

[REDACTED]

From: Charles Murray [REDACTED]
Sent: 01 August 2014 13:31
To: Planning
Subject: Application no. 2014/4332/P

Dear Sir / Madam

Although not a Camden resident, I have enjoyed the walks and ponds of Hampstead Heath for more than forty years.

I have therefore very considerable concerns about the proposed works on The Ponds.

I understand that these works would necessitate the closure of the Ponds and neighbouring areas for some two years. Over one hundred trees, many of them mature, would be cut down and wild life would be devastated in this unique area. Construction of dams above the Men's Pond and at Catchpit Valley, the construction of a concrete wall below the Men's Pond and various spillways would totally change the nature of a substantial part of the Heath.

Apparently these measures are necessary to protect against an event calculated to occur only once in 400,000 years. This seems totally disproportionate and could be compared with many other flood protection schemes where the protection is effective only for events once in 200 years or the Thames Barrier where a figure of once in 100 years was used.

For these reasons I wish to object to Planning Permission being given to this project

Best regards
Charles Murray (Dr)
6 Quaggy Walk
London SE3 9EL

[REDACTED]

From: Lindsay Davies [REDACTED]
Sent: 01 August 2014 15:53
To: Planning
Cc: [REDACTED]; Chung, Linda
Subject: Dams on Hampstead Heath

To Whom It May Concern

I hereby lodge my objection to the City of London Corporation's proposals for erecting dams on the Heath, around the Ponds...on the grounds that they are based on alarmist projections, are excessive in scale, and will cause an irreversible reduction in the quality of our 'enjoyment' of the Heath.

In this Borough, we are already appallingly blighted by the Council's excessively generous granting of Permissions for 'developments' in domestic/residential premises.

I am submitting this Objection in spite of being fully aware of the fact that the Council's Planners *always* ignore the efforts that we voters make in attempting to keep at bay such disproportionate 'developments'. In our democracy, I never feel so unrepresented as I do when I'm trying to make my voice heard at local level.

Lindsay Davies
86A South Hill Park,
LONDON NW3 2SN

[REDACTED]

From: Marlies <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 01 August 2014 16:26
To: Planning
Subject: save ponds -

Application number: 2014/4332/P

I object to the building of massive dams around the ponds on the Heath after reading the independent expert's reports, who maintain that the City of London has based its plans on unrealistic computer modelling that assumes 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. They maintain that less drastic measures could ensure less disruption and more than adequate results.!

The inconvenience for Pond users and regular Heath users is immense and the thought of felling 160 trees is absolutely unbearable. As well as the noise and the considerable spoiling of the look particularly the men's pond with a massive dam is unacceptable.

I object to works proposed:

- .Catchpit Valley above the mixed pond will be obliterated by a massive dam 5.6m wide and 100m long.
- .2.5m dam erected above the men's pond and a concrete wall below it.
- .massive reconstruction of model boating pond
- .giant spillway gouged between ponds
- .more than 160 trees felled.
- .All these works would devastate the unique and beautiful natural environment vital to local wildlife enjoyed by millions of and myself visitors myself included.

Marlies Kisch

From: Julia Dick [REDACTED]
Sent: 01 August 2014 16:37
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application No 2014/4332/P Objections.

Dear Sir/Madam,

I wish to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposed application by the City of London in respect of its proposed dam works.

I object on the following grounds;

- (a) The proposed works are contrary to statutory obligation on the CoL under HHA of 1871, namely "to preserve it in its natural state and aspect".
- (b) The proposed works are based on an entirely unrealistic risk model of 1:400,000 year "probably maximum flood". There is no statutory requirement in the Reservoirs Act to work to this level of risk.
- (c) What has been proposed in a purely "engineering" solution as opposed to one which balances a real risk to public safety with the protection of the Heath and the local environment. For example, there has been a failure to consider greater use of the Heath's capacity to absorb water - such a consideration would obviate the necessity for such extensive works.
- (d) The Reservoirs Act was intended by Parliament to apply to new reservoirs; accordingly the extent to which the Hampstead Ponds fall within the "mischief" of the Act is legally unclear. The proposal by the Heath and Hampstead Society to make a joint application to the High Court for a determination of the extent of CoL's obligation under the Act in respect of the Ponds seems very sensible. Why are the CoL determined to press ahead without seeking legal clarification ? This should be carried out in advance of any planning application.
- (e) If a group of engineers, acting under the purported authority of the Reservoirs Act, decided that it was necessary to demolish Hampton Court Palace to avoid a 1:400,00 year chance of the Thames flooding, do you think it would go ahead ? Of course not ! No, instead, a solution would be found which balanced heritage, public safety and the environment. The present proposals are entirely disproportionate to the remoteness of the risk !
- (f) The damage to the Heath, to the landscape and bird/wildlife will be incalculable. The disruption and the disfigurement for years to come will be unimaginably awful and with huge volumes of traffic.
- (g) If LB Camden were the managers of the Heath, do you think for a moment that engineers would have proposed such a solution ! Of course not. Such an onerous level of statutory obligation would bankrupt any other public authority which Parliament cannot have intended when it drafted this legislation.

This has such serious implications for the future of the Heath and the local environment that it should be the object of a public enquiry.

Kind regards,

Julia Dick
55 Lissenden Mansions,
Lissenden Gardens
London NW5 1PR

[REDACTED]

From: Sally Gold - [REDACTED]
Sent: 01 August 2014 17:17
To: Planning
Subject: Application no. 2014/4332/P

Re. Application no. 2014/4332/P Hampstead and Highgate Chains of Ponds, Hampstead Heath, London

I wish to register my strongest objection to this planning application.

I am reliably informed that the City of London Corporation's proposals have ignored the opinions of independent experts who have advised that the plans are excessive and completely unnecessary. As they stand, the construction works proposed will devastate the wild and natural state of the Heath in contravention of the Hampstead Heath Act 1871. Independent experts are recommending that the safety concerns which appear to unlie the Corporation's proposals would be better solved by other, less invasive and destructive measures.

I strongly urge Camden Council to reject this planning application.

Dr Sally L Gold

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Karen Durham <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 01 August 2014 18:42
To: Planning
Subject: Hampstead Ponds

Dear Camden,

I am writing with regard to the proposed building of dams in Hmapstead Heath. I have looked at the plans and also the promotional event where you had an information depot near the Heth station entrance. The proposals seem to drastic for the Heath and would be a huge input of money to make a large scale flood protection that would be more indicative of more excessive flood potential than the heath is at risk of. There are many more methods that would be less harmful to the conservation of the heath which I have heard discussed by independent experts.

This dam project would contravene many targets of the Biodiversity Action Plan. Many aspects would be affected and damage or impede the following

- Wildlife conservation
- Ecosystem maintenance
- Aesthetics
- Wild and Natural appearance
- Continued use of the ponds by thousands that utilise the ponds daily as part of health and wellbeing

I look forward to your response regarding my points raised in relation to this project and trust that this will be forwarded in relation to the planning application, so that alternatives can be explored.
Best regards
Karen Durham

Enirayetan, Oluwaseyi

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 01 August 2014 18:59
To: Planning
Subject: Objection to plan for construction of dams on Hampstead Heath.

I would like to record my strong objection to this project. I live 250 yards from the Heath and use it for walking nearly every day using paths that will be put out of action for long periods if this scheme goes forward. The justification for the scheme seems extremely poor. Please do not go ahead.

Philip Graham
36 St Albans Rd
London
NW5 1RD
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 01 August 2014 19:31
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Objection to Ref. 2014/4332/P

Dear Mr. Markwell,

I should like to object to the massive industrial engineering works, which the City of London Corporation is proposing for Hampstead Heath, under the 1975 Reservoirs Act.

The scale of the works is quite simply unjustifiable in relation to the 1 in 400,000 year risk. The Heath is a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation and is to be preserved for public amenity and for biodiversity. The felling of over 160 trees is quite simply incompatible with the status of the Heath and with the city's roles the guardian of the Heath's habitat.

The proposed construction would introduce a huge man-made structure which would have a major negative impact on the natural landscape of the Heath. The HGV traffic and engineering plant would cause significant disruption to biodiversity and result in lasting damage.

Furthermore, this work is hardly appropriate during an era of economic hardship. Investing in charitable schemes and the like would be more appropriate.

I urge you to reject this disproportionate application.

Oliver Mayo
12A Hollycroft Avenue
London
NW3 7QL

[REDACTED]

From: Brenda Beary <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 01 August 2014 21:15
To: Planning
Subject: Application no. 2014/4332/P Heath ponds

As a local resident with no vested interest, I would like to object in the strongest terms to the proposed damming of the ponds on Hampstead Heath. Given that the ponds have regularly been risk assessed according to requirements, and as little as seven years ago given the all clear, it seems to me that the present unnecessary proposal is a product of faulty computer modelling. The engineers doing the risk assessment have entered a doomsday scenario on to a computer programme and clicked 'go'.

The result, as they themselves admit is a once in 400,000 year chance that multiple calamitous events will coincide and cause the ponds to flood as far as Gospel Oak.

What we actually know is that in 1976 the flooding in South End Green was caused by overflowing rain-water drains in the streets and that the ponds caused no problems at all. 2013/14 was the wettest winter in recorded history, causing large scale flooding all over the country, and there was not a hint of a flood from the ponds.

Could it be that those who stand to gain a lucrative contract building the dams have more influence with the City of London than concerned local residents and thousands of responsible Londoners?

Brenda Beary
43 Parliament Hill
NW3 2TA

[REDACTED]

From: becky field [REDACTED]
Sent: 01 August 2014 23:51
To: Planning
Subject: damming hampstead heath

I am very concerned about the proposal for the damn to be built on the heath. From reading the information on offer, it does not warrant the amount of disfigurement to the existing Heath, the culling of established trees, disruption to the natural habitat and will effect the character of the Ponds and Heath. I am also astounded by the cost to the tax payer when there does not seem to be a valid enough data to support such risk. So far, the beauty of the Heath has been preserved with no unnecessary development (Hampstead Heath Act of 1871). This proposal contravenes this pledge and you need to listen to users of the Heath and local residents. Please reject this unjustified, destructive, colossal expense that will adversely effect many users and the natural environment.