

Markwell, Jonathan

From: RSCDevelopmentControl
Sent: 15 January 2015 08:38
To: Markwell, Jonathan
Subject: FW: Planning Application Ref. 2014/4332/P - Hampstead and Highgate chains of ponds

Late written submission in support

Hannah Hutter
Principal Committee Officer

Telephone: [REDACTED]

From: Waltraud LOGES [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: 14 January 2015 22:53
To: RSCDevelopmentControl
Subject: Planning Application Ref. 2014/4332/P - Hampstead and Highgate chains of ponds

To:
Committee Services, Camden Town Hall, Judd Street, London, WC1H 9JE

From:
Waltraud Loges (Ms)
[REDACTED] Oak Village, London, NW5 [REDACTED] (neighbouring occupier)
Tel: [REDACTED] Mob: [REDACTED] Email: [REDACTED]

Re: Planning Application Ref. 2014/4332/P and Associated Ref: 2013/7231/P, 2014/0320/P, 2014/2149/PRE
Address: Hampstead and Highgate chains of ponds, Hampstead Heath, London

Dear Sir/Madam,

I urge the Development Control Committee to support the planning application for the proposed engineering works to the Hampstead and Highgate chain of ponds (Application Ref. 2014/4332/P). I also urge the committee to support the application in full and not to scale the project down in any way that would weaken the protection it offers.

I have been living near Hampstead Heath for over 30 years and have enjoyed walking and swimming upon it throughout this time. I feel passionate about the Heath and applaud the steps being proposed by the City of London Corporation, which will safeguard the well-being of citizens and civic infrastructure.

Independent assessors have determined that work is required to strengthen the dams. Therefore it is more than prudent to proceed with the work. If an expert informed me of a potential flaw in my roof, I would be wise to deal with the matter forthwith rather than waiting for disaster to strike and then dealing with the consequences.

For more than a year, opponents of the City's proposals have been spreading considerable disinformation about the project, understating the real flood risks and belittling the genuine concerns of local residents. This may have swayed some clicktivists into signing a petition, but those professional experts tasked with examining the issue - including Mrs Justice Lang in her Judicial Review - support the City. As do I.

Thank you.

Yours faithfully,
Waltraud Loges

Markwell, Jonathan

From: RSCDevelopmentControl
Sent: 14 January 2015 12:38
To: Markwell, Jonathan
Subject: FW: reference: 2014/4332/P

note: responded

Hi,

[REDACTED]

As per usual please may you refer to having received late written submission in your presentation.

Cheers
Hannah

Hannah Hutter
Principal Committee Officer

Telephone: [REDACTED]

From: Dominique Le Gendre [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: 14 January 2015 12:28
To: RSCDevelopmentControl
Subject: Re: reference: 2014/4332/P

To whom it may concern:

With regard to Camden Council's planning decision on Heath Dams scheduled for 15/01/2015

I have recently moved into the area after many years enjoyment of Hampstead Heath especially the bathing ponds in summer. Having been alerted via a range of sources- local newsletters, word of mouth/e-mail and the KLPA website- of the planned works to the Heath, I would like to register my strong objection to the proposal. The evidence put forward represents only one perspective and certainly does not take into account more ecologically friendly and cheaper options that have been proposed to the council for dealing with the "so-called" problem. I would also be interested to know what proportion of local rate-payers and taxpayers money will be used to fund these works at a time of cuts to essential services.

I look forward to this debate and a more transparent and genuinely consultative approach to this "risk" of flooding.

Yours sincerely

Dominique Le Gendre
[REDACTED] Tabley Road
London N7 [REDACTED]



Markwell, Jonathan

From: RSCDevelopmentControl
Sent: 14 January 2015 16:49
To: Markwell, Jonathan
Subject: FW: Planning application 2014/4332/P

note: responded. Send to JM

Hi Jonathan,

This is the only other late submission received today.

Have a good evening and I'll see you tomorrow!

Hannah

Hannah Hutter
Principal Committee Officer

Telephone: [REDACTED]

From: Andrew Hollins [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: 14 January 2015 13:56
To: RSCDevelopmentControl
Subject: Planning application 2014/4332/P

Dear Sir or Madam,

I understand that planning application reference 2014/4332/P is to be considered at a meeting being held on 15th January 2015. As work commitments mean that I am unable to attend that meeting, which I would very much like to do, I would like to register my strong objection to the proposals in this application.

As a regular visitor to Hampstead Heath and a user of the bathing ponds, which would be adversely affected by the proposed construction work, I feel that these works would permanently damage the natural appearance of this area of Hampstead Heath both now and for future generations. This work will cost a disproportionate sum of money in relation to the extremely minimal gain and reduction of risk of flooding which the application indicates as the reason for submission of the application.

I repeat my strongest possible objection to these proposals, and trust that this message will be included in the submissions which are laid before the Planning Committee on 15th January 2015.

Yours sincerely,

Andrew Hollins

Markwell, Jonathan

From: joyce [REDACTED]
Sent: 15 January 2015 01:35
To: Markwell, Jonathan
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: DAM PROJECT - Please listen to the residents of Camden

Importance: High

Dear Mr Markwell,

1. Hampstead Heath is the reason I moved here 23 years ago and the reason I still live in the same flat at its edge. I cannot afford to go away in the summer so the Ladies (and Men's if we could use it!) Pond is a lifeline. In the summer I jog to the pond, swim and jog home. It is my exercise and keeps osteoporosis at bay. It makes me feel great rather than sorry for myself that I am on south exotic island like the managers of the Heath.

2. Because I know the Heath so well, I know that in the past 23 years, management standards haven't fallen. I tell people to put out barbecues when I spot them because police patrols are so few and far between. After being hit by a cyclist on a no cycling path, I direct illegal bike riders to the bike path (enduring verbal abuse and threats of physical abuse from the horrid cyclists in so doing) because I have seen patrol cars pass by rogue cyclists preferring to sit in their cars than get out and take issue with the law breakers. In the winter I jog on the Heath and know every blade of grass and tree. So I know that the cross country races, boot-camp outdoor gym groups (up to 2,500 people a week), and rugby and football practice from countless school groups has affected the turf and created big patches of dirt and dirt paths where grass will never grow again. So yes, the Corporation of London has already shown that it is not a good guardian of the Heath. Its management of the Heath should be examined by an independent and qualified team.

3. Nothing demonstrates the need for this more than the Corporation of London's handling of the Dams project. Instead of using its resources and manpower and government influence to figure out how to resolve any remote flood panic, they are turning belligerent as though on a crusade to destroy the Heath once and for all, using some law-of-unintended-consequences legislation to do so. And the budget for so doing has risen to a staggering £18 million!!! Apart from a handful of ignorant people who believe that: (1) they will be flooded (2) the dams will prevent flooding, and (3) they will not have to pay for insurance, *the vast majority of the public is against the dams and the Corporation of London*. Those who believe the dams will flood-proof their homes are, in some instances, the same people who have concreted over their gardens, increasing the chance of flooding.

4. Two years of heavy machinery (like tanks in war) and digging up acres of turf and creating high mounds around beautiful ponds will destroy what is left of Camden's most valuable asset. The Heath will never be the same again. All we will see for the next 5 years is a muddy waste land, much worse than it looks after 30,000 racers in cleated shoes trample the wet grass into muddy dirt fields every November. And that is assuming some of the turf and plants grow back, and some trees are replanted.

5. If the ponds did not overflow last winter when will they? I live in the flood plain and yet last winter, the wettest on record, it was my front windows facing the road that were hit by pounding rain and winds and leaked. The back windows onto the Heath were fine as was my down stair's neighbour's basement. What I fear more than flooding are the foxes and rats that will rush toward homes on the edge of the Heath when they are uprooted by bulldozers. Millions of rats. I see them in daylight when I walk or jog on the Heath. They are huge and hungry. If we have a rat infestation will the Corporation of London pay for us to move while our homes are exterminated and made rat proof?

6. The main point I would ask you to consider before an irrevocable error and an irreversible crime is committed is this: If we continue to destroy the little bit of natural beauty left this overcrowded city for a remote and dubious 'health and safety' concern, our parks will become concrete wastelands, like so many front gardens. There have been a dozen excellent proposals on how to deal with the alleged flooding issue and the legislation without sacrificing the Heath, but the Corporation of London has refused to explore them. There are even some bright legal minds who do not agree that the Corporation is under an obligation to destroy the Heath because of a piece of legislation aimed at the Somerset Broads. The Heath is the lung of Camden and we cannot puncture our lungs without becoming very ill.

Please stop this madness while there is still time.

Yours sincerely,

Joyce Glasser

Savernake Road
London NW3

T: [REDACTED]
M: [REDACTED]

Markwell, Jonathan

From: Julia Palca [REDACTED]
Sent: 15 January 2015 08:17
To: Markwell, Jonathan
Subject: Hampstead Heath dams

Dear Mr Markwell

I am writing to express my concern about this project. I urge the planning committee to reject the application.

Yours sincerely

Julia Palca

Markwell, Jonathan

From: Merle Mahon [REDACTED]
Sent: 15 January 2015 08:30
To: Markwell, Jonathan
Subject: Objection to Hampstead Heath Ponds Project

I am writing to object to the unnecessary works proposed for the Ponds.
Dr Merle Mahon

Markwell, Jonathan


From: G Laing
Sent: 14 January 2015 22:57
To: RSCDevelopmentControl
Subject: Objection to Planning Application 2014/4332/P

Dear Sir or Madam

I have lived in Camden for 25 years and I object to the proposed application for the following reasons.

1. W S Atkins recommended the proposed works in order to protect against a flood event that might happen once in four hundred thousand years. This an enormous time-span that bears no relation to the scale of human activity in this locality.
2. The disruption that these works would cause is therefore disproportionate to the tiny odds of such a flood occurring. By comparison, it is a certainty, not a 1-in-400000 possibility, that these works would would destroy the peaceful amenity of Hampstead Heath.
3. I believe that W S Atkins is scaremongering, using the remote possibility of a 1-in-400000 event, and the threat of legislation, as a way to coerce the Corporation of London to propose this application, and to coerce the London Borough of Camden to approve this application.
4. The proposed works were recommended by W S Atkins, the same company that will be paid 15 million Pounds to carry out the proposed works. This is transparent self-interest, and a conflict of interests.
5. The Heath ponds coped without any problem in 2014, when the highest ever levels of rainfall were recorded in England. It is a fact that such unusually high levels of rainfall will sooner cause problems in other places in England than on Hampstead Heath.
6. The opinion of many environmentalists is that water, on open land such as Hampstead Heath, would be better managed by methods other than building dams. W S Atkins' recommendations have been questioned and rejected by well-qualified experts. This difference of expert opinion casts doubt on the efficacy of the proposed works.
7. I read in the press similar objections, for example
Evening Standard, 4 March 2014
Why spoil all this to build dams that nobody will need? (Simon Jenkins)
<http://www.standard.co.uk/comment/simon-jenkins-why-spoil-all-this-to-build-dams-that-nobody-will-need-9168016.html>
8. The long history of Hampstead Heath includes several occasions when governing authorities have acted decisively to protect the Heath against profiteering developers. This protection has ensured that Hampstead Heath remains a unique and much-needed place of peace and tranquillity, enjoyed by all Londoners. If Camden approves this application, it will cause parts of Hampstead Heath to be ruined, both during the long-running works and forever after. I implore Camden to use its authority to prevent this development from happening.

Thank you for taking my comments into consideration at your committee meeting on
15 January 2015.

G Laing
Maryon Mews
London NW3 

Markwell, Jonathan

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 14 January 2015 22:37
To: RSCDevelopmentControl
Subject: Objection to the Planning Application for the engineering works on the Hampstead

My apologies for delay in submitting this objection which is due to my illness. I hope, given the wide social importance of the matter, that it may be considered

From: the Chair of the United Swimmers' Association of Hampstead Heath.

To: the Development Control Committee.

Reference: Objection to the Planning Application for the engineering works on the Hampstead and Highgate chain of ponds.

As the Chairman of the United Swimmers Association of Hampstead Heath, I have pleasure in explaining our objections to the significant reconstruction of the dams on Hampstead Heath.

1. The proposals will mean, in the view of the many who objected to the proposed reconstruction, a visual deterioration to current prospects and landscape. We argue that because this view is shared by many that it may be treated as a significant social fact and not a mere individual value judgment. Over the last two years, as evidenced from its own survey of opinion, the City of London Corporation (CoLC) was unable to persuade significant numbers of Heath users of the desirability and utility of its proposals. Moreover, the impact of such construction will be unalterable and in perpetuity.
2. The proposals, to use the language of the man on the Camden omnibus, is a giant hammer to crack a nut because they are designed to prevent - and they will not be entirely successful - an event which has a probability of occurring of 1 in 400,000; a probability which seems incompatible with the much lower statistical probabilities commonly used in urban water drainage construction.
3. To that extent, we judge the proposals to be unreasonable, disproportionate and significantly excessive in a world where economic and financial resources are scarce. They could possibly be argued a precedent for other similar construction, such as storm drains, in circumstances where finance will not be sufficient to meet such obligations without the sacrifice of other important social objectives.
4. The CoLL consultation process did not at any stage include the possibility of considering other models based on lower and various statistical probabilities. We ask the Committee to urge that upon the Applicant before planning permission is granted. We believe that the public have a reasonable entitlement to judge between different proposals based on other statistical probabilities and not just one extreme model based on a 1 in 400,000 probability.
5. Moreover, no consideration was given to non civil construction solutions, such as insurance against damage to property – the premiums would probably very low in the case of a 1 in 400,000

probability; or warnings to residents etc. We believe that these should have been considered in public consultation but they were not.

Robert Sutherland Smith,

Chair of the United Swimmers' Association of Hampstead Heath

Markwell, Jonathan

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 14 January 2015 20:43
To: RSCDevelopmentControl
Subject: 2014/4332/P Objection

I wish to record an objection to the proposed construction of dams on Hampstead Heath. Having read a number of different sources on this I do not think the risk justifies the level of disruption to the heath, cutting of trees, and the loss of amenity.

Yours sincerely

Dr. Jonathan Bindman

[REDACTED] Mercers Rd N19 [REDACTED]

Markwell, Jonathan

From: IRENE ANDREAE [REDACTED]
Sent: 15 January 2015 09:50
To: Markwell, Jonathan
Subject: Ponds on Hampstead Heath

Dear Mr. Markwell,

I'm writing to you to strongly object to the proposed plans to alter the system of ponds on Hampstead Heath. This will be very costly and disruptive. I live near Hampstead Heath and will be greatly saddened by these alterations which will spoil the pleasure the Heath has always given to so many people. The danger of flooding is minimal, and the disruption and cost of repairing flood damage, when it should occur, will be small compared to the proposal to build dams and alter the system of ponds. I beg you to reject these damaging proposals.

Best wishes,
Irene Andreae

[REDACTED]
Windmill Hill
London NW3 [REDACTED]

Markwell, Jonathan

From: Dr Jill A Franklin [REDACTED]
Sent: 15 January 2015 09:57
To: Markwell, Jonathan

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to object to the current proposal to construct dams on Hampstead Heath.

My objections centre upon the excessive scale of the dams in relation to any perceived threat of flooding, and especially to the permanent damage that that construction work will cause to the unique and ancient nature of the Heath as a relatively untouched and gently managed, but vulnerable, historic open space within an enormous and densely populated city.

I hope that measures will be taken to amend the current proposal so as to minimise the threat to the character of the Heath.

Yours faithfully,

Dr Jill A Franklin

[REDACTED] Well Road, London NW3 [REDACTED]

Markwell, Jonathan

From: annabel [REDACTED]
Sent: 15 January 2015 14:28
To: Markwell, Jonathan
Subject: dams

Dear Jonathon,
im writing in protest to planned work on hampstead heath re dams.
i strongly protest to this proposed work
its oversized and disproportionate
irrelevant to the enviroment
sets a terrible precedent by allowing major development on the heath
we live in london urban overpopulated we need opur heath as it is for hundreds of years the heath has been unspoilt why the desire
to change this? disruption money spent a waste? for what? where is the respect for local residents and those who use the heath? there
is no justification for this action
please mark my objection to this ludicrous propsal.
sincerely
a bacal
[REDACTED] perrins lane NW3 [REDACTED]

Markwell, Jonathan

From: RSCDevelopmentControl
Sent: 15 January 2015 14:53
To: Markwell, Jonathan
Subject: FW: Hampstead Heath Planning Application: 2014/4332/P

Another one

Hannah Hutter
Principal Committee Officer

Telephone: 020 7974 6065

From: Lorna Mikhelson [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: 15 January 2015 13:29
To: RSCDevelopmentControl
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Hampstead Heath Planning Application: 2014/4332/P

Dear Hannah,

Further to our tel.conversation, please kindly pass this late submission to the Planning Officer.

My submission is as follows:

The City of London Corporation's plans will contravene their stated objective; "As the primary objective, to manage and preserve the Heath as an open space and maintain its unique and natural aspects of ecology", as well as contravene the tenets of being a "Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation."

The KINGFISHER, a protected but vulnerable species, will be threatened. Human disturbance from heavy machinery, the felling of trees (their fishing perches), inevitable contamination from water run-off, will remove their essential and secure feeding habitat of 1 - 3 kilometres in length, which incorporates the ponds all the way along the chain on the East (Highgate) side of the Heath. This in turn will affect their ability to produce up to 3 broods between March and October each year.

The UK government signed the 1992 Rio Convention committing us to halt biodiversity loss through the UK Biodiversity Action Plan. The Biodiversity Law Policy Planning Statement PPS 9 states that "if significant harm cannot be prevented, adequately mitigated against, or compensated for, then planning permission should be refused."

Yours sincerely,

Lorna Mikhelson

Markwell, Jonathan

From: Tim Sowula [REDACTED]
Sent: 15 January 2015 15:18
To: Markwell, Jonathan
Subject: Heath Dams planning proposal ref ref: 2014/4332/P

Dear Mr Markwell

I am writing in objection to the proposed engineering works to the Hampstead and Highgate chains of ponds, ref: 2014/4332/P.

I am a member of the HMPA, although I am writing in a personal capacity, as a regular swimmer and life-long user and lover of Hampstead Heath.

As a swimmer, I am very concerned over the impact that the proposed dams will have on the Men's Pond. Note that the City of London's (CoL) proposed works will directly impinge upon both ends of the Men's Pond.

At the north end of the Men's Pond, adjacent to the Model Boating Pond, the CoL plans to construct an 8 foot high dam and a 20-30m wide by 100m long spillway. Those works will radically alter the appearance of the landscape, involve loss of trees and bushes, and will interfere with the wildlife.

The CoL additionally plans to erect a 1m high barrier (either a brick wall or a steel barrier) positioned along the existing fenceline between the Men's Pond and Nom 1 Pond. However, the proposed barrier is entirely at odds with the Heath's existing natural aspect. It will cause loss of light and overshadowing for swimmers. Together with another 20 m wide spillway at that end of the Men's Pond, that barrier will permanently alter the appearance of the Men's Pond.

As a user of Hampstead Heath, I am horrified by the proposals. If they were absolutely necessary, it would be very sad that the Heath would have to undergo such a radical change, with huge amounts of disruptive


and potentially hazardous heavy building work over a long period, risking the safety of Heath users nearby and causing so much noise pollution. But the current Dams have never collapsed or over-topped, even in years of very heavy rainfall that has caused flooding elsewhere. There has been no conclusive hydro-engineering evidence saying that the dams are at risk of collapse, over-topping, or that the proposed dams could then even guarantee the safety of local residents if there was to be a freak weather occurrence. The proposed works are logically a horrendous waste of the CoL's money and should not be allowed to proceed.


There are no grounds in terms of safety to do this work as proposed, there are no environmental grounds to do the work as proposed, and therefore the proposed works seem to directly violate the 1871 Hampstead Heath Act that states: the Board shall forever keep the Heath open, unenclosed and unbuilt on' and that 'the Board shall at all times preserve, as far as may be, the natural aspect and state of the Heath, and to that end shall protect the turf, gorse, heather, timber and other trees, shrubs and brushwood thereon'.

I therefore request that the Development Control Committee reject the application for the proposed works.

Yours Faithfully,

Tim Sowula

 Napier Road


London E11 

Markwell, Jonathan

From: RSCDevelopmentControl
Sent: 15 January 2015 15:58
To: Markwell, Jonathan
Subject: FW: urgent - dam proposals

Hannah Hutter
Principal Committee Officer

Telephone: 020 7974 6065

From: Thomas Pope [mailto:
Sent: 15 January 2015 15:25
To: RSCDevelopmentControl
Subject: urgent - dam proposals


Dear Sir/Madam

re: 2014/4332/P

Please can I appeal to your good senses to question and halt the City of London's proposed dam works to the Heath which I think are unimaginative, destructive and misconceived as they presently stand. I have followed the arguments and I think it would be a missed opportunity to address the concerns for flooding in the way proposed. Surely a more appropriate and longer term solution surely is to provide adequate drainage by means which recognise north London's underlying problems of drainage, for example by enlarging the flow of underground sluices. So please let us take the time and trouble to pause and listen properly to the range of intelligent and practical solutions that have been offered.

With good wishes

Thomas Pope 15.1.2015

 Gorinne Road
London N19 