

**Dike, Darlene**

---

**From:** Mary Powell [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 06 January 2015 16:56  
**To:** Markwell, Jonathan  
**Cc:** Planning  
**Subject:** Further Consultation Response - Planning Application 2014/4332/P  
**Attachments:** Camden Planning Consultation 2014-4332-P - Mary Powell.pdf

Dear Mr Markwell

I am writing to you further to my letter of 17 July 2014 (attached for information). I am a regular swimmer at the Ladies' Pond and wish to reiterate my opposition to the proposed dam works on Hampstead Heath. In particular I would like to add the following points:

1. Although the Judicial Review in November 2014 found in favour of the City of London's interpretation of the 1975 Reservoirs Act, I understand that Camden Council is not bound by this Act or the Judicial Review verdict to approve the proposed works. Camden Council has the opportunity to act with courage and reject the proposed destruction of Hampstead Heath.
2. In doing so Camden Council would also help to uphold the public health benefits offered by this open space. The Heath is freely available to all local residents irrespective of their economic status, and as such is probably of greatest benefit to those who cannot afford access to holidays or the countryside.
3. The City of London ignored the results of its own limited consultation exercise a year ago, where two thirds of respondents were very dissatisfied with all of the dam proposals. Respondents were given limited options to comment on in this consultation.
4. Subsequently in response to Camden's planning consultation the council was handed a petition from the Dam Nonsense campaign in August 2014, with nearly 12,000 signatures from people opposed to the works. The petition was supported by 38 Degrees.
5. The proposed removal of 160+ trees would be particularly damaging to the Ladies' Pond, opening up views into the facility which have previously given privacy to female swimmers. This is of concern to all users of the Ladies' Pond but especially those who swim in gender-segregated facilities for religious reasons. Camden Council would be failing in its public sector equality duty if it did not protect this secluded swimming area.
6. The City of London has failed to give adequate consideration to less engineered options, relying instead on the self-interested recommendations of a prominent member of the dam-engineering profession, Dr Hughes. Proposals such as those of Stephen Myers which would make greater use of the natural absorbency of the Heath should be investigated further. A dam engineer is always going to recommend a dam "the bigger the better".
7. In over 300 years' existence the ponds on the Heath have not collapsed or caused any major flooding. In 2014/2015 we had the wettest winter on record with no ill-effects to the ponds. On 13 October 2014 Hampstead Heath experienced exceptionally high rainfall, the heaviest in the country, again with no ill effects on the existing dams.
8. There are ambiguities in the planning documents relating to the Ladies' Pond indicating it may be closed for much longer than originally anticipated, for up to 7 months. Although the City sought to allay fears of swimmers after this was raised with them in July 2014, as yet there has been no specific discussion of alternative swimming arrangements during any closure period. In particular many swimmers are still concerned about access to female only swimming facilities during this time, which is a matter of necessity for some swimmers e.g. Orthodox Jewish.
9. Subsequently, the City carried out a survey of the existing deck at Ladies' Pond (in September 2014) after submitting the planning application. The lack of a clear result for this survey raises suspicion that the deck may be in too poor condition for re-use, so the Ladies' Pond may be closed for much longer than January-

May 2016 anyway if deck has to be rebuilt. These designs may in any case change of the whole deck has to be rebuilt.

Regards

Mary Powell

**Dike, Darlene**

---

**From:** Marsha Sanders [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 06 January 2015 15:19  
**To:** Markwell, Jonathan  
**Cc:** Planning; Kenwood Ladies' Pond Assoc.  
**Subject:** Hampstead Heath Dam Proposals

Dear Jonathan Markwell

I am writing to register my objections to the above proposals. I am a frequent and long standing swimmer at the Ladies' Pond and, perhaps, more importantly, a resident of Brookfield Mansions, which as you will know lies at the end of the chain of ponds below the duck pond, so is, theoretically at risk of flooding should the pond burst its banks.

Despite this I am very much opposed to the proposed works, which I consider to be disproportionate to the possible or even probable flood risk. The damage to trees, wildlife and the natural state and aspect of the Heath beloved of so many local people and iconic the world over would be devastating.

I believe that there are other ways of dealing with the possible risks e.g. 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). Attempting to eliminate all risk of dam failure is unrealistic and irrational and, in any case, the vast sums of money involved could be put to much better use in putting in place lesser but more effective and environmentally friendly as well as early warning systems, evacuation procedures and insurance measures.

City of London ignored the results of its limited consultation exercise which found a majority dissatisfied with the proposed project and it was obvious from the meeting in the summer at Parliament Hill School that Camden Council and The City of London did not come to the table with an open mind but were hostile to all objections.

I sincerely hope the Council will see sense and take into consideration the objections of those who know, love and value the Heath for what it is - a wild and beautiful sanctuary in the middle of a very big Metropolis.

Yours sincerely

Marsha Sanders

43 Brookfield  
Highgate West Hill  
London N6 6AT