

**From:** Stephen Clarke [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 26 April 2015 09:00  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** The Water House

Dear Sir/Madam

Please note that I am against the Water House planning application being allowed. The usage of the nearby road by heavy lorries would be unacceptable.

sincerely

Stephen Clarke

**From:** Alix [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 26 April 2015 12:43  
**To:** Thuaire, Charles  
**Cc:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Response to Camden Council - the Water House

RE : planning submission 2011/4390/P

Please do not permit this vanity project to proceed. We are already enduring colossal disruptions to our peaceful enjoyment of the women's pond with the extensive damming project.

The build also appears to be an extremely dangerous undertaking on a path which even as a cyclist can be tricky to negotiate with so many pedestrians, children and pets.

A double basement is completely unnecessary and would surely be detrimental to the maintenance of the water table.

The housing frontages of many new developments along the Heath now are very ostentatious and resentment-inducing from everyday people who rely on the communal space and publicly shared tranquility which the Heath affords. Why do a select elite get to build such enormous properties which are rarely ever lived in and oblige the community not one jot?

Camden council has an obligation to work in the common interest and not for the wealthy few. The staggeringly high housing problems in the borough will not be aided by permitting this project. There has to be more morally responsible ways to incur revenue to help the poor and in need.

Yours sincerely

A l i x Lemki  
Life-long Hampstead habitué

**From:** Sarah Saunders [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 26 April 2015 18:00  
**To:** Planning; Thuair, Charles  
**Subject:** Planning application 2011/4390/P

Re: Planning application 2011/4390/P, Water House

I would like to raise strong objections to the vehicle movements described in the construction plan for the above. I have looked carefully at the plan but the use of heavy vehicles on Millfield Lane means it will be extremely difficult for walkers and cyclists during that time, and I believe not nearly enough has been done to create a dwelling (if there must be a new dwelling) that causes minimal impact to users of the lane and the ponds. The fact that lorries would turn at the point where we enter the pond makes the entrance extremely hazardous, and the 1.2 m of pedestrian space along the lane is far too small for comfort or safety. Large vehicles are simply not suited to this lane. I also object to the cutting away of trees and bushes to enable this transport.

Sarah Saunders

**From:** Sheila Clarke [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 26 April 2015 23:03  
**To:** Thuaire, Charles; Planning  
**Subject:** Planning application 2011/4390/P: the Water House, Millfield Lane

Dear Sirs,

I wish to object to the above planning application for the following reasons:

1. Demolishing and rebuilding this house would cause an intolerable degree of disruption, not only to users of Millfield Lane, but also, because of the noise made by large numbers of heavy vehicles, to anybody on the Heath within a few hundred yards of the demolition and rebuilding of the Water House.
2. Millfield Lane is in fact narrower than is claimed by the authors of the planning application, and the turning places (entrance to the Water House and entrance to the Ladies' Pond) are too small to be practical for the turning of large construction vehicles.

And, most important,

3. Even if "banksmen" were to accompany every movement of every vehicle that travelled in either direction along Millfield Lane, there would still be a high degree not merely of anxiety for pedestrians on Millfield Lane, but also a degree of real danger for them, especially if they had children with them.

Signed  
Sheila Clarke  
1a Lisburne Road  
London NW3 2NS

[REDACTED]

Apex Lodge, Fitzroy Park

London N6 6JA

27/04/2015

Reference the Water House Millfield Lane, London N6 2011/4390/P

Dear Charles Thuair

We are raising further objections to the redevelopment of the Water House. The changes to the CMP for the Water House planning application that have been made, in no way address the objections we made to the earlier application.

The developers do not mention our concerns that their traffic and enormous loads on the part of Millfield Lane immediately adjoining our house are likely to damage our foundations. They have not contacted us or looked at our building and seem to have ignored the problem.

The developers are trying to suggest that the lane was originally a highway that has been allowed to become overgrown to merge with the landscape. This is not so. It has never had a proper foundation and is essentially a farm track with a surface of gravel and compacted earth. There is no embankment on the Heath side and no drainage system, while several natural springs wash across it in wet weather.

They are proposing hundreds of journeys along the track by lorries that are twice the weight of a double-decker bus for a period of two years or more.

On the figures they have supplied the width of the track is five metres or less for much of its length leaving a clearance of a foot or so in some places (including our boundary wall). We have grave concerns for the safety of pedestrians and cyclists in spite of their assertions that banksmen will give priority to the users of the Heath.

In the recent past a CMP for a proposed development of Fitzroy Farm was rejected by Camden because it involved the use of Millfield Lane by heavy construction vehicles. Those developers had to abandon the plan and sell the site to a new owner who produced a more sympathetic, although very large building without the use of Millfield Lane. The rejected CMP recognised the impossibility of pedestrians and construction traffic safely sharing the lane and proposed a detour for pedestrians through the nature reserve adjoining the lane.

With the present proposal the only safe course would be to close the lane for the duration of the construction period. This would be an unacceptable interference with a public amenity and an intrusion on Heath land.

The present Water House is an admirable building which appears to be in good condition and was built only about 30 years ago. It sits unobtrusively in a sensitive position beside the Heath. The owner benefits aesthetically (and financially) from its unique position. The present owner and the

architect should accept that its position imposes restrictions on the access to the site which in turn impose restrictions on the scale of any works on the site. The owner cannot expect to benefit further at the expense of his neighbours and the unique public space that is Hampstead Heath.

Yours sincerely

Dr Colin Cooper

and

Professor Christine Hall

**From:** Family Cooke [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 29 April 2015 17:33  
**Cc:** Planning  
**Subject:** Water House Millfield Lane

Dear Camden Planners

I am a user of the Heath, the Heath ponds and a cyclist. I live in Dartmouth Park

I am writing to oppose the plans for the construction of the new Water House on Millfield Lane. I think the building is too large for the site, the plans to dig down are potentially damaging and the construction plans for work lasting well over 2 years with significant additional traffic for much of that time are unneighbourly, will damage the area and will be very very intrusive for all users of the area as well as residents

I very much hope you will turn down this application

yours sincerely

J H Cooke - Laurier Road, London NW5