

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 31 July 2014 11:50
To: Planning
Subject: Objection to dams :application number 2014/4332/P

I would like to make a strong objection to this planning application, which represents a huge waste of money. Come on, a 1 in 400,000 year chance?? What next. The building of a shield around the earth in case of a meteor strike? The banning of all walking on any pavement's because there is a significantly higher risk than 1 in 400,000 year chance of tripping up over the unmaintained pavements? There are more useful and more needed ways to spend money than on a scheme like this.

Hampstead Heath is a unique resource in a major European Capital City. Any body with REAL environmental concerns would realise that the maintenance of wild green spaces in cities does much to improve the health and wellbeing of a population in a city which has definite problems with air quality caused by traffic emissions. The felling of trees, the disturbance to habitat for wildlife and plant species which will be caused by turning this precious piece of countryside into an urban wasteland, tickboxed into cosmetic orderliness is a horrible, horrible prospect.

Not only will this beautiful, historic, magical space be despoiled but local businesses will also suffer hugely – the Heath is a popular place to visit, for both locals, Londoners, and visitors to London from both this country and abroad.

The savage, ugly destruction FOR NO SENSIBLE REASON would keep visitors away in their hundreds of thousands – what then happens to the local shops and businesses in Highgate Village, Parliament Hill Fields, South End Green and Hampstead itself who all benefit from people 'visiting the Heath'

As has been far better pointed out elsewhere, IF that once in 400,000 were to happen, most of the rest of London itself would be under water. There has NEVER been a breaching of the existing dams on the Heath, despite torrential rain. Spend the money on maintenance of the existing dams, not on this foolish piece of ill-thought out build which satisfied no one except the companies who are awarded the contracts.

Victoria Plum, Holly Lodge Estate resident, Highgate Heath lover, Heath user



This email is free from viruses and malware because [avast! Antivirus](#) protection is active.

Gentet, Matthias

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 31 July 2014 14:50
To: Planning
Subject: Hampstead heath

Dear Planning Camden,

I wish to support 38 Degrees in their efforts to preserve Hampstead Heath. I recall the heath was saved from building work in 19th century on the basis that, without public's free run of the heath, north London would not be worth living in in the future. I absolutely think this applies even more today.

Mr. G. mackinnon

Gentet, Matthias

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 31 July 2014 13:34
To: Planning
Subject: Projected works on Hampstead Heath

Dear Sir/Madam

I am writing to you to object the planned works on Hampstead Heath. I have lived near the Heath for over 25 years and it is one of the great treasures for those living in London. It is one of the most beautiful wild open spaces in London and if the planned works go ahead it will ruin the Heath.

I ask you to consider the damage that will be done and how the works are a grossly excessive response to the supposed threat of flooding which would only occur in the unlikely event of a truly apocalyptic downpour.

Not only will the Heath be ruined forever but there will be at least two years of disruption from heavy machinery during which the Heath will be a pretty unpleasant place to visit.

I ask you, please do not allow this to go ahead.

Yours sincerely,

Jenny Ashworth and Kash Dewar

1, New Court
Lutton Terrace
London NW3 1HD

Gentet, Matthias

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 31 July 2014 20:23
To: Planning
Subject: reference 2014/4332/P Hampstead Heath dams project

Please review the dams project and look for a less drastic alternative solution to this very minimal threat of flooding.

I have been using the Mixed Bathing Pond at Hampstead for many years, and before that the Men's Bathing Pond. I was looking forward to spending many happy times at the Mixed Bathing Pond during the Summer now I'm retired. I'm 69 and this is one of my few pleasures. I will be devastated if the ponds are ruined, or even shut for one or two years. This facility is virtually unique in London.

At the very least you should insure that the Mixed Bathing Pond remains open even if the Men's and Ladies Ponds have to be temporarily closed. Then do the work near the Mixed Bathing Pond when the Ladies and Men's Ponds re-open. This is far from ideal, as there is very little sunbathing space at the Mixed Pond. Though this could easily be rectified by extending it along the bank, clearing some of the shrubbery. However I understand this is the responsibility of the City of London Corporation.

Tony Papard

Gentet, Matthias

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 31 July 2014 09:32
To: Planning
Subject: Application Number 2014/4332/P

FAO: Planning

Dear Sir / Madam,

Re: Save the Ponds

I have resided in Highgate most of my life

I am most disturbed to hear about the proposed work building dams on the heath.

Independent experts are suggesting that this work is unnecessary.

It seems as if the motivation for doing the work is simply that of significant revenue generation.

I am strongly opposed to this proposed work and respectfully ask that Camden Council put a stop to the proposal to build the dams.

Yours sincerely,

Gordon Greville
Highgate N6

Gentet, Matthias

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 31 July 2014 10:59
To: Planning
Subject: Application Number 2014/4332/P

I am writing to register my strong objection to the proposed works to the ponds on Hampstead Heath. My life would be massively affected as I walk on the heath almost every day (I live in Kentish Town) and swim during the summer months. The great beauty and tranquility of the is a major source of benefit to my physical (I have a respiratory condition and arthritis) and psychological well being, particularly in times of stress. This is a unique and precious resource for countless Londoners from all over the capital (and visitors), all ages and all walks of life. It is also a haven for wildlife.

I believe the proposed works would destroy the nature of the heath and ponds for ever, and for years during the works would destroy the peace of the heath.

In 30 years I have never seen any flooding, even last winter just a few puddles on the footpaths. I visited the exhibition and some engineers were present- they confirmed that the ponds are fed only by springs originating on the heath, they are not fed from further afield or a river from outside the area. Therefore the vast extent of the works I believe are not warranted by the extent of the risk. If there was a history of substantial flooding then this would be a different case- however there is none. I believe it has been proved far lesser measures would fulfil legal obligations.

I particularly object to the high dam above the Men's Pond and concrete wall, the massive reconstruction of the boating pond, and the loss of 160 trees, many of them mature. This will seriously affect the nature of the ponds and many trees are already at risk from disease, eg the horse chestnut trees.

I understand that the engineers who assessed the works needed may benefit from the 17 million pound project- therefore they have a vested interest and an independent assessment is surely required.

We are the caretakers of the heath for future generations and need to be extremely vigilant and we should take great care, as those have done who have fought for the heath in previous generations.

Julia Lodge
21a Lady Margaret Road
NW5 2NG

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 31 July 2014 16:15
To: Planning
Subject: 2014/4332/P

Dear Sir/ Madam

I wish to comment on the above proposal concerning engineering work on Hampstead Heath. I would be grateful if you could acknowledge receipt (as this has not happened in the past and my commentss have gone astray)and also let me know when the committee is.

I am a frequent user of the Heath and Ladies Pond and after thirty five years of living in the city, I still cannot get over how lucky we are to have both amenities. Given the lasting impact that the proposed engineering works will have on the Heath and ponds therefore, Camden Council must consider VERY carefully whether such extensive work is justified and whether there are alternatives which will not damage this priceless asset to the same extent.

I personally regard the proposed works with deep concern and wish to register my opposition on the following grounds that the nature of the Heath will be irrevocably changed, that the character of the works will have a highly damaging impact on the Heath and ponds. I would also question whether the works need to be carried out at all.

1. The Heath

The City of London is required under the Hampstead Heath Act of 1871 to preserve it in its "natural state and aspect".The Heath is the lung of North London. There are other parks but nothing on the same scale. It is freely available to everyone – children, adults, dogwalkers, sunbathers, swimmers, joggers etc etc and provides enormous health and mental benefits as well wider economic benefits. It is a natural space, subject to gradual human intervention over hundreds of years. One of its most important aspects is its wildness and the sense it provides of being far away from the centre of London, thereby allowing its users to truly 'escape'.

The proposed engineering works will take at least 2 years, during which time there will be massive disruption to the Heath and wildlife. Large areas will be inaccessible during the the works and the highly sensitive environment will be damaged by traffic and heavy machinery. Recovery will take years and in many areas, the heath will take on an industrial aspect completely at variance with 'its natural state and aspect.'

2.Scale of works

The work over 2 year period will be sudden and dramatic, and will require the use of heavy plant which is likely to worsen the soil compaction and increase flood risks. It will have a major adverse impact on the look of the Heath and its amenities, including the 1 metre dam at the Men's bathing pond, the 2.5 m dam at the Boating pond, the 1.25 m dam at the Highgate No 1 pond, the 1 m dam at the Mixed Bathing Pond and 5.6m high earth embankment at the Catchpit Valley. 160 mature trees, at least will have to go and the spillways will also be very visible. These will radically alter the

landscape and have an irredeemable impact. If we decide we don't like them, we can't just click a switch. The Heath as we know it will be changed forever.

3.The threat.

Given the scale of the proposed engineering works, and the enormous impact they will have on the Heath and bathing ponds, council representatives acting on the peoples' behalf, must be absolutely sure that there is clear evidence of a threat of flooding that could bring about the loss of over 200 lives. This is by no means realistic or logical.

Within the context of flooding in London a 'once in 400,000 year' flood risk is hard to justify by comparison with risk thresholds applied to other schemes. For example: Thames Water sewers south of the Heath are designed to cope only with a 'once in 70 year' flood and the Thames Barrier is made to cope only with a 'once in 1000 year' flood. In over 300 years' existence the ponds on Heath have not collapsed or caused any major flooding. The 2013/2014 winter was the wettest winter on record but there were no ill-effects to the ponds.

This proposal additionally takes no account of the responsibilities of bodies like Camden Council and Thames Water to reduce the impact of flooding. There is no consideration of civil contingencies measures e.g. early warning systems or evacuation procedures that Camden Council is required to have in place. It does not allow for other infrastructure which would fail earlier than the proposed dams, and still lead to flooding and deaths e.g. drains and sewers south of the Heath. Finally it assumes the 300 additional people who might die in floods due to dam failure remain in their homes and take no action to leave.

Thankyou

Judy Cumberbatch (Ms.)

Gentet, Matthias

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 31 July 2014 21:35
To: Planning
Subject: re Planning application 2014/4332/P
Attachments: letter re dams.doc

Dear Development Management Team

I attach an letter regarding the above planning application registering my reasons for strongly opposing this.

As you can see i have also sent it by post to Jonathan Markwell.

Yours sincerely

Anne Elton

Gentet, Matthias

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 31 July 2014 09:44
To: Planning
Cc: Markwell, Jonathan
Subject: Heath Ponds Project

The disruption, destruction of trees and wildlife damage is out of all proportion to the overdrawn future scenario of giant storms and the damage they may or may not cause.

Please note my strong objection to this project.

Liz Costalas

Sent from my iPad

Gentet, Matthias

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 31 July 2014 22:51
To: Planning
Subject: application number 2014/4332/P
Importance: High

Dear Dir/Madam

I am writing to lodge my objection to the proposed planning application to build massive dams and giant spillways. The reason for my objections are as follows

1. These plans would devastate the unique and beautiful natural environment vital to local wildlife and migrating birds, and enjoyed by millions of visitors.
2. More than 160 trees would need to be cut down, many of them mature.
3. The proposed spillway and concrete dam of the model boating pond and men's pond are unnecessary, they would not add any intrinsic value.
4. Independent expert opinion, suggests the plans are completely unnecessary, the risk factor of flooding is so minimal that it cannot be used as evidence to support the project
5. Having been a regular visitor to the heath for the past 22 years, I have never experienced or noted any particular issues with regards to flooding and I am an all year round user of the Heath, how can you justify this project and spend £1.7 million pounds of tax payers money. It is just wrong.
6. It would impact on the local businesses, the tourist trade is buoyant on the heath and a lot of local businesses rely on this to survive.

This project is a waste of time and money, and will only financially benefit those that seek to justify it and push it through.

It is just wrong, so wrong and I so upset that Camden would even consider destroying and devastating one of the most beautiful parts of London especially when such little concrete and tangible evidence exists to support the importance of the work.

Please please stop it.

Dilek Djemil
45 Sylvan Avenue
London
N22 5JA

Gentet, Matthias

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 31 July 2014 11:18
To: Planning
Cc: Markwell, Jonathan
Subject: heath dams project

I object in the strongest possible terms to the project to fortify dams at the ponds on Hampstead heath. The project is in my view altogether unnecessary, but even if some flood protection is called for the planned project is out of scale and will have seriously detrimental effects on the heath.

Victoria Chick
44 Denning Road
NW3 1SU

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 31 July 2014 18:43
To: Planning
Subject: RE Planning Application number 2014/4332/P

I have been a keen heath user for nearly 40 years, enjoy walking on the heath and swimming in the pond. In a busy city it is a blessing and necessity to have a quiet, unspoilt space, in which to retreat from the bustle of life. It is not acceptable that this should be threatened by the proposed dam works which are unnecessary, would involve massive and unsightly changes and threaten the very essence of the Heath. One of the major benefits of the heath is that it is natural environment evolving slowly at its own pace, albeit with sensitive management where necessary.

I am opposed to the proposed dam developments for a number of reasons, explained below. You may well have heard most of these objections before, but please do remember that every person who writes to you is one more of many concerned individuals who love the Heath and do not want it ruined by unnecessary, costly and ugly works.

Nature and Wellbeing

The City of London has been custodian of Hampstead Heath since 1989 - a relative newcomer - and is required under the Hampstead Heath Act of 1871 to preserve it in its "*natural state and aspect*". Yet the proposed works would involve traffic and heavy machinery, take at least 2 years, cause massive disruption to the Heath, seriously threaten wildlife and the well being of those using the heath. Large areas would be inaccessible during the works and afterwards areas would be permanently disfigured.

The Heath is world famous, freely available to all Londoners and visitors. It is used daily by wide variety of people, walkers, runners, swimmers, families with children. As a common facility it brings massive benefits in terms of physical and mental health, in turn a wider economic benefit - all this would be threatened by the massive works, the scale and speed of which are enormous and unnecessary, and completely out of step with the slow natural rhythm of nature and way out of proportion to any perceived risks.

Scale of works and cost:

The scale of works proposed, taking place over a 2 year period, would require use of heavy plant on the Heath which would be likely to worsen the soil compaction and actually increase flood risks.

The works would cost £17million, which is money which could be better spent elsewhere.

The works will have a massive impact: -

- Spillways proposed as a "soft engineering" option, which will still have significant impact.
- Proposals to fell at least 160 mature trees as part of these works, to keep spillways clear.
- Model Boating Pond to be enlarged, island created and 2.5m dam to south - this is big enough already.
- Men's Bathing Pond 1m dam
- Highgate No1 Pond 1.25m dam and wall
- Catchpit Valley earth embankment, 5.6m high, up to 40m deep at base and 100m long

Mixed Bathing Pond 1m dam

Risk model/Flooding:

The computer modelling for the proposals is based on a 1 in 400,000 worst case flood scenario which presumes total collapse of all pond dams and massive loss of life. There has been no collapse of dams, no escape of water and no deaths in the Ponds' 300 year history - and this includes last winter, the wettest on record. Building of the dams is not a legal requirement and this work is not a requirement of the 1975 Reservoirs Act. And the dams will not stop future flooding from storms.

The flood model 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. Nor does the model allow for other infrastructure which would fail earlier than the proposed dams, and still lead to flooding and deaths e.g. drains and sewers south of the Heath. In addition, the model assumes the 300 additional people who might die in floods due to dam failure remain in their homes and take no action to leave.

Money would be better used advising local residents of potential flooding risks and supporting access to suitable insurance.

Ignoring consultation and failure to consider alternatives - this is not acceptable

Why is the City of London pressing ahead with this and failing to consider alternatives such as 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).

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. And respondents were given limited options to comment on in the first place.

Proposed works at Ladies' Pond

There are several areas of concern with this:

- Full Amenity Assessment (Appendix 10.1) states Ladies' Pond will be closed for 7.5 months and there will be no alternative swimming facility for most of this period (October 2015-March 2016) as the Mixed Pond is closed for most of this time too. Needs to be clarified as assurances were previously given about access to female only swimming facilities throughout the works i.e. access to the Mixed Pond as a substitute.

- Furthermore, the builders (BAM Nuttall) indicated at Development Management Forum on 5 June 2014 that swimming would be restricted for a much shorter period, due to use of aqua-dam during work on Ladies' Pond. Indicated they would only need to restrict swimming during de-silting works and when changing rooms being rebuilt.

- Proposed single narrow entrance to deck area and changing rooms will be much more congested than at present. Potential risk in emergency situation.

- Single point of exit from proposed lifeguard facilities makes no provision for alternative emergency exit from long/narrow building. Also a "blind spot" from the back of the office area, no view of the south meadow. An emergency exit door here facing south meadow, with suitable glazed panel, would resolve both issues (instead of proposed window to side/gate).

I urge you to seriously consider all these points,

The Heath is a much loved common legacy and needs to be managed sensitively. Its users need to be listened to and local bodies, such as the Heath and Hampstead society, need to be listened to sincerely

Gentet, Matthias

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 31 July 2014 17:11
To: Planning
Subject: Proposed dam on Hampstead Heath

These ponds have been on the Heath longer than you or I, and can it only be now that you have decided to spend taxpayer on daming them?

Over a hundred years and now at a time of fiscal tightening you want to do this?

Please think twice.

There are other more important things to do with taxpayer money.

Thank you

Gentet, Matthias

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 31 July 2014 11:30
To: Planning
Subject: DamNonsense

Dear Camden Council,

I was shocked and disgusted to hear that a dam was being considered would threaten the unique natural oasis that is Hampstead Heath.

The Heath provides a haven for people and wildlife alike and is unique in a city such as London. It is vital for the physical and mental health of an urban population to have places like this available to all. It is also an important historical reminder of the area's past.

I urge you to reconsider these plans.

Dr Anna Porter

Gentet, Matthias

From: Markwell, Jonathan
Sent: 31 July 2014 10:14
To: Planning
Subject: FW: Planning Application 2014/4332/P Hampstead and Highgate ponds
Attachments: Planning application comments 30.7.14.docx

Please log the attached from Brookfield Mansions Freehold Ltd - on behalf of the leaseholders and residents of the flats at 25 to 56 Brookfield Mansions.

Please add in the postal address of 53 Brookfield, 5 Highgate West Hill, London N6 6AT for committee / decision notification purposes.

Thanks,

Jonathan Markwell
Principal Planning Officer

Telephone: 0207 974 2453

From: Christopher Kelly [REDACTED]
Sent: 31 July 2014 09:50
To: Markwell, Jonathan
Subject: RE: Planning Application 2014/4332/P Hampstead and Highgate ponds

Dear Jonathan Markwell

Thank you. Please send anything to 53 Brookfield, 5 Highgate West Hill, London N6 6AT.

Regards

Chris

From: Markwell, Jonathan [mailto:Jonathan.Markwell@Camden.gov.uk]
Sent: 31 July 2014 08:37
To: 'Christopher Kelly'
Subject: RE: Planning Application 2014/4332/P Hampstead and Highgate ponds

Dear Mr Kelly,

Thank you for your email and attachment. To enable you to be kept up to date with the proposals please detail a postal address which future correspondence can be sent to?

I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely,

Jonathan Markwell
Principal Planning Officer

Telephone: 0207 974 2453

Please consider the environment before printing this email. Please note that the information contained in this letter represents an officer's opinion and is without prejudice to further consideration of this matter by the Development Management Section or to the Council's formal decision. This e-mail is intended solely for the person to whom it is addressed. It may contain confidential or privileged information. If you receive this message but are not the intended recipient you are expressly notified that any copying or dissemination of this message without our permission is prohibited. You must not copy, distribute or take any action in reliance on it. Unless stated to the contrary, any opinions or comments are personal to the writer and do not represent the official view of the Council.

From: Christopher Kelly [REDACTED]
Sent: 30 July 2014 12:47
To: Markwell, Jonathan
Cc: 'Harriet King'
Subject: Planning Application 2014/4332/P Hampstead and Highgate ponds

Dear Jonathan

I attach some comments on this planning application on behalf of the residents of Brookfield Mansions.

I would be grateful if you could acknowledge receipt

Regards

Christopher Kelly
Chair Brookfield Mansions freehold Limited

This e-mail may contain information which is confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright protected. This e-mail is intended for the addressee only. If you receive this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer.

Gentet, Matthias

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 31 July 2014 14:45
To: Planning
Subject: HAMPSTEAD HEATH.

Dear Sirs,

I want to add my voice to those who have already contacted you to oppose any heavy construction on Hampstead Heath. I think that the Heath, with its ponds, and with Kenwood, is a jewel of an amenity, which needs to be protected and preserved for posterity. The ponds are a tranquil haven for swimmers, and the whole environment is a delight for those who enjoy landscape and wildlife. To disturb it would be tragic.

Yours Sincerely,
Judith Roberts..

Gentet, Matthias

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 31 July 2014 09:50
To: Planning
Cc: Markwell, Jonathan
Subject: Dams Objection - Planning Reference 2014/4332/P

Dear Sirs

I wish to register my objections to the Hampstead Heath Dams project.

There appears to be no evidence that such an enormous project is either legally or realistically necessary. The disruption to local amenities, wildlife, landscape and tree loss is unjustifiable and the benefits completely obscure.

I strongly oppose this unnecessary project and propose that the funds are directed into more necessary areas.

Yours faithfully

Caroline Dale

Gentet, Matthias

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 31 July 2014 11:31
To: Planning
Subject: application number 2014/4332/P

Dear Sir/Madam,

As a resident of North London who uses the wonderful opportunities afforded by Hampstead Heath for walking and swimming in a (largely) unspoilt environment, I am appalled by the plans to build dams and destroy the beauty of the Heath and ponds. They are of no proven benefit to anyone, would involve excessive incursions of machinery into the Heath, would make the ponds unusable for a long time and would spoil their appearance permanently.

Please reject these plans completely and irrevocably. Many thousands of Londoners who love the Heath will be grateful.

yours sincerely,

Hillary Ratna

Gentet, Matthias

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 31 July 2014 09:42
To: Planning
Cc: Revah, Lorraine (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 15, 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. In August 1975 my present dwelling was flooded to a depth of 6 feet

Mick Farrant
15, Oak Village,
NW5 4QP

[REDACTED]

Gentet, Matthias

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 31 July 2014 10:17
To: Planning
Cc: Markwell, Jonathan
Subject: Planning Reference 2014/4332/P

To whom it may concern:

I would like to object to the City of London's plans to rebuild the Heath dams.

The proposed work is a costly over-reaction to a perceived risk based on faulty modeling and will cause permanent damage to the Heath, both aesthetically and environmentally. The Reservoirs Act 1975 does not necessitate that works be carried out on such a scale.

I urge Camden to reject this application and ask the City of London to revise its plans along a more realistic, and less damaging, assessment of actual risk.

Sincerely,

Janine Griffis
Chair, Pilgrim's to Willoughby Residents Association

Dear Jonathan Markwell

I am writing to object to the Planning Application 2014/4332/P made by the City of London.

I am a regular swimmer in the Ladies Pond, an occasional one in the Mixed Pond and a regular, almost daily walker on the Heath, both for pleasure in walking and as a preferred or indeed necessary route to various places nearby; these include my allotment in Fitzroy Park.

It really is impossible to describe the enormous pleasure the Heath gives to those, like myself who use it regularly, particularly the enjoyment of a large open space which, if not natural is as near as that can be in an urban environment. Despite my current great concerns re this application I would want to register my appreciation of the way in which the City of London has managed the Heath in recent years, encouraging actively more natural areas of planting.

The scale of the works proposed on the new dams will necessarily involve heavy construction traffic which must damage if not destroy some areas in their path (quite apart from the new dams themselves), and will cause enormous disruption to those using the areas involved. It is also incidentally likely to cause considerable noise. This will affect not only those of us who live nearby, but the many thousands who come to the Heath from other parts of London and indeed the globe to find pleasure and relaxation in the green surroundings. As you must be aware the Heath has been a cherished "green lung" for Londoners for at least 2 centuries. The benefits to physical and mental health of having such a facility cannot be over-estimated.

Wildlife too is likely to be affected both by the actual construction and by the felling of a large number of trees which provide habitat for many creatures.

The works proposed will alter irrevocably the aspect and landscape in at least 2 areas - between the Mens' Pond and the Boating Pond and in the Catchpit area above the Mixed Pond. These changes are not of the kind which would occur by natural means (other than an earthquake) or by ordinary human intervention in the landscape. Indeed what is proposed is most closely resembles the enormous damage and impact caused by a major earthquake not, I believe, something which mankind has ever wished for anywhere.

Even the softer option of spillways will alter the landscape.

I have attended a number of meetings on these proposals including a consultation meeting. In none of them was I seriously impressed by the need for such a major building task. I have not heard the City mention anywhere the possibility of considering other measures to lessen the risk of flooding by other measures, such as increasing the Heath's own capacity to absorb more water. While I appreciate the need for them to try to avoid loss of life in a major flood, the possibility of this appears to be so remote as not to be within the parameters of normal planning. It is also documented that the flooding which has occurred in Gospel Oak, Kentish Town and St. End Green in recent decades has been attributable to very heavy rainfall and the lack of capacity of the sewers to cope. Surely the sewers are the responsibility of either Camden or the water Board? In their various meetings the City of London has stated many times that even these projected dams would

not save all lives. In a recent consultation meeting they initially refused even to consider the question put about early warning systems and finally to say that these were the responsibility of Camden Council without clarifying how they would link with Camden.

The final application gives a very different timescale for the works at the Ladies Pond from those discussed with the Pond committee. It also states that for a period of 5 months only one pond will remain open, despite repeated assurances to us that there would always be 2 open at a time, allowing one to be dedicated to women. Although they have corrected that to us recently I cannot be impressed by an application which makes errors of this nature in an area with which I am very familiar. It leaves me to have even greater doubts about the City's clarity about the whole project

I am also concerned that the City refused a proposal from the Hampstead and Heath Society to put the whole matter before a judge together and not in the context of judicial review, a considerably more expensive proceeding. One appreciates the legal problem which the City perceive themselves to be in, but surely requesting legal advice could have been a way of clarifying the real meaning of the laws. Their refusal to do this would suggest that they are taking a rather blinkered view of the whole problem and are unable to see outside a box called "big dam building."

For these reasons I wish register my strong opposition to this whole proposal.

Yours sincerely

Anne Elton

Planning Application 2014/4332/P
Hampstead and Highgate chains of ponds

Comments from Brookfield Mansions Freehold Ltd

Brookfield Mansions is an Edwardian building, with basements, situated directly below Highgate Number 1 pond. Brookfield Mansions Freehold Limited is the company which owns the freehold of the 32 flats which make up 25 to 56 Brookfield Mansions. The company is owned by the leaseholders. These comments are submitted on behalf of the leaseholders and residents of the flats.

Generally:

The drawings submitted do not show the area to the south, west and east of the spillway from Highgate No 1 Pond. There is no indication of the extent and depth of flooding from surface water discharged down the spillway in storm events of the magnitude of 1:2,000; 1:5,000, 1:10,000 and PMF. It is therefore difficult for us to assess the true impact of the proposed new spillway on Brookfield.

We support the application for the following reason:

1. Brookfield is extremely vulnerable should the dams fail. Apart from any other water damage, the foundations could be undermined. We therefore in principle strongly support the measures to prevent dam collapse.

We have the following concerns about the impact of the scheme:

2. A new 60m wide spillway is proposed along part of the raised crest of Highgate No 1 Pond. The spillway is designed to increase the discharge capacity of water from the chain. Without the proposed works and the construction of the spillway, overflowing water would be distributed over the north, east and south of the Pond. In the event of an overtopping, the proposed spillway would concentrate all the high velocity discharge occurring into Brookfield and the neighbouring properties located beneath the dam. Conditions in the vicinity of Brookfield could in consequence be worse than if no work was carried out. The proposed timber fence bordering the spillway would be ineffective in preventing this from happening.
3. In the past the 'scour pipe' from Highgate No 1 pond has been opened when water threatened to overtop the dam. City of London have not taken the effect of this into account in their estimate of the existing Standard of Protection (the standard to which a building, asset or area is protected against flooding) of 1:100.
4. We are concerned that because of their focus – for reasons which we understand - on preventing dam failure the City of London have paid insufficient attention to the possibility of relatively minor measures of flood prevention which could be done at the same time as the works to the dams at a reasonable cost and with little or no environmental impact.
5. Among other things, we have suggested the following measures be taken:

(i) An additional overflow pipe which would take water from Highgate No 1 into the sewers or flood relief tunnels. This pipe would operate just below the elevation at which water reached spillway level. The existing overflow is through the existing dam. It is proposed that this part of the dam becomes part of the spillway and therefore the overflow will lie within the spillway; it could therefore become blocked, allowing water to overtop the spillway earlier than anticipated. An additional overflow would significantly decrease surface water flooding of Brookfield and neighbouring properties in storm events between 1:1,000 and 1:10,000.

(ii) A small earth bund, approximately 1m high, to ensure that any flow over the spillway was directed past the flats and houses along the natural stream bed.

(iii) Additional water storage on the Heath, e.g. west of the Men's Pond. This area was flooded in January 2014. The water eventually drained away and no harm was done to the Heath. There are no trees or shrubs in the area. The area would only be flooded in storms greater than 1:1,000. Making provision for it would be in accordance with Environment Agency's recommendations to increase flood water storage on site.

Comment [CK1]: Should we say what we mean by this?

5. We were promised some time ago by the City of London that these suggestions would be taken seriously. We have no evidence that this has been done.
6. The objection to the additional overflow pipe appears to be both that it would be relatively ineffective and that it would add unacceptably to the amount of water reaching the sewers. We do not see how both can be true at the same time. It would, in fact, create additional protection for all the downstream communities in storms where the water overtops the spillway. Moreover, the water concerned would mostly reach the sewers without much delay. The issue is primarily about the route which the water takes. As proposed, the water discharged down the spillway is uncontrolled and would flood Brookfield and the adjacent buildings before reaching the sewers.
7. It is difficult to see what the objection could be to the idea of the bund, which could run along the existing (tree-lined) fence and would be scarcely visible.

We urge the planning committee:

- A. To support the proposals to decrease the danger of dam failure in the interests both of the safety of the residents of Brookfield, a number of them elderly, and of other Camden residents downstream of the dams.
- B. To make it a condition of granting permission that the City of London include an additional overflow from Highgate No 1 pond of the same capacity as the existing overflow and a small bund to ensure that any water coming over the spillway is directed away from Brookfield. It is not reasonable to pass this water through the buildings which comprise Brookfield, flooding the basements and causing potential danger to residents and property.
- C. To ensure that maps based on the topographical survey data showing the extent and depth of surface water flooding downstream of the chains in 1:2,000; 1:5,000 and 1:10,000 events are made available to local residents before a final decision on the application is made.