

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 August 2014 04:28
To: Planning
Subject: 2014/4332/P

To whom it may concern.

I am writing to object to the above proposal, the building of dams on Hampstead Heath, on the following grounds:

Hampstead Heath is world famous, freely available to all Londoners and visitors, used daily by a wide range of people: walkers, runners, swimmers, families with children; a natural and tranquil respite from the urban side of London, bringing benefits to visitors' physical and mental health, which in turn brings a wider economic benefit.

The City of London, which has been the custodian of Hampstead Heath since 1989, is required under the Hampstead Heath Act of 1871 to preserve it in its "natural state and aspect".

The proposed works would take at least 2 years, incurring massive disruption to the Heath, making large areas inaccessible during the works and is not a requirement of the 1975 Reservoirs Act.

Wildlife will be disrupted and displaced, and the natural, sensitive environment would be damaged by traffic and heavy machinery, which is likely to worsen the soil compaction and thereby increase flood risks.

The Heath is a natural space, subject to gradual human intervention over hundreds of years. The proposed works would be sudden and dramatic, changing the current views, vistas and ambience by permanent disfigurement.

The proposing to fell at least 160 mature trees as part of these works is ecological madness. This would change the natural state of the Heath to something akin to a sculpted park. People come to the Heath for its natural beauty, not for orderly structures.

Spillways proposed as a "soft engineering" option will still have significant impact.

The proposed works would cost £17 million! This is money that could be better spent elsewhere, especially in the current economic climate.

This proposal has failed to consider alternatives e.g. Stephen Myers' proposals reported in the Camden New Journal on 4 July 2014 (greater use of the Heath's natural capacity to absorb flood water requiring much smaller modifications to the existing dams).

It is based on a risk model of the 1 in 400,000 year "probable maximum flood" and seeks to "virtually eliminate" the risk of dam failure, which is totally unrealistic, and is based on the number of additional people (300) who might be killed if the dams fail (assuming they remain in their homes and take no action to leave). It takes no account of the responsibilities of other bodies like Camden Council and Thames Water to reduce the impact of flooding and no consideration of civil contingencies measures e.g. early warning systems or evacuation procedures that Camden Council is required to have in place.

Also, it doesn't allow for other infrastructure which would fail earlier than the proposed dams.

In over 300 years' existence the ponds on Heath have not collapsed or caused any major flooding and

we have just had wettest winter on record with no ill-effects to the ponds.

Lastly, the City of London has ignored the results of its own limited consultation exercise (November 2013 – February 2014) where two thirds of respondents were very dissatisfied with all of the dam proposals, especially as there were limited options to comment on in first place.

Yours faithfully,

Claire Pollock

16d Christchurch Hill
London NW3 1LG

[REDACTED]

From: LES LEVIDOW <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 03 August 2014 07:46
To: Planning
Subject: objection to Heath dam proposal

I object to the Heath dam proposal, application no. 2014/4332/P

It would cause enormous permanent damage -- under the pretext to avert harm from a hypothetical, implausible flood from the ponds.

The only benefit would accrue to the construction companies which gain the contracts.

It is no coincidence that the 'expert' report favouring the dam came from dam engineers.

Independent experts advise that homes and lives can be better protected by alternative measures:

- * improving the Heath's capacity to retain water -- which would be undermined by dam construction;
- * improving the existing dams; and
- * investing in early warning systems.

Les Levidow
48 Fortress Rd NW5 2HG

[REDACTED]

From: Agi Katz <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 03 August 2014 09:39
To: Planning
Subject: Application no 2-14/4332/P

TO whom it may concern

I have lived near the Heath for over 48 years and have been a swimmer at the Ladies' Pond for at least 25 years. Hampstead Heath is my second home

I am appalled at the thought of massive dams destroying parts of the Heath and forever spoiling the ponds. And all this with **no evidence of the necessity** to construct huge dams. The City of London has consulted only one firm of so called aquatic experts - and never addressed the above issue to independent experts. We have.

There is only one in 400,000 years that a flood would occur and even then it would only happen if all the existing dams would collapse.

We do know that **last year was the wettest winter on record; yet, NOTHING happened** to areas which are supposed to be endangered.

I would like to lodge my objection to the proposed construction of dams therefore.

Agi Katz
24 Oakeshott Avenue N6 6NS

[REDACTED]

From: Karen Gibb <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 03 August 2014 10:17
To: Planning
Subject: Save the Hampstead Bathing Ponds

Application Number 2014/4332/P

Dear Camden Planning

I am objecting to the planning for dams that will affect the heath. I have walked on the Heath and swum in the ponds for the past 35 years. The ponds are rare and unique spaces in London. The trees that will be cut down were there before us and should outlive us. The wildlife will be disturbed and possibly changed forever.

I understand that safety of people and property is an extremely important issue, but according to Independent experts this can be achieved by softer measures such as improving the Heath's natural capacity to absorb water; minor improvements to existing dams (which have already proved safe through the wettest on record in 2013 and the floods of 1975; and investing in early warning systems. Lawyers say that these measures would fulfil the City of London's legal obligations to protect downstream households, and preserve the unique ponds and beautiful Heath.

Karen Gibb

[REDACTED]

From: Gina Birch [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 August 2014 12:03
To: Planning
Subject: Hampstead ponds Project Ref 2014/4332/P

We as a family strongly object to the above planning application It is a devastating plan to ruin a unique and beautiful natural environment and healthy resource with an unnecessary and excessive reaction to potential flooding, (which to this date despite torrential downpours has never happened) benefiting only some dam engineers to the tune of £17million. It is sheer madness Please please please do not succumb to this madness Gina Birch Mike Holdsworth Honey Birch Lei Lei Birch

Sent from my iPhone

[REDACTED]

From: Christina Sharp <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 03 August 2014 12:18
To: Planning
Subject: Hampstead Heath Planning Application

Dear Camden Council,

I am writing to ask you to please consider rejecting the planning application that would see massive dams destroying parts of Hampstead Heath and changing the Hampstead ponds forever.

My grounds for objection are the felling of more than 160 mature trees and the possible devastation that these plans would cause to this unique and precious natural landscape.

I am a regular user of Kenwood Ladies' Pond on Hampstead Heath. I love swimming there because it is a necessary counterbalance to the stresses and strains of urban living. After spending a short time there, swimming in natural surroundings of beautiful trees and wildlife, I am invigorated and the problems of the day melt into the refreshing waters. Looking around at the other swimmers, you can tell their faces look similarly refreshed by nature and the pond waters.

My understanding is that independent experts have suggested softer measures which would fulfil the City of London's legal obligations to protect downstream homes such as minor improvements to existing dams and investing in early warning systems.

Thank you for your careful consideration of the concerns of pond and heath users such as myself.

Kind regards,
Christina Sharp
Address: 100c Albion Road, London N16 9PD, phone: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Anneli Carter [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 August 2014 12:33
To: Planning
Subject: Hampstead Ponds Planning Objection

Dear Camden Council,

I am writing to ask you to please consider rejecting the planning application that would see massive dams destroying parts of Hampstead Heath and changing the Hampstead ponds forever.

My grounds for objection are the felling of more than 160 mature trees and the possible devastation that these plans would cause to this unique and precious natural landscape.

My understanding is that independent experts have suggested softer measures which would fulfil the City of London's legal obligations to protect downstream homes such as minor improvements to existing dams and investing in early warning systems.

Thank you for your careful consideration of the concerns of pond and heath users such as myself.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]

From: Moragh Gee <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 03 August 2014 12:50
To: Planning
Cc: Markwell, Jonathan
Subject: Planning Reference 2014/4332/P

Dear Sir,

Planning Reference 2014/4332/P

Proposed works on Hampstead Heath Using a sledgehammer to crack a nut

I am horrified by the proposed works. If you go ahead with them, they will seriously and permanently interfere with the public's right of enjoyment of the Heath, which is its prime purpose. The Heath is a truly great public amenity, which is used - and needed - by thousands of people. Hampstead Heath is one of the glories of London, and respected by Londoners and foreign visitors alike.

I list below the points I beg you to take serious, informed account of and I beg you not to go ahead with these massive, unnecessary- and extortionately expensive works.

Proceeding with these proposals as they stand, would be a terrible example of using a sledgehammer to crack a nut.

Yours faithfully,

Moragh Gee

6 Cenacle Close,

London NW3 7UE

1. Legality

Reservoirs Act 1975 does legally not require works to be carried out on this huge scale.

2. Unrealistic modelling:

- > models for a giant storm with a 1 in 400,000 year probability;
- > assumes no warning and no emergency services.

3. Disfigurement of Heath landscape:

- > new and unnatural huge earthworks and excavations at Catchpit and Model Boating Pond;
- > concrete walls at Men's Bathing Pond and Highgate No.1 Pond.

4. Tree loss:

- > over 160 trees to be felled;
- > large tree loss at Stock Pond to create giant spillway.

5. Closure and disruption:

- > 2 years of works requiring closure of popular parts of the Heath;
- > closure of bathing ponds;
- > heavy engineering plant and thousands of HGV movements;
- > damage to wildlife.

[REDACTED]

From: Nathaniel Copsey <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 03 August 2014 14:05
To: Planning
Subject: Hampstead Heath Dams and Ponds Project Ref 2014/4332/P

Dear Sirs,

I would like to register my objection to the proposed project Ref 2014/4332/P.

We live at 10 Gordon House Road, NW5 1LN within a few minutes of the Heath, and I feel that the application is based on false assumptions and that the disruption to the Heath is not justified by the remote chances of flooding. I walk on the Heath several times each week and my use of this amenity will be greatly impaired by the proposed works. I also swim in the Men's Pond regularly and this is something I would not wish to forgo. Our road is particularly noisy and the serenity of the Heath is of great benefit to my mental well-being. I would not wish to lose this.

Yours faithfully,

Professor Nathaniel Copsey

[REDACTED]

From: Peter [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 August 2014 14:07
To: Planning
Subject: Application 2014/4332/P

Asa resident of Camden for more than 50 years and a user of the men's pond I am writing to object to the Corporation of London's application for major works to the ponds. I have followed the arguments carefully and it appears that the report which triggered this Application is based on statistics that are unreal, and the corporation's response to this report Follow other less expensive and less dramatic cures to everyone's benefit. I trust you will reject this application on behalf of all Camden's citizens

P.H.Katz

Sent from my iPad

[REDACTED]

From: tatyana <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 03 August 2014 14:09
To: Planning
Subject: Hampstead Heath Dams and Ponds Project Ref 2014/4332/P

Dear Sirs,

I would like to register my objection to the proposed project Ref 2014/4332/P.

My partner and I live at 10 Gordon House Road, NW5 1LN within a few minutes of the Heath, and I feel that the application is based on false assumptions and that the disruption to the Heath is not justified by the remote chances of flooding. Therefore I object to the construction of the dam.

Kind regards,

Dr Tatyana Guveli

[REDACTED]

From: Allison Havey [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 August 2014 15:05
To: Planning
Subject: Grounds for Objection to Hampstead Heath Dams

Dear Sirs & Madams,

I am a resident of Camden for over 24 years now, and I visit Hampstead Heath on most days of the year. I have read much about the City of London Corporation plans to build new dams to replace all existing dams which assumes the current plans will collapse in a flood. My family and I also now understand that the damage created by the planned works would far outweigh the highly remote chance of this happening. The risk threshold is just not strong enough to warrant such massive upheaval and closures to our wildlife and ponds.

Please deny the CLC's planning application.

Kind regards,

Allison Havey
Agincourt Road
NW3 2PA

[REDACTED]

From: iris ansell - [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 August 2014 16:08
To: Planning
Subject: Application Number 2014/4332/P Hamstead Heath proposal

Gentlemen:

We firmly object to the plans for re-construction of the ponds on Hampstead Heath for several reasons:

- 1) The valley above the mixed pond obliterated by a massive dam
- 2) 2.5m dam above the men's pond -- are you serious????
- 3) a reconstruction of the boating pond -- you can't be serious!
- 4) giant spillways between ponds -- whose idea was this nonsense?
- 5) cutting down 160 mature trees? Is this a Heath? Or a playground for mad so-called conservationists/designers?

No, No, NO.

Iris Ansell Iwamoto
Takara Iwamoto

2 Court View
Swains Lane
N66HA

[REDACTED]

From: Caroline Beattie-Merriman [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 August 2014 16:16
To: Planning
Subject: Hampstead bathing ponds

Dear Madam or Sir

I am writing to object to the proposals for building larger dams on Hampstead Heath. Existing dams are quite up to the job as they protected the area in 2013 and 1975. In addition, increasing the area's ability to absorb water is a much more efficient long-term solution to any flooding, and it is also more attractive to human and wildlife residents in between any possible flooding events.

The heavy machinery that will be used for the work will cause soil compaction, reducing its absorptive capacity in a way that will be quite difficult to reverse, a real consideration on London Clay. The 160 trees to be felled for the work will no longer hold the soil, and with it water, once they are gone, again a real consideration on London Clay as mature trees open up the soil with their roots, allowing water to flow into the soil. Trees also move huge volumes of water out of the soil through transpiration.

If the computer modelling has been carried out using unrealistic assumptions, such as the worst possible storms, the collapse of all dams, no warning and no emergency services available, then the outputs from the modelling are not credible.

The destruction of such an important area for wildlife and people is not justified, and I urge you to refuse planning permission to this proposal.

Yours faithfully,
Caroline Beattie-Merriman