

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 02 August 2014 00:08
To: Planning
Subject: Protest about Hlghgate ponds project

The planners concerned with this project did not voice any serious concerns about the danger of flooding of these ponds causing loss of life until the national legislation was passed. This is not surprising since in the 80 plus years I have been a local resident I can remember only two deaths due to flooding and these were not related to the ponds. I entirely agree with the statement made others:

"Planning for a 1 in 400,000 year event does not respect risk/reward principles. The 1:400,000 year flooding scenario is extreme, unrealistic and hypothetical" .

The cost-benefit in terms of lives saved would surely be much greater if spent, say, on improving the safety of the roads, or increasing the support of local NHS centres.

Alternatively, given that the soil on the Heath is gradually impacting due to increased use, a better approach to the remote possibility of flooding might be to improve the under ground drainage. This would be less invasive and probably cheaper.

Eva Alberman
3 Millfield Place
N6 6JP
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: ann <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 02 August 2014 00:20
To: Planning
Subject: Hampstead Ponds

Dear Planners,

Please, please, please, leave the wonderful Hampstead Ponds in their current, natural state. I have been going to the Lady's Pond for half a century and I love it. There is no where that is so good for the soul, so close to the clamour of the city.

The chances of a flood in Gospel Oak are small. A dam would be taking a hammer to kill a fly.

Please reconsider,

Sincerely,

Ann Jungman

[REDACTED]

From: liza johnston [REDACTED]
Sent: 02 August 2014 07:32
To: Planning
Subject: objection to DAMM BUILDING ON Hampstead ponds

Since the ponds have not experienced any problems over flowing in the last few years when vast heavy rainfall has challenged all other areas causing wide spread flooding.

since the work will not only ruin the natural beauty, eco systems and wild life stability of the areas particularly around the ladies pond

since the work seems to be more motivated by a desire to force control on what is actually a self balancing system totally capable of managing and sustaining it[s own health and well being without man's intervention

I object to the planning as proposed in the strongest possible terms.

Elizabeth Johnston BSc Hons

57 A Sumatra Road London NW6 1PT

[REDACTED]
Camden Resident for 23 years

[REDACTED]

From: liza johnston <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 02 August 2014 07:40
To: Planning
Subject: Objection to Planning for damn developments around ponds on Hampstead Heath

this planned alteration to the existing condition of the ponds seems to me to be totally excessive and out of all proportion to the requirements of the stated aims. that is to prevent flooding resulting from the ponds being over filled in winter spilling out onto near by properties etc.

perhaps if as much consideration were given to preventing basement developments which force water to find alternative routes through the land and underground around the edges of the heath these potential threats to property would not be arising now.

People who buy property around the Heath and near the Ponds have a responsibility to accept the impact of natural fluctuations in water level, especially if they are in part the cause of these changes.

the damage done by the damn building will ruin beyond repair a number of precious and important natural sites and I object to all works going ahead. as do many others for whom it is impossible to get to write in time.

this development is totally unnecessary, a means of bullying the swimmers and other heath users, and actually could be seen as a way for the owners to start selling off more land for development and eating in to the precious and uniquely valuable resource that Hampstead Heath is for so many Millions of visitors each year.

yours sincerely
Elizabeth Johnston BSc Hons

[REDACTED]

From: Anne Allison [REDACTED]
Sent: 02 August 2014 10:08
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application No. 2014/4332P

Attn. Jonathan Markwell

I write to record strong support for this planning application by the City & the associated applications 2014/2149/PRE, 2013/7231/P, 2014/0320/P.

The risk of the Heath dams failing in an extreme rainfall event is wholly unacceptable. They must be strengthened. The applications must not be watered down to provide a lower level of protection, and no measures must be included which would increase the risk of flooding or of sewer surcharge; this should be independently verified.

Anne Allison
23 Elaine Grove NW5.

[REDACTED]

From: Rachel Moore [REDACTED]
Sent: 02 August 2014 12:35
To: Planning
Subject: regarding application# 2014/4332/P

Hello

I write to object to the proposed dam building on Hampstead Heath.

It appears to be a severely destructive measure to protect against flooding, whose necessity on this scale is highly questionable. Moreover the loss of root systems through the felling of trees will remove natural means of drainage, inciting a never ending spiral of demolition, dams and drains that will be costly, ugly, and environmentally damaging. I urge you to consider less invasive measures to protect against flooding, and to reconsider the level at which protection is necessary. I find it difficult to believe that you are relying solely on dam engineers and computer modelling to make a decision that will have no obvious benefit to anyone other than the dam builders, and terrible effects on the many people who enjoy the park and the ponds in particular.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you find a better solution,

Rachel Moore

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED] on behalf of Peter Wesley
Sent: 02 August 2014 13:21
To: Planning
Subject: Application Number 2014/4332/p

I wish to lodge my objection to this planning application for the following reasons:

1. The application will destroy a unique and beautiful part of the Heath.
2. It seems unnecessary as the flood prediction is forecast to occur only once in every 400,000 years.
3. The legal obligations of The City of London can be met by improving the Heaths natural capacity to absorb water and other less drastic measures.
4. The people who built the model appear to have an unhealthy vested interest in the civil engineering contract currently envisaged by this planning application.

Peter Wesley

[REDACTED]

From: Allan Mayo <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 02 August 2014 14:14
To: Planning; Markwell, Jonathan
Subject: Objection to Dams Project: Planning Reference 2014/4332/P

Objection to Dams Project: Planning Reference 2014/4332/P

Dear Sir,

I am writing in connection with the proposal to place protective dams around the swimming ponds on the Heath.

With the increase in frequency and intensity of extreme weather events, there are legitimate concerns for the safety and well being of those in areas prone to flooding and it is the duty of public authorities to take all reasonable steps to avoid loss of life and damage to property. However, it is also the duty of public authorities to protect areas of natural beauty which, in an urban environment, this area of the Heath certainly is, and to take steps which are commensurate with any reasonable assessment of risk.

My objection to the project, as currently proposed, is that this massively intrusive man made structure has been designed to obviate a risk which has a probability of 1 in 400,000 years – an extraordinary level of protection which I believe to be unnecessary and unmatched elsewhere in the country. If, in order to achieve this level of protection, the changes to the contours around the ponds were to be minimal then there would be less grounds for objection but, to meet this level of risk, the proposal involves a significant change to lines of sight and the natural contours of the Heath, a massive disruption over an extended period of time, and the loss of a large number of mature trees. In the circumstances, I do not believe there is a legal requirement for the Council/City Corporation to act in the way proposed. Indeed, the proposal seems to be hopelessly over-engineered.

I really do think this needs to be reconsidered, starting from a risk assessment in the low hundreds of years rather than thousands.

Thank you for taking my concerns into consideration,

Allan Mayo

From: Jenny Lewenstein <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 02 August 2014 14:53
To: Planning
Subject: Dams

I know you will have received many messages about this and I am also worn out with this battle. The ponds have been a wonderful refuge and therapy for me as I am recovering from chronic illness and I can't bear to think of the destruction and damage that all these unnecessary works are going to cause so I will keep this brief, please think again!

GROUND'S FOR OBJECTION

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.

Enirayetan, Oluwaseyi

From: Lindsay Watson <lindsaywatson@blueyonder.co.uk>
Sent: 02 August 2014 14:53
To: Planning
Subject: Application Number 2014/4332/P

Dear Sir/Madam,

Application Number 2014/4332/P

Having informed myself as much as possible about the implications of the proposed dam works on Hampstead Heath, I wish to raise objections to this application on the following grounds:

Overall, I believe that the City of London Corporation has used unrealistic computer modelling that assumed that the very worst possible storm would occur (predicted to happen once in every 400,000 years); that all existing dams would collapse; that there would be no warning, and no emergency services.

Specifically, I object to the application on the following grounds:

1. More than 160 trees, many of them mature, would be felled, causing devastation to a unique environment.
2. There would be a massive influx of heavy traffic, and a large area of the Heath, including the swimming ponds, would be closed for a period of at least 2 years.
3. There would be extensive reconstruction of the Model Boating Pond.
4. Catchpit Valley, above the Mixed Bathing Pond, would be obliterated by a dam 5.6m x 40m x 100m.
5. A 2.5m dam would be erected above the Men's Bathing Pond, and a concrete wall below it.
6. Huge spillways would be excavated between the ponds.

I understand that there are softer, more environmentally friendly measures, recommended by independent experts, that would fulfil the City of London's legal obligations, and I suggest that these measures should be implemented instead.

Yours faithfully

Lindsay Watson
95 Parliament Hill Mansions
Lissenden Gardens
London NW5 1NB

