

Comments Form

Name. MRS MARY WALLAddress. FLAT 1, LAKE HOUSE, SOUTH HILL PARKEmail address. NW3 2SHTelephone number [REDACTED]Planning application number. 2014/4332/PPlanning application address. HAMPSTEAD + HIGHGATE CHAINS OF
PONDS, HAMPSTEAD HEATH.I support the application (please state reasons below) LONDON ☒I object to the application (please state reasons below) ☐

Your comments

I Support the application for the work which is proposed for Hampstead pond number 1, as the proposals are reasonable. I am concerned however, as to the disruption this work may cause to ~~wild~~ the wild life - especially the water fowl. I am also worried about the vista from this side of the pond - East - . I hope that I will be consulted at each stage of the work. As I am almost housebound due to medical conditions my view of the pond & thus the wild life and my garden are of utmost importance to me.

**22 Southway
LONDON NW11 6RU**

Development Management Team
Camden Town Hall Extension
Argyle Street
LONDON
WC1H 8EQ

3 August 2014

Dear Sir or Madam,

RE : 2014/4332/P Hampstead and Highgate chains of ponds, Hampstead Heath, London

I am writing to oppose the above planning application submitted by the City of London Corporation for the following reasons :

1. the City of London Corporation may have a legal duty to ensure health and safety by ensuring that the ponds are properly maintained. This, however, is not synonymous with building 2 to 2.5 metre high defences on the basis of a freak weather event, the odds of which are somewhere in the region of one in 400,000 years and presumes total collapse of all dams and massive loss of life. The professional guidance behind these extreme calculations is still being questioned within the engineering profession.

The City has already admitted that "Extreme storms will still cause floods in the area downstream after the work is complete": *ergo*, they will not solve the perceived problem

2. the application is based on a mistaken view of reservoir law and an extreme and irrational approach to flood risk. The Reservoirs Act stipulates only "measure in the interests of safety".

3. If I have understood correctly, the report concerning the need for the dams in question were prepared by an engineering company connected with the future building works, hence it cannot be considered independent. Indeed it gives the impression of vested interest.

4. in their current form, the ponds have been coping with rainfall for 300 years. During that same period, there has been no collapse of any dams, no uncontrolled escape of water and no deaths in any storm.

The ponds did not overspill in the torrential rains of 2013.

The flooding in South End Green, Gospel Oak and Kentish Town in 1975, which is being used to justify the scheme, was officially recorded as being due, not to the ponds overflowing, but to torrential rain and the failure of the sewers to cope – not the same thing.

5. The proposed scheme will turn charming, natural chains of ponds with modest dams that blend into their surroundings, into something akin to municipal waterworks. The Heath is a historic landscape which has inspired artists, poets and writers over the centuries and the City has a duty to protect it.

6. the City of London Questionnaire inviting views on the project (closing date 17 Feb 2014), made mention of the possible felling of 2 trees. A more recent assessment (Ham and High 17 July 2014) suggests it would be more like several hundred mature trees – not the same thing.

7. rather than avert the risk of flooding, the proposed scheme will create a future potential problem as more water will be stored on the Heath and the reservoirs will have to be maintained to ensure their integrity and safety.

8. the application makes no mention of the City of London's intentions for the water. Is it, as has been suggested, going to be sold to, say, Thames Water who will then sell it back to us – a public who will have no choice and who in fact have opposed the scheme? The commercial interests involved in this scheme need to be made clear.

It is wrong for the City of London to submit such an application during the summer months when many people are away on holiday. The consultation period should be extended until at least the end of September in order to allow Heath users to comment.

Yours sincerely,



Linda Ficker

cc : Heath and Hampstead Society

Heathland Studio

Valley of Health

Hamstead

NW3 1AZ

6/8/2014

Development Management Team

Application 2014/4332/P

Dear Sirs,

I wish to object in the strongest possible terms to the City's Dams Project.

Lacking any evidence of a convincing risk assessment, it appears to be based on a computer generated "worst scenario storm" likely to occur once within the unlikely, and somewhat farcical, time-frame of 400,000 years. Surely there is no better instance of the cart being placed firmly before the horse.

Once produced, this fictional storm of course requires appropriately drastic action to meet the severity of the occasion.

Resolutely ignoring the evidence that no death has been caused by dam collapse since 1925 and that damage caused by the 1975 storm over Hamstead Heath was not the result of dam breach but ineffective sewers, the City holds resolutely, and inexplicably, to this project.

What for me is most shocking is the devastating loss of over 160 trees which will result from this scheme, including the band of mature oaks on the left of the Stock Pond to make way for the spillway, the magnificent

Line, just one of many trees on Highgate 1,
and one or possibly two beautiful Plane trees
by the causeway of Hampstead 2.

I believe nobody, but those contracted
to carry out this monstrous project, will
benefit from it, and, if implemented, the
Heath, as we know and love it, will be
changed to its detriment for ever.

Yours faithfully,
Janis Hardiman

