

## Gentet, Matthias

---

**From:** Markwell, Jonathan  
**Sent:** 28 July 2014 08:49  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** FW: Planning Reference 2014/4332/P – engineering works to the Ponds on Hampstead Heath

Please log the original objection below from Ms Clark-Darby as being from the following address:  
22 Maryon Mews, London, NW3 2PU

Thanks,

Jonathan Markwell  
Principal Planning Officer

Telephone: 0207 974 2453

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 28 July 2014 08:48  
**To:** Markwell, Jonathan  
**Subject:** Re: Planning Reference 2014/4332/P – engineering works to the Ponds on Hampstead Heath

Good morning Jonathan,

Thank you for your below email.

My postal address is: 22 Maryon Mews, London, NW3 2PU. Sorry for not including it in my original email.

Regards,  
Maureen

Sent from Samsung tablet

----- Original message -----

From: "Markwell, Jonathan" <Jonathan.Markwell@Camden.gov.uk>  
Date: 28/07/2014 08:41 (GMT+00:00)  
To: [REDACTED]  
Subject: RE: Planning Reference 2014/4332/P – engineering works to the Ponds on Hampstead Heath

Dear Ms Clark-Darby,

Thank you for your email, which will be taken into account as part of the consideration of the application. However, should you wish to be kept updated with the progress of the application, you will need to specify your postal address (as such communications are undertaken via post rather than email). As such, please confirm this is should you wish to be updated on the application in due course.

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:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 25 July 2014 12:44  
**To:** Markwell, Jonathan; Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Reference 2014/4332/P – engineering works to the Ponds on Hampstead Heath

---

Dear Mr Markwell,

I would like to object to the above planning application on the following grounds:

The main driver for these works is based on flood risk. The engineering works applied for in this application are disproportionate to the risk posed, based on the modelling used for this application, a giant storm with 1 in 400,000 year probability. I question the unrealistic modelling used for this application.

This application does not take into consideration the accuracy of the weather forecasts and weather warnings in resonant years. There is no allowance or consideration given for drainage in the local areas, supposedly at risk, should this 1 in 400,000 year flood happen.

The works applied for are excessive, wholly inappropriate, unnecessary and are totally out for character on the much loved natural space and wildlife habitat of Hampstead Heath. These works will harm the established character of the Heath forever.

There will certainly be noise nuisance on a daily basis to the whole surrounding area for at least two years. Traffic will be seriously affected in South End Green, Gospal Oak and Hampstead. The Royal Free hospital's emergency services will surely suffer.

The heath will be disfigured with concrete walls, unnatural earthworks and excavations. The works carried out should be appropriate to the risk posed. On what bases is this risk calculated. Can it be relied on to result in these major works? I say they can't. I ask Camden to carry out a flood risk assessment.

The heavy engineering plant and the thousands of HGV movements will surely damage forever this wonderful haven of natural beauty and wildlife. The landscape of the heath will radically change for the worst.

There will also be a major loss of trees on Hampstead Heath should this work be given permission.

Does Camden council want to be responsible and remembered for these heinous unnecessary works, should they give their permission for this application?

I ask you to reject this application in its entirety and ask Atkins to go back to the drawing board and reconsider their modelling.

Regards,  
Maureen Clark-Darby

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:** 28 July 2014 12:12  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Number 2014/4332/P

Dear Sirs

I am writing to object to the City of London's planning application to carry out dam works on Hampstead Heath.

The evidence is overwhelming that this scheme is vastly overblown, based on fears of a one-in-400,000 years storm possibility. Trying to eliminate such an unlikely threat with such invasive procedures is not rational. We have just experienced the wettest winter on record which left the Hampstead Ponds unaffected.

Under the Hampstead Heath Act 1871 the City of London is required to preserve the heath in its "natural state and aspect".

Instead the scheme would involve work on all the ponds and a series of new dams ; possible closure of the ponds for two years; extensive disruption and invasion of the heath by dozens of heavy vehicles per day, impacting seriously on the heath's flora and fauna. Most controversially the plans would raise the dam between the Model Boating Pond and Highgate Men's Bathing Pond by 8 ft and the embankment about the Mixed Bathing Pond by 18 ft. The Ladies' Bathing Pond would be out of use for more than 7 months with no equivalent alternative offer.

Aside from long-term damage to the sites, the ponds would be blighted for years by the scale of the building work. The heath's wild inhabitants and the public will all suffer from this expensive and unnecessary scheme if it is allowed to go ahead. For the above reasons, as a regular walker on the heath and user of the Women's and Mixed Bathing Ponds I strongly object to the City of London's planning application and urge you to reject it.

Yours

Anne Boston  
7 Inkerman Road, NW5 3BT  
[REDACTED]

**Gentet, Matthias**

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 28 July 2014 11:36  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** ponds

To the Planning Dept. re Dams on the Heath

Please listen to the arguments against the Dams and vote against this scheme

from one of the many local users of our favourite green space.

Jenny West

**Gentet, Matthias**

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 28 July 2014 18:09  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Re: Application Ref: 2014/4332/P - writing in support of the application

For the attention of Jonathan Markwell:

I am writing with reference to Planning Application No: 2014/4332/P and the Associated Applications, Refs:- 2014/2149/PRE, 2013/7231/P, 2014/0320P.

I wish to support the City of London Corporation's proposals for the dams on Hampstead Heath and to register my dismay at the manner in which a very vocal and well-funded lobby group has distorted the arguments surrounding the case. Not everyone who loves and uses the Heath is opposed to the projected scheme, but the voices of those in favour have been drowned out by the Dam Nonsense band. Over the past months I have discussed the issue with supporters of the Dam Nonsense campaign. They agree with me that the City of London Corporation have proved excellent custodians of the Heath in the past; and they also acknowledge that it is impossible to preserve the Heath from all change. Yet their response to the Corporation's current proposals is one of knee-jerk hysteria, combined with an at-times offensive dismissal of the safety concerns raised by people living downstream of the Heath ponds.

Yours sincerely,

Jason Best  
14 Maitland Park Road, London NW3 2EX

[REDACTED]

This E-mail is from IPC Media Ltd, a company registered in England and Wales, whose registered office is at Blue Fin Building, 110 Southwark Street, London, SE1 0SU, registered number 53626, VAT number 646150645. The contents and any attachments to it include information that is private and confidential and should only be read by those persons to whom they are addressed. IPC Media accepts no liability for any loss or damage suffered by any person arising from the use of this e-mail. Neither IPC Media nor the sender accepts any responsibility for viruses and it is your responsibility to check the email and attachments (if any). No contracts may be concluded on behalf of IPC Media by means of e-mail communications. If you have received this e-mail in error, please destroy and delete the message from your computer.

**Great savings on over 50 magazine subscriptions at [www.magazinesdirect.com](http://www.magazinesdirect.com)**

**Please consider the environment – only print this e-mail if absolutely necessary**

**Gentet, Matthias**

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 28 July 2014 15:57  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Swimming Facilities on Hampstead Heath

Your ref. 2014/4332/P

Dear Sirs

I swim every day in the ladies lake on Hampstead Heath. It is very much part of my life. I therefore feel that all the swimming facilities on Hampstead Heath should be left as they are for the public's use. I strongly believe that you do not have any reasonable argument to make any changes based on current expert opinion.

Yours faithfully

Edith Ullmann (Miss)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 28 July 2014 19:12  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** application number 2014/433/P

Application number 2014/433/P

As a regular user of the men's pond, I wish to register the strongest possible objection to the City of London's plans to close the bathing ponds in 2015-6 and erect massive dams which will spoil the harmony of the ponds for ever. These are said to be

- a) an enormous dam above the mixed bathing pond obliterating the present " catchpit Valley"
- b) a 2.5meter high dam above the men's pond
- c) a massive reconstruction of the model boating pond
- d) more than 160 trees being cut down.

The risk of flooding said to justify all this appears to have been grossly exaggerated. It postulates storms which would cause a collapse of all existing dams and no warning measures or emergency services. Such storms are likely only to occur every 400.000 years! i.e. a far more remote a risk than the Thames Barrier was built to confront ( once every 1000 years). Such risk as there is can adequately be confronted by the alternative, less draconian measures proposed by independent experts instructed by the objectors. The taking of these alternative measures would be more than sufficient to discharge the Covert's duty to protect downstream households.

A.R.H. Urquhart  
Holly Lodge



**Gentet, Matthias**

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 28 July 2014 20:03  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Hampstead Heath dam

Dear Sir/Madam,

Please do not grant permission for the dam works at Hampstead Heath as it would cause damage to the area. They will not eliminate the risk of downstream flooding - the entire premise for building them. This is a project for the sake of a project.

Yours faithfully,

Frederick Rodriguez

**Gentet, Matthias**

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 28 July 2014 10:56  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Objection against Planning Application - 2014/4332/P

Dear Sir/Madam,

I object against the building of dams in Hampsted Heath that would see destroying parts of Heath and changing our ponds forever.

The dams would devastate unique and beautiful natural environment vital to local wildlife.

I am convinced that softer measures, rather than building a dam, would fulfill the City of London's legal obligation to protect households, and preserve the beautiful ponds and the Heath for its wildlife and many visitors for years to come.

Yours faithfully,

Jana Kvaltinova  
1 Westville Road  
Flat 5  
London W12 9BB

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 28 July 2014 12:17  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Objection to planning application 2014/4332/P

Dear Camden

I write to object to the above planning application for work to the dams on Hampstead Heath.

It seems to me to be completely unnecessary to disfigure the Heath in this way. I live on Willow Road, and visit the Heath most days. I walk on the Heath, I picnic there, and I use the ponds for bathing. I have lived in the area for 13 years. I work in the City.

First, dealing with the disfigurement.

The works will require huge earthworks at the Catchpit and Model Boating Pond, disfiguring those ponds and removing existing views. The concrete walls to be inserted at the Men's Bathing Pond and Highgate No.1 Pond are an aggravated disgrace – it is shocking to me these works are considered necessary or wise. They are a travesty.

Further, over 160 trees will be felled, including the tree loss at Stock Pond to create the unnecessary and huge spillway. Wildlife will be disrupted, and the Heath will lose its natural appearance.

All of this will require earth moving equipment and trucks, including through Conservation Areas in Hampstead and Highgate, and closure of some parts of the Heath for 2 years.

Second, dealing with the unnecessary nature of the work – this work should be stopped even if it were considered necessary, and other options considered. However, the work is not even necessary. The Reservoirs Act 1975 does not require works to be carried out on this huge scale. It is also unrealistic to model for these sorts of works on the basis of something that may not happen for 400,000 years – or that, when it does happen, assumes no warning. Weather prediction services are now sufficiently advanced that loss of life can be avoided through warning systems, including evacuation if necessary, just in case the nightmare scenario on which this is all predicated hits before 402,014.

I urge Camden to reject the application.

Regards

David  
David Stone  
40 Willow Road  
LONDON NW3 1TN

This email is sent on behalf of Simmons & Simmons LLP CityPoint, One Ropemaker Street, London EC2Y 9SS United Kingdom T +44 20 7628 2020 F +44 20 7628 2070 [simmons-simmons.com](http://simmons-simmons.com). Simmons & Simmons LLP is a limited liability partnership registered in England & Wales with number OC352713 and with its registered office at CityPoint, One Ropemaker Street, London EC2Y 9SS, United Kingdom. It is authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority. The word "partner" refers to a member of Simmons & Simmons LLP or an employee or consultant with equivalent standing and qualifications. A list of members and other partners together with their professional qualifications is available for inspection at the above address. The content of this email and any attachments ("the email") is confidential, may be privileged, is subject to copyright and may be read, copied and used only by the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient please notify us by return email or telephone and erase all copies and do not disclose the email or any part of it to any person. We monitor email communications through our networks for regulatory compliance purposes and to protect our clients, employees and business.

[elexica.com](http://elexica.com) is the award winning online legal resource powered by knowledge from Simmons & Simmons.

Simmons & Simmons is a Carbon Neutral organisation. Please consider your carbon emissions before you print this email.

**Gentet, Matthias**

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 28 July 2014 07:41  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Objection to planning application 2014/4332/P

Dear Sir/Madam

I wish to object most strongly to planning application 2014/4332/P which involved exceptional works to the bathing pond on Hampstead Heath. I have swum in the Ladies' pond for 50 years and it is a place of outstanding natural beauty and a haven for wildlife, as well as being a very pleasurable facility for the local residents.

As far as I can tell, the extensive works proposed are based on a risk management study which is deeply flawed and suggests that in the event of flooding of the ponds, a thousand people will die. This is blatant nonsense and realistically I would suggest that if they were going to flood, they would have done last winter which was exceptionally wet.

The proposed works are completely disproportionate to the risk and way beyond any required maintenance. They will severely damage the Heath and the existing ponds. In addition to the heavy machinery which will be involved in the works, apparently 160 large trees will be destroyed. This alone will detrimentally affect the animal and bird life of the Heath and the ponds. There are few places in central London where kingfishers are a common sight, for example, and this is very important. Destroying trees is also bad for the environment - they cool the air, provide shade and help to control pollution - and look beautiful.

There is also a suggestion that the Ladies' pond would have better facilities built. I suggest that this is some sort of feeble attempt at a sop by whoever has a vested interest in this appalling project. The facilities at the pond are entirely sufficient and suitable for the ambience of the pond which is not a lido.

I hope you will consider my objections

Yours faithfully

Jane Jones

The Bungalow  
2b Ospringe Road  
London NW5 2JE  
[REDACTED]

**Gentet, Matthias**

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 28 July 2014 14:27  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Objection to planning application 2014/4332/P

Dear Camden Planners

I object to this planning application on the grounds that the negative impact on the Heath and the swimming ponds will be major and the need to undertake such large scale expensive works has been sufficiently questioned to make it necessary for there to be a review and revision of the proposed scheme.

Yours sincerely

Barbara Thorndick  
22 Quadrant Grove NW5 4JN

[REDACTED]  
preferred method of contact is email

**Gentet, Matthias**

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 28 July 2014 18:23  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Objection to the pond planing it is madness ehat you are trying to do unnecessarily.please please stop such crazy idea!

Enviado de Samsung Mobile

## Gentet, Matthias

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 28 July 2014 10:40  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Objection to the proposed dams on Hampstead Heath

I would like to voice my objection to the proposed dam building project in the strongest terms. I don't feel that the building work is commensurate with the risk, it will ruin the character of the area, I live in the neighborhood (NW3 2LT) and walk past the ponds very frequently for recreation and don't want the views of the water to be taken away from any angle. I regularly swim in the laddies pond, and would be very severely affected by a two year halt in this activity. Plus the proposed loss of trees is shocking.  
Many thanks indeed  
Emily



**Gentet, Matthias**

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 28 July 2014 11:34  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning application 2014/4332/P  
**Attachments:** Reference Works on Hampstead Heath 2014 letter.docx

To Whom it may Concern.  
Please find attached letter in response to the proposed works.  
Best wishes  
Emma McKay