

Gentet, Matthias

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 July 2014 20:50
To: Planning; Markwell, Jonathan
Subject: Planning Reference 2014/4332/P

Planning Reference 2014/4332/P

Dear Sir,

I object to: Planning Reference 2014/4332/P

I find it very disappointing that there was limited real dialogue between the proponent of this scheme and the various organizations such as the Heath and Hampstead Society.

This is supposed to protect the environment against highly a very unlikely flood. Then why is that in the process we are talking about 160 trees to be felled? I see no modelling or analysis on what the loss of these trees would do to the environment and the amenities of the area.

Trees have a very important function in the retention of water and this appears not to have been taken into account whatsoever.

Furthermore the likelihood of a prolonged storm of such magnitude I am told is less than 1 in over 100,000 years!

I also find it grotesque and totally contradictory that meanwhile large basements that destroy the environment and have vastly negative and dangerous implication on the local hydrology keep being authorized right and left despite strong local opposition.

The proposed scheme is akin to want to kill a fly with a giant hammer.

Where has common sense gone? Where has democracy gone?

Please stop this ecological non sense and stop wasting taxpayers time and money.

Yours sincerely,

Oliver R Froment

Gentet, Matthias

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 July 2014 13:20
To: Planning
Subject: Hampstead Heath Dams and Ponds Project Ref 2014/4332/P

To whom it may concern:

I feel passionately opposed to the threatened development of Hampstead Heath.

The Heath is one of London's greatest treasures. It is a health and social resource of unmeasurable importance to all those who use it. I moved to London in 1979 and have always been convinced that great open natural spaces such as the Heath make London one of the most civilised cities in the world. It is a site of huge importance to all who use it and any change that threatens it should be subjected to intense and very objective scrutiny. From the debate, it is clear that there needs to be an impartial intervention on the proposed dams.

My central concern are as follows:

- seems to be no certainty that the work is necessary.
 - That the proposed works are grotesquely insensitive and monumental.
 - That the work will materially change the beauty of the Heath for ever
 - That any work of this kind will involve untold unpleasant disruption but that is not the long term complaint.
- The real concern is that the proposals represent the most serious threat to the wild and natural state of the Heath.

I do therefore support the objections as set out by the Heath and Hampstead Society.

I hope to be at any public committee meeting having lodged my complaints on the Camden website.

Yours sincerely,

Kate Evans
137 West End Lane,
London NW 6 2PH

ST PAUL'S GIRLS' SCHOOL St Paul's is a registered charity (no. 1119613) and a charitable company limited by guarantee (registered in England as no. 6142007). STUDENTS' COMMUNICATIONS We scan incoming and outgoing e-mails for offensive material in order to protect our students. ABOUT THIS E-MAIL This e-mail and any files with it are solely for the individual(s) to whom they are addressed. Nobody else may use this information or take action based on it. If you receive this e-mail in error, please delete it and contact the sender immediately. We have taken all reasonable precautions to ensure that no viruses are transmitted with this message. However, St Paul's cannot accept any liability for any loss or damage resulting directly or indirectly from this e-mail or its contents.

Gentet, Matthias

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 July 2014 13:50
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Reference 2014/4332/P

Dear Sir, I would like to object to this application re the Dams on Hampstead Heath. I feel the scale of the work is not justified by the experiences of weather in recent years or that which is predicted, that it will disfigure the landscape and require the removal of too many trees.

Yours,

Michael Berkeley

Lord Berkeley of Knighton CBE

Gentet, Matthias

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 July 2014 14:50
To: Planning
Subject: Hampstead Heath Work - 2014/4332/P

To Whom It may Concern

I object to the above quoted proposal for several reasons:

1. According to my information, the Reservoirs Act of 1975 does not require/demand/expect work on this scale i.e. There is no legal requirement for such works.
2. The proposal suggests the need for this work in case of an eventuality that has a 1 in 400,000 year probability of occurring. Hardly a high statistic!
3. The impact on the landscape of Hampstead Heath will be ugly and disfiguring to a London site of outstanding natural beauty.
4. The likelihood is that 160 trees will be felled in order to create a spillway, which is a ridiculous proposition from an environmental perspective.
5. In the process of carrying out this unsuitable development, parts of the Heath, including the ponds, will be closed and inaccessible for at least 2 years, which will have an impact on a huge number of people, not to mention the disruption of the land and disturbance to wildlife.

I hope you will consider my objections seriously, and look forward to hearing from someone regarding my email.

Yours faithfully,

Emily Saner

Sent from my iPad

Gentet, Matthias

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 July 2014 19:43
To: Planning
Cc: Markwell, Jonathan
Subject: FW: Dams Objection Camden Council (Planning Reference 2014/4332/P)

Dear Sir

We wish to register our strong objection to the plans to disrupt the Heat for 2 years on the basis of a model of a potential flood which seems utterly unrealistic. It is a megalomaniac vision which we cannot afford, in more than one sense.

Please keep us informed of the planning progress

57, Cecile PARK
London N8 9AX.

Thank you

Katherine Arnold and Adrian Harris

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 July 2014 19:48
To: Planning; Markwell, Jonathan
Cc: info@heathandhampstead.org.uk
Subject: Dams Objection

Dear Camden Development Control Team,

Planning Reference 2014/4332/P.

GROUNDS FOR OBJECTION

1. Legality

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

2. Unrealistic modelling:

models for a giant storm with a 1 in 400,000 year probability;
assumes no warning and no emergency services.

3. Disfigurement of Heath landscape:

new and unnatural huge earthworks and excavations at Catchpit and Model Boating Pond;
concrete walls at Men's Bathing Pond and Highgate No.1 Pond.

4. Tree loss:

over 160 trees to be felled;
large tree loss at Stock Pond to create giant spillway.

5. Closure and disruption:

2 years of works requiring closure of popular parts of the Heath;
closure of bathing ponds;
heavy engineering plant and thousands of HGV movements;
damage to wildlife.

Yours sincerely,
Elena Day (Mrs)
18A, Buckland Crescent,
NW3 5DX

Gentet, Matthias

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 July 2014 20:50
To: Planning
Subject: Hampstead Heath Dams and Ponds Project Ref 2014/4332/P

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to object to the planned works on Hampstead Heath. I feel the works are unnecessary and needlessly intrusive. The danger of floods in North London is grossly exaggerated, as evidenced during last winter's floods which mysteriously managed to avoid Gospel Oak and environs, despite the lack of new dams. The destruction of the environment, and ergo wildlife - eg. kingfishers and herons - and the joy that wildlife and the ponds bring to the lives of Londoners is pointless and distressing.

I sincerely hope that, on this occasion, our council will listen to local views on this deeply unpopular proposal.

Thank you,
Holly Koorey Crook

Gentet, Matthias

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 July 2014 21:34
To: Planning
Subject: Objection to Planning Permission Planning Reference 2014/4332/P

Dear Camden Planning Office

I wish to strongly object to the proposals referenced above. Many of us who live in this area do so because of the magical beauty of the heath.

I have lived here all my life and each time I go to the heath I always find something new and different to enjoy.

I understand that this work is not legally required and based on some misguided modelling of flooding. I cannot accept that based on the probability

of 1 in 400,000 there are plans to disfigure the natural beauty of the heath and cut down over 160 trees. Trees which have endured for years - it is not acceptable.

The heath ponds are one of the many curiosities of London - although not a swimmer myself - I support the right of those dedicated swimmers to enjoy the ponds. The closure and disruption the work will cause to swimmers and walkers alike is unnecessary. A waste of time and money.

Please leave our heath alone - and let us continue to enjoy one of the few unspoilt open spaces we Londoners have.

Refuse the Planning proposal.

Penny Davis
29 Briardale Gardens
London NW3 7PN

Gentet, Matthias

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 July 2014 20:28
To: Planning
Subject: Application number 2014/4332/P

I object to the planning application on the basis of the unrealistic computer modelling used to support the application.

This modelling is based on a "Black Swan" type event to make the application seem more viable than it truly is.

That does not seem very fair or just to me and Common Sense must prevail in the end so that this application is declined by Camden.

The consequences of not doing so would be very unfortunate for both the wildlife and the people who enjoy the Heath and it's amenities.

Daniel Huff

Gentet, Matthias

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 July 2014 19:26
To: Planning
Subject: Hampstead Heath Ponds Project

Dear Sir/Madam

Hampstead Heath Ponds Project
Planning Reference 2014/4332/P

I wish to express my strong objections to this application and all it involves for the following reasons:

1. I care very much for the environment and the wild life on Hampstead Heath. Not only would there be much disruption, noise and unfavourable conditions during this major work but there is a strong possibility that this will result in permanent loss of plants and wildlife. None of this can be predicted and permanent loss will be a disaster for the Heath, one of Camden's major assets.
2. I am unable to comment on the alleged risks of not doing this work or whether it is actually required by law but in the event of flooding there would be warning systems in place, Camden Council and Thames Water would undoubtedly take every possible action to reduce risk to life and residents would be able to move from any threatened areas. The reason given for carrying out this major work (serious risk to life) are not valid in my opinion.
3. The general unavoidable disruption caused by such extensive work, both on the Heath and outside it, would continue over a long period and adversely affect the whole area. The interference with a peaceful life for many of us and with our enjoyment of the beautiful Heath would be unacceptable.

I hope that, for these reasons – and many others I have not mentioned to keep this e-mail short – the Project will not be allowed to be carried out.

Yours faithfully

Hannelore Braunsberg
12A The Pryors
London NW3 1BS

Gentet, Matthias

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 July 2014 14:05
To: Planning
Subject: HAMPSTEAD PONDS Planning Ref: 2014/4332/P

I have been following the arguments for and against work on the Hampstead Ponds, and I think it is crazy for the Corporation of London to be considering the changes they propose to stop the ponds flooding over. I strongly object to the proposals.

FIRST: the model they have used for the likelihood of flooding is completely unrealistic – 1 in 400,000 year probability I understand.

SECOND: the heath landscape will be massively disfigured - huge earthworks at the Model Boating Pond and Catchpit and concrete walls at the Men's Bathing Pond and Highgate No. 1 Pond. All this will require closure of bathing ponds and other popular parts of the Heath for two years, excavation and thousands of HGV movements to remove the spoil, and the presence of heavy engineering plant disturbing the wildlife.

THIRD: the loss of over 160 trees.

FOURTH: The Corporation claims that it is required by law to carry out this work, but the Reservoirs Act of 1975 DOES NOT require work to be carried out on this scale.

As far as I know, the only time that houses at the bottom of East Heath Road were affected by flooding a few years ago, the water flowed down the roads (Downshire Hill and East Heath Road). It did not come from the Heath.

I do hope that the Council will not allow the Corporation to desecrate the Heath in the manner they propose, spending huge amounts of money unnecessarily.

Elisabeth Bristow
Hampstead Way,
London NW11 7JE

Gentet, Matthias

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 July 2014 08:06
To: Planning
Cc: info@heathandhampstead.org.uk
Subject: Dams on Hampstead Heath - FAO Jonathan Markwell

Dams on Hampstead Heath - FAO Jonathan Markwell

Dear Jonathan Markwell,

As a local resident and frequent user of Hampstead Heath I would like to add my voice to the proposed dam reconstruction project.

It has become clear that the proposal is a grotesquely over-designed and unnecessary proposed solution to a marginal safety issue which will adversely affect the Heath at both an aesthetic and an ecological level.

In addition to the loss of 160 trees and the extreme disfigurement of the area of all the ponds, the effect of this overblown construction project on local residents will be disastrous.

It is my understanding that in addition to being unnecessary from a safety point of view the work is not required by the laws and regulations which pertain to the Heath.

I urge you to reconsider this proposal.

Sincerely,

James Burge
19 Heath Hurst Road, NW3 2RX

Gentet, Matthias

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 July 2014 09:47
To: Planning
Subject: Hampstead ponds

I wish to lodge objection to the proposed dam works on Hampstead Heath.

Dr Bridgett Jones,
17 Lambolle Road, NW3 4HS

Gentet, Matthias

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 July 2014 10:39
To: Planning; mail@davidlammy.co.uk
Cc: enquiries@environment-agency.gov.uk; lynne.featherstone.mp@parliament.uk;
defra.helpline@defra.gsi.gov.uk; barbara.blake@haringey.gov.uk;
gina.adamou@haringey.gov.uk; peter.morton@haringey.gov.uk;
aligul.ozbek@haringey.gov.uk
Subject: RE: STOP HEAVY CONSTRUCTION ON HAMSTEAD HEATH.

To whom it may concern,

Reference 2014/4332/P.

I write to you to implore Camden Council not to permit the above planning proposals to go ahead. I believe that the only motivation for these proposals is that someone is lining their pockets with tax payers money.

Hampstead heath and all its glory is a treasure and a vital space for me personally as well as the whole community both locally as well as far and wide.

From the mid 1800's the ponds have been used by people to swim and relax. I have used the heath all year round for the past fifty-three years from donkey rides, to climbing trees, picnics and bathing in the ponds. Both the mixed when I'm with my husband and son and the women's pond with my daughter and many friends and other female members of my family. It is a vital natural resource where we can relax physically, mentally and emotionally. An area where we can recharge ourselves from the urban environment that we live in. Hampstead Heath and the beautiful ponds are so exquisite that they need no interference or improvements as they are perfect just as they are.

We do not need these huge works to be carried out and the Reservoirs Act 1975 does NOT require them.

The plans are unrealistic based on a giant storm with a 1 in 400,000 year probability.

The disfigurement of the Heath landscape will be a devastation. There is already enough concrete we don't want or need anymore. As well as the loss of countless trees

The disruption will be a horrendous blight and invasion on all of human life as well as devastating wild life.

PLEASE RESPECT THE HEATH AND VALUE IT AS SO VERY MANY OF US DO.

Pedro Ortiz

Gentet, Matthias

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 July 2014 12:49
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Ref 2014/4332/P

Dear Jonathan Markwell,

I am writing to object to the Hampstead Heath Dams development. I am not persuaded that the works are necessary. Simon Jenkins in particular has pointed out that the main source of influence on which the City of London has based it's proposals is in fact a company which derives its income from building such dams. This does not look like work which serves the interest of the surrounding residents and the preservation of our precious natural habitat. I do not welcome the felling of trees, the alteration of the bathing ponds with the use of concrete and the disruption caused by heavy machinery. I concur with Simon Jenkins' suggestion that more tree planting is a sensible way to manage the water table. He also points out that the ponds, which survived the Hampstead storm of 1975 without overflowing and, indeed, the heavy rainfall of this year, are not fed by a great river and in fact in all the 300 years of their existence, they have never overflowed. The test of failure applied by the engineering firm Atkins of a 1-in-400,000-years probability is quite absurd. I urge you to reject this planning proposal on the grounds of common sense.

Yours sincerely,

Elizabeth West
40 Pilgrim's Lane
London
NW3 1SN