the heath- at a time when the EU is pressuring London to do something about dangerous levels of pollution effecting the health of its residents and visitors. The risk of flooding is miniscule and totally out of proportion to the massive works proposed which will destroy a unique natural oasis in the most beautiful open space in the best city on the planet. Stop this planned engineering works now.

Alison McGrath

[redacted]

From: Giovanni Bienne <[redacted]
Sent: 04 August 2014 07:57
To: Planning
Subject: objection to Application Number 2014/4332/P

To Camden Council

I only discovered the ponds last summer (I knew they were there, but I wasn't using them). I'd enjoyed Hampstead Heath before, but not the ponds. Once I started, though, I realised what an invaluable treasure they are: they are an oasis of tranquillity and an opportunity to escape London. I understand now why they're such a beloved and historic feature of London, why Virginia Woolf and her fellow Bloomsburyites were swimming in them. I can't think of anything comparable in London, not even remotely. Open-water swimming really is very different to swimming in a pool and does genuinely contribute to people's wellbeing and health. Camden is so lucky to have them and it would be such a shame to squander that.

I understand and appreciate the safety preoccupations that lie behind the planning works, but I also understand that the computer model assumes the collapse of every single existing dam, no warning and emergency services (when I'm sure these are in place in Camden and work well) and the kind of storm that happens only once in 400,000 years (!). After all, the existing dams have already proven their worth: in the winter of 2013, the wettest on record and I'm told the floods of 1975.

I understand that the City of London has relied solely on the advice of dam engineers who might have a vested interest in such dramatic and financially lucrative dam works - and that experts in wider flood considerations were not consulted.

Independent experts, in fact, believe that improving the Heath's natural capacity to absorb water, which, ironically, could even be diminished by heavy construction (!), minor improvements to existing dams and investing in early warning systems, which would alert residents and workers to other flood risks would be enough and moreover, these softer measures would fulfil the City of London's legal obligations.

Whenever a settled landscape is changed, the consequences are sometimes unexpected and often not in a favourable way. That kind of apocalyptic flooding is improbable, the changes to the settled landscape - among which the cutting down of 160 trees, many of them mature - is certain.

Please consider all this when making your decision.

Thank you and kind regards,

Giovanni Carmosino, a recent convert and beneficiary of the ponds

[redacted]

From: Markwell, Jonathan
Sent: 04 August 2014 08:48
To: Planning
Subject: FW: Application Ref: 2014/4332/P

Please log in support of 2014/4332/P – please take the postal address of Jason Best to be Blue Fin Building, 110 Southwark Street, London, SE1 0SU

Thanks,

Jonathan Markwell
Principal Planning Officer

Telephone: 0207 974 2453

From: Bowles, Lisa-Marie
Sent: 01 August 2014 15:28
To: Markwell, Jonathan
Subject: FW: Application Ref: 2014/4332/P

Hi Jonathan

I have also been requested to forward the email below to you by Cllr Revah.

Kind Regards

Lisa-Marie Bowles
Member Support Officer

Telephone: 020 7974 6775

-----Original Message-----
From: [redacted]
Received: Friday, 01 Aug 2014, 10:48

[redacted]

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 wish to support the City of London Corporation's proposals for the dams on Hampstead Heath and to register my dismay at the manner in which a very vocal and well-funded lobby group has distorted the arguments surrounding the case. Not everyone who loves and uses the Heath is opposed to the projected scheme, but the voices of those in favour have been drowned out by the Dam Nonsense band. Over the past months I have discussed the issue with supporters of the Dam Nonsense campaign. They agree with me that the City of London Corporation have proved excellent custodians of the Heath in the past; and they also acknowledge that it is impossible to preserve the Heath from all change. Yet their response to the Corporation's current proposals is one of knee-jerk hysteria, combined with an at-times offensive dismissal of the safety concerns raised by people living downstream of the Heath ponds.

Yours sincerely,

Jason Best

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Clare Allen <[redacted]>
Sent: 04 August 2014 09:20
To: Planning
Subject: Hampstead Ponds

Dear Camden Planning,

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

short term and 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 environmentaly 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, diesal 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

Clare Allen

Clare Allen
[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Clare Allen <[redacted]
Sent: 04 August 2014 09:21
To: Planning
Subject: Hampstead Ponds

Dear Camden Planning,

I am writing to object, in the strongest possible terms, to the Dam proposals on Hampstead Heath. I tthink 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 environmentaly 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, diesal 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

Jon Allen

Jon Allen
[redacted]

[redacted]

From: rebecca salvidant <[redacted]
Sent: 04 August 2014 09:32
To: Planning
Subject: Save the Ponds

I object to the building of the dams on Hampstead Heath.
I swim in the ponds often - this is a valuable and wonderful part of womens community in London.
please don't take it away from us.
rebecca salvidant

[redacted]

From: Sally George [redacted]
Sent: 04 August 2014 10:17
To: Planning
Subject: Save The Ponds -Sally George

To Whom It May Concern

Please can I lodge an objection to any plans to destroy this beautiful and important piece of land and its history.

SAVE THE PONDS PLEASE-

yours faithfully -Sally George

[redacted]

From: James Boardwell <[redacted]
Sent: 04 August 2014 10:23
To: Planning
Subject: Objection to pond works Ref 2014/4332/P

Hello,

I'd like to register my objection to the planned Ponds Works on Hampstead Heath ref: **Hampstead Heath Dams and Ponds Project Ref 2014/4332/P**

The ponds have drawn me and the family to the heath for many years. We moved away from London a few years ago yet continue to come back, in large part to swim and enjoy the area around the ponds.

The ponds are an incredibly important part of both the community in the area as well as the environment of the heath and I'd urge you to re-consider the planned work and protect the ponds as a fantad stic and unique leisure and environmental space - there's nowhere else in London (or the UK) like it.

My grounds for objection also include:
1. Unrealistic modelling that assumed the collapse of all damns, no warning and no emergency services and the worst storm possible predicted every 400,000 years! - a scenario that is entirely unrealistic (the London Barrier is only predicted to manage a flood that would occur every 1000 yrs)
2. The closure of the ponds over 2 years
3. The environmental damage caused by trucks and tankers

Thank you,

James Boardwell
43 Westbourne Road
Sheffield
S10 2QT

Camden Planning Dept
LBC
Argyle Street
London WC1H 8ND

4th August 2014

Dear Sirs

Objection to Application Number 2014/4332/P

The proposed works on the heath will be devastating to all who use and enjoy the heath – i.e. humans and creatures and plants of nature alike. It would cause widespread upheaval and damage to the environment which, I am of the opinion, are out of proportion to the miniscule risks of flooding that these plans are designed to prevent.

The risks do not warrant such an expensive and disruptive undertaking.

The heath is a conservation area bequeathed to the nation in perpetuity. It is possibly the most precious few acres in the whole of London. Its character and beauty must be preserved as they are.

The noise and disruption as a result of these works being undertaken in a place where we all know traffic and access are severely limited will have a huge impact on the whole area of Hampstead and Highgate.

Please do not allow this application to proceed.

Faithfully
Michael Rothstein

9 Camden Square
Nw1 9UY