Gentet, Matthias

From:	[redacted]
Sent:	01 August 2014 10:24
To:	Planning
Cc:	Revah, Larraine (Councillor); McCormack, Maeve (Councillor); Blackwell, Theo (Councillor); Phil Jones; Gimson, Sally (Councillor)
Subject:	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 believe it complies with Camden's Core Strategy, Development Policy 23 and will provide increased protection against flooding for much of our community and other downstream communities in certain circumstances.

Gillian Edwards

44 Oak Village

Gentet, Matthias

From: [redacted]
Sent: 01 August 2014 09:29
To: Planning; campaignsbyyou@38degrees.org.uk; elizabeth.meakins@gmail.com
Subject: heathdams

Planing ref 2014/4332/P

Dear Camden Planning
I am astonished that a proposal to grossly disfigure our wonderful Heath, which I have enjoyed for most of my 85 years, has got so far.
All this to avert the consequences of a flood on which the odds are very very remote .
The scheme seems to rest on the idea that excess water should be kept on the heath.Hence the dams.
It would be far less destructive, to improve the drainage from pond to pond and to make sure that London main drainage down to the Thames can cope If there is to be an oral hearing I would very much like to attend Bruce Kent Once Hampstead Garden Suburb now
11 Venetia Road
London N4 1EJ
[redacted]

Gentet, Matthias

From: [redacted]
Sent: 01 August 2014 07:08
To: Planning
Subject: OBJECTION: Proposed works on Hampstead ponds

To whom it may concern at Camden:

I strongly object to the major works planned by Camden to the Hampstead ponds re: your planning application dated July 2014.

My objection is on the basis that the works you are planning are:

1. Not necessary - if it ain't broke for hundreds of years don't touch it now.

2. What you propose is damaging to the environment as it will involve the cutting down of trees, bringing in of heavy machinery that will disrupt wild life , be an eye sore at the end and all for no good reason.

3. Unrealistic and prohibitively expensive based on advice from the appropriately named 'dam engineers' consulted by Camden.

As a regular user of the ponds to swim in and a daily walker on the Heath, I find your proposal preposterous and immoral when you could spend your money on hospitals or schools or old people or children..... I suggest you put this project on hold immediately and consult the Save the Ponds Association that has realistic, cheaper and environmentally more friendly suggestions based on consultations with a number of independent experts.

Please listen to us!!

Yours sincerely,

Jill Furmanovsky and family

108 Croftdown Road

London NW5 1HA.

Gentet, Matthias

From: [redacted]
Sent: 01 August 2014 10:19
To: Planning
Subject: Hampstead Ponds - 2014/4332/P

To Whom It May Concern,

I wish to object to the proposed works to be carried out on the ponds on Hampstead Heath.

Yours faithfully,
Barbara Galloway

Gentet, Matthias

From:	[redacted]
Sent:	01 August 2014 10:17
To:	Planning
Cc:	Revah, Larraine (Councillor); McCormack, Maeve (Councillor); Blackwell, Theo (Councillor); Phil Jones; Gimson, Sally (Councillor)
Subject:	Application Ref: 2014/4332/P Hampstead Heath dams on the Heath

For the attention of Jonathan Markwell

As a resident of Oak Village 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 believe it complies with Camden's Core Strategy, Development Policy 23 and will provide increased protection against flooding for much of our community and other downstream communities in certain circumstances.

Joanna Neicho
40 Oak Village
LONDON
NW5 4QL

Gentet, Matthias

From: [redacted]
Sent: 01 August 2014 09:31
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application: 2014/4332/P - Hampstead Heath Ponds Flood Scheme

Dear Sir

I am very concerned about the plans to develop the ponds to reduce potential flood impacts. I use the Heath on a regular basis and feel that the scheme will irrevocably alter Heath to the detriment of the users of the park and its wildlife.

The reasons for my objections are:

- The proposed works are massively obtrusive and completely out of character for the area
- The need for the proposed works has not been sensibly assessed. In particular the assumptions on which it is based are wholly unrealistic (eg no warnings would be given)
- The threshold for risk mitigation has been set absurdly low – a 1 in 400,000 year event is not a credible basis for action
- While some measures against floods may be necessary, there are alternatives to large scale dams, particularly increasing the Heath's natural capacity to absorb water. I do not believe these have been adequately considered.

Adrian

Adrian Henriques
[redacted]
website: www.henriques.info

Gentet, Matthias

From: [redacted]
Sent: 01 August 2014 09:36
To: Planning
Subject: THE LADIES POND

Like so many others I have been bathing in the most beautiful ladies pond on Hampstead Heath for decades. My mental and physical health has been so improved by the calming effect of the still water and the gentle sounds and sights of the wild life around me while swimming and just standing on the platform with the wonderful lifeguards.
Please do not embark on unneccessary work and spoil forever this haven.

Sincerely,

Catherine Shakespeare Lane

Gentet, Matthias

From: Jacob Doran <jacob@2simple.com>
Sent: 01 August 2014 11:32
To: Planning
Subject: objection against dam expansion 2014/4332/P

Dear Camden Planning,

I am writing to raise an objection to the planning of major dam construction on Hampstead Heath. I have been a resident close to the heath for over five years and I regularly walk there and swim in the ponds and I consider it to be one of the most beautiful natural areas within London.

The proposed plans would have a massive impact to the area, 160 trees would be cut down, it would devastate the natural environment which is a home to many species of migrating birds and local wildlife. It would also destroy the aesthetic beauty of the area with unsightly concrete constructions which would reduce visitors and local revenues.

The plans are based on computer models with erroneous assumptions based on highly improbable scenarios, almost certainly calibrated to procure work for the dam engineers rather than to evaluate the option with the least environmental impact. Independent experts have recommended much less drastic improvements to the dams, enhancing the heaths natural water absorbing capacity and improving warning systems.

I have a distinction from Kings College in environmental modelling and whilst I have not looked at the scenarios in detail I can tell you that environmental modelling is an imprecise science, outcomes are based on huge simplifying assumptions and the motivations of the modellers combined with conflicts of interests can drastically influence the conclusions.

I urge Camden Council to veto these destructive plans or at least to thoroughly consider all possible alternatives from independent experts.

If you wish to discuss this further please do not hesitate to contact me.

Best Regards,

Jacob Doran

Jacob Doran
Head of Development
2simple
2Simple Software • Enterprise House, 2 The Crest, Hendon, London NW4 2HN
T: +44(0) 20 8203 1781 • F: +44(0) 20 8202 6370
www.2simple.com • www.purplemash.co.uk

Explore our award-winning online creative suite, Purple Mash
Join in the conversation on Facebook and Twitter where you'll find updates, resources, competitions and more..

Gentet, Matthias

From: [redacted]
Sent: 01 August 2014 11:08
To: Planning
Subject: Objection to Hampstead Heath Dams and Ponds Project Ref 2014/4332/P

Dear Sir/Madame

I'm writing to strongly object to the Application Number 2014/4332/P that has been put forward by the City of London Corporation on July 9th 2014 and that, from my point of view, will lead to the destruction of one of the most loved and used natural reservoirs in London: the Hampstead Bathing Ponds. As a daily user of the Men's Bathing Pond and Hampstead Heath in general I think that this proposal will ruin for ever not only a beautiful and peaceful part of North London but the life of thousands and thousands of people using these facilities. The City of London have the obligation, under the Hampstead Heath Act of 1871 to preserve it in its natural state and aspect and by putting this proposal forward, they are doing exactly the contrary, putting at risk a place that is been used daily by thousands of citizens that enjoy Hampstead Heath as it actually is, as it has been said very clearly in the extremely limited and obscure consultation exercise of 2013-2014 where more than 66 per cent of participants strongly objected and opposed these plans. I am not prepared at all, by accepting this happening, to lose the mental and physical benefits that the daily visits to Hampstead Heath gives to my body and mind, therefore I am expressing my total and complete opposition to the plans. There has been no collapse of any of the dams, no escape of water and no deaths in any storm in the Pond's 300 year history and as the same City of London admits, the proposed dams will NOT stop future flooding from storms, so why all this nonsense, in the name of whom or what for?

The proposal is based on a risk model of 1 in 400,000 chances of serious flooding happening under "biblical" circumstances, a prospect that is not only not serious but is also not realistic at all, because, in between so many other things, will assume that people who potentially may be affected will remain locked in their houses without attempting to do anything to save their lives, if at risk. Do you really believe this scenario possible in the age of digital instant communications? This approach is completely illogical and the works proposed are not a requirement under the 1975 Reservoir Act. Does the City of London Corporation really thinks that this Probable Maximum Flood will happen or is this just another good chance for some companies operating within the Fear Industry to make good profits at the expense of the well being and the interest of the citizens of London in general and Camden in particular?

Camden Council and Thames Water have responsibilities to minimize the impact of this potential risks, so why are they not being taken into the equation of potential things to be done to avoid such circumstances? Why civil emergencies measures are not being taking into account, measures that will minimize completely any sort of risk to the life of people who theoretically could be affected by a "biblical" rain, a rain or kind of storm that did not happen in the Pond's 300 years existence and have only one chance in 400,000 to happen in the next 10 centuries? We just had the wettest winter on records and nothing, nothing whatsoever, nothing at all happened to the Ponds, so what makes the City of London believe that something can happen? What about other infrastructure that will fail earlier than the proposed dams, that, of course, in case of "biblical" proportion disasters happening in London, why nothing is being said about these other infrastructures? And above all, why the City of London, in those flawed and biased forms given in that so called consultation, did not give space to people to express their views on these proposals, that will for sure lead to a natural and ecological disaster if carried forward ?

More than 160 mature trees will be destroyed, how one can accept that happening in our beloved Heath? How can one be silent and quiet when facing such ecological catastrophe? These plans, apart from interrupting the daily life of the Ponds for at least 2 years, will also lead to a permanent disfigurement of the area as we actually know, and enjoy, it. Our beloved wildlife will be disrupted and probably affected well beyond repair by the constant presence of heavy machinery, trucks and all sort of industrial equipment while the destruction of the landscape is being carried out. Why will Camden Council let it happens? The soil compaction will be worsened and that will increase the risks of normal floods. The dams proposed will ruin for ever the idyllic landscape so much loved by users, and the actual views will be replaced by something equivalent to the Berlin Wall or the shameful Wall built by Israel to discriminate against the Palestinians. The whole proposal loos like a real shame to me.

And why the City of London Corporation is not taking into account the opinion of INDEPENDENT experts that recommended that homes and lives could be better protected by improving the Heath's natural capacity to absorb water or making minor improvement to existing dams or investing in early warning systems for residents, goes beyond my comprehension? Lawyers said that these softer measures would fulfill completely the City of London legal obligations to protect households and preserve the ponds, but are also being ignored. Why? Why these sudden and dramatic changes to a place that does not need them at all? Why these proposed giant spillways that will have such a bad impact on the place? Why those dams obscuring the view of the natural ponds? Why the artificial walls? Why the needless embankments? Why the reconstruction of the Model Boating Pond, a favorite place for meetings and relaxing? Why the refusal to Stephen Myer's proposals? Why all this nonsense costing well over 17 millions pounds? I really hope that Camden Council will see all these points as common sense and will act to stop this project that aims to destroy our ponds forever.

Yours sincerely

Pablo Robledo
123 Lulworth
Wrotham Road
London NW1 9SU