

Gentet, Matthias

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 24 July 2014 23:09
To: Planning
Subject: Please do not grant planning permission for the redevelopment of the Hampstead Heath Ladies' Pond

Dear Madam or Sir,

I am writing to express my objection to the planned development works 2014/4332/P. I am concerned that the building works will be unnecessarily disruptive while they are being carried out and irreversibly damage the natural beauty of the area.

I have been coming to the ladies' pond regularly for ten years and I consider it one of the most valuable facilities in North London. Its peaceful, serene atmosphere benefits local women from all backgrounds by providing a respite from the stress of London life. In particular it benefits the elderly, many of whom rely on it for exercise. It is this healthy serenity which I fear will be lost if the planned building works are carried out.

Not only will the pond be affected during the building works but the reshaping of the landscape and loss of tree cover will have a permanently detrimental effect. Please do not tamper unnecessarily with something so precious to me and many of my friends.

I urge you to reconsider before North London is robbed of one of its finest assets.

Yours Sincerely,

Marianne Kelly

Gentet, Matthias

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 24 July 2014 11:05
To: Planning
Subject: Hampstead Heath Dams

Dear Sir/Madam,

Our family seriously object to the plan to have dams built on Hampstead Heath.

The Reservoirs Act 1975 does not legally require works to be carried out on this huge scale.

There is unrealistic modelling. Models for a giant storm have a 1 in 400,000 probability and assumes no warning and no emergency services.

The Heath will be badly disfigured with new and unnatural huge earthworks and excavations and excavations at Catchpit and Model Boating Pond.

There will be tree loss with over 160 planned to be felled. This large tree loss at Stock Pond is to create a giant spillway.

There will be unacceptable closure and disruption with 2 years of works requiring closure of popular parts of the heath, closure of the bathing ponds, heavy engineering plant and thousands of HGV movements and damage to to wildlife.

Alan & Jennifer Davis

5 Squires Mount Cottages
NW31EE

No virus found in this message.

Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

Version: 2014.0.4716 / Virus Database: 3986/7909 - Release Date: 07/24/14

Gentet, Matthias

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 24 July 2014 19:27
To: Planning
Subject: reference 2014/4332/P

The proposed works to dam up the ponds on such a large scale is not only unnecessary but will disfigure the landscape

entirely, destroying trees and wild life.

i have lived in the area for over 30 years and enjoyed the natural beauty of the ponds and the heath.

There has been no floodings during that time.

Would it not be better to spend the money on dams to prevent flooding of the thames and other areas which propose a threat to the people living there.

i hope Campden council will reconsider these proposals democratically as the majority of people are against it.

Caroline Borgmann

Gentet, Matthias

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 24 July 2014 22:30
To: Planning
Subject: Application Number 2014/4332/P

Dear Mr Markwell

I am writing to strongly oppose the above application. I am a frequent year-round swimmer in the ponds. I strongly believe the provision of outdoor swimming in a natural environment is one of the things which makes our local area special. I find it difficult to express just how important the ponds are to many, many people - to their physical and mental wellbeing.

I urge you to rethink these major works and decide instead to follow the advice of independent experts who state that the ponds and the area around them would be equally well or better protected by taking less drastic measures. I object strongly to the building of new dams and the felling of trees around the ponds and to the closure of any of the ponds for any period of time.

Yours sincerely
Kate Pahl
15 Albert Street
NW1 7LU

Gentet, Matthias

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 24 July 2014 10:09
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Reference 2014/4332/P

Dear Camden

I object to the City of London's proposal for extensive - too extensive - flood protection works on Hampstead Heath.

Risk management is of course vital to proper governance, but measures to mitigate risks must also consider the downside risks that are involved. They must be proportionate.

I am well aware of the upside risks. In 1975 I was working at the Tavistock Centre when 7" of rain fell on the Heath in three hours. Two people died in nearby basements and we spent many hours trying to salvage our archives. Climate change - absent strenuous efforts to reduce CO2 equivalent emissions - will probably increase such risks but I have seen nothing in the City of London's documentation to justify the extreme risks that would be mitigated by their proposal.

Mitigating risks takes a range of forms, for instance text and phone alerts as well as flood protection works including drainage.

On the downside such works must consider encouraging healthy pursuits and enjoyment of our natural heritage. Who wants to walk between walls on the Highgate Ponds - it will certainly be less, who will enjoy the Stock Pond - the most important water bird site on the Heath with Reed Warblers, Kingfishers, Rails..... let alone the other scarce birds such as Whitethroats, when the trees are destroyed?

Please reject this proposal

Michael Norris
currently
5 Deakin St North
Hampton
VIC 3188 Australia

Gentet, Matthias

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 24 July 2014 15:58
To: Planning
Subject: 2014/4332/P - Hampstead Heath Dam Project

Dear Sir/Madam,

Hampstead Dam Project

I have a point of view about the Corporation of London's recent planning application which, although not strictly a valid objection *per se*, seeks to give some larger context to the deliberations of the planners and councillors

What is at stake is one of the last natural environments in the borough. This is more than just a planning matter. I would therefore be most grateful if you could circulate this letter to those involved in the decision-making and to please let me know who those individuals are

The Corporation's application is underpinned by expert advice (commissioned by the Corporation) which claims there are significant risks of flooding of the ponds on Hampstead Heath. Flooding and potential flooding is the essential nature of all bodies of water without exception. The conclusions of the expert advisors correctly predict the inevitable: someday or other, tomorrow or in four hundred thousands years from now, the ponds will indeed flood.

I take issue with the whole culture of so-called 'risk-mitigation' and the self-serving industry of advisors that has grown up around it. Rather than being used as a tool for decision-makers, 'expert advice' is often allowed to trump all other considerations including sound judgement. More and more, we are submitting ourselves to the tyranny of the 'expert advisor' and in so-doing we have abdicated our responsibility as voters and politicians.

There will always be advice - If this great city was to submit to expert advice relating to any number of possible scenarios and models from all manner of professional people (scientists, engineers, climatologists, lawyers, policemen, security consultants, doctors), it would grind to a halt, rendered moribund, the population would be gripped by famine. If a geology or engineering practice were appointed to write a report about the potential risks to the London Underground from seismic activity or subsidence or indeed flooding, it is inconceivable that they would conclude there are no risks. It is inconceivable they'd recommend doing nothing. It is inconceivable that their professional liability insurers or their lawyers or their own *raison d'être* as experts could ever permit a 'do nothing' recommendation. This is the way of things.

There will always be advice - It is the job of government (in this case Camden Council, its officers and elected officials) to interpret that advice; to apply reason, common-sense and discretion; and to bring perspective and a wider context to considerations. That is what the people of Camden expect from their Council. That is why the Council exists. We are relying on our elected Camden Council to do what the unelected Corporation of London has disgracefully failed to do. We are relying on Camden to exercise its judgement and distinguish between 'professional risk' and 'real risk'. This is the job of wise men and women.

There will always be advice - Were indeed Camden Council to commission its own expert advice from scientists, biologists and engineers on the potential impact of the proposed dam scheme, it is impossible to imagine that that advice would not anticipate serious risks. Of course it would. But even then the experts wouldn't be able to anticipate the real risks. Have we not yet learnt the lesson that when we tamper with the workings of the natural world we create myriad unforeseen and unforeseeable consequences?

There will always be advice - And there will always be risks. When timeframes are extended to hundreds of years (let alone four hundred thousand years), advice becomes meaningless, the risks unknowable. We fool ourselves if we think we can predict the future. Risk can never be eliminated and the very act of trying to do so is in itself risky.

In this matter the Council has tremendous responsibility on its shoulders: Let's not wilfully disfigure one of the last vestiges of mother nature in this great city of ours in the false belief that we are her master. Leave the ducks and the willows and the swimmers alone, and if in three hundred years a great flood engulfs our city, I promise, it won't have been begotten by the lovely ponds on Hampstead Heath.

Thank you.

Yours faithfully,
Peter Watson
South Hill Park Gardens
NW3

Gentet, Matthias

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 24 July 2014 09:45
To: Planning
Subject: Objection to Planning Reference 2014/4332/P

To: Mr. Jonathan Markwell, Development Control Team, London Borough of Camden, Town Hall, Judd Street, London WC1H 8ND

From: Eric Beinhooker, 21 Willoughby Road, Hampstead, London NW3 1RT, [REDACTED]

Dear Mr. Markwell,

I have been a resident of Hampstead for 12 years and live within a couple hundred yards of Hampstead Heath. We are frequent Heath users, walking our dog, jogging there, or taking our children to play almost daily.

I am writing to object strongly to the proposed scheme for changes to the ponds in the Heath (Planning Reference 2014/4332/P). My reasons for objecting are as follows:

- There is no legal requirement under the Reservoirs Act of 1975 for works to be carried out on this scale. A much smaller project with significantly less impact on the ponds and surrounding area could address both the legal requirements and environmental issues.
- While climate change and flooding potential must be taken seriously (I am an Oxford economist who works on climate change issues), the modelling for this project, based on a 1:400,000 year probability is highly unrealistic.
- The large scale earthworks and concrete walls involved would significantly disfigure the natural Heath landscape for which the Heath is treasured by its local residents and visitors
- Significant numbers of trees (over 160) would be felled for this project - many of these trees are quite old and would take generations to re-grow
- The ponds are a major home for Heath wildlife and their habitats would be severely disrupted
- The Heath would have at least 2 years of heavy engineering and construction works, closures and the local neighbourhood would face 2 years of HGV traffic

I strongly urge the Council to reject this inappropriate, unnecessary and expensive scheme and to work with local residents' associations such as the Heath & Hampstead Society and the City Corporation to develop a lower impact scheme that meets the Heath's real needs for flood control without the negative impacts on the Heath environment that this current scheme involves.

With best regards,

Eric Beinhooker

Gentet, Matthias

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 24 July 2014 20:48
To: Planning
Subject: 2014/4233/P

Why do the City of London refuse to listen to the views of other experts who believe the project to be unnecessarily vast in scope? Why do they not take into account that previous flooding downstream of the ponds has been caused by poor drainage, not pond overflow? Why do they not also recognise that a downpour of the magnitude needed to cause the present dams to give way would be a calamity that would have far wider repercussions than flooding from the ponds? It seems out of all proportion to subject the Heath to so much disruption and pollution for a project that is at best controversial and for which the legal necessity is being challenged by eminent lawyers. Help. Yours Neville Sattentau.