

## **KENWOOD LADIES POND ASSOCIATION.**

c/o Jane Shallice  
17 Haslemere Road  
London N8 9QP.

### **KLPA OBJECTION TO THE PLANNING APPLICATION 2011/4390/P**

#### **THE WATER HOUSE DEVELOPMENT.**

We are extremely concerned about the planning application for the Water House, whose only access to the property is the gate opposite to our entrance in Millfield Lane.

As we have always argued the Kenwood Ladies Pond is a very special place. The only open water swimming place in the country for women, it is a sanctuary for so many.

Millfield Lane was the subject of an enquiry by a Planning Inspector four or five years ago and he ruled that the lane was not suited to construction traffic and refused the application. Obviously when considering the application for the Water House, the lack of alternative means of access is an overriding factor, but the concerns previously expressed must not be ignored.

It is obvious that there will be a constant focus on the movement of traffic along what is now a lane with hardly any use by vehicles of any description. There is a real and potential danger of heavy construction lorries and other vehicles driving along the narrow space of the lane, when pedestrians, runners and cyclists are also using it. We do not think that the statistics on which the CMP is based are

current, the survey having been made four years ago, and the usage of the lane by walkers, runners and cyclists has increased. We consider that the numbers of vehicles being suggested in the CMP will make the lane a continual danger.

When reading the CMP there is a complete lack of clarity in the use of the terms “delivery” and “movement”. It would appear in the table in 3.3 that in the site set up phase there will be 10 movements of HGVs and in “Peak Daily Movements” maximum 4 per day. But if a movement is an arrival and delivery does this mean there will two movements along the lane for each delivery?

The Table 2 is incomprehensible - the map/plan is more appropriate. However in 3.5 it is stated that daily movements will NOT exceed the maximum numbers stated in Table 2. But Table 2 has no such guidance or assurance.

The entrance to the Water House is directly opposite to the entrance of the Ladies Pond, and it is assumed that this space will be used as a turning place for the construction traffic. The numbers of swimmers is increasing, as open water swimming is becoming more popular, which means that larger numbers are entering and leaving the pond. It is not therefore a place for turning heavy goods vehicles.

Further it appears that in the construction Management Plan 5.3 it is suggested that the lifeguards contact the site manager if there is an emergency. There is no way that in an emergency there should be any further demands made on lifeguards. The entrance to the pond has to be clear at all times for any emergency vehicles.

We were pleased to read that there is no intention of tarmacking the road and any holes will be patched. But this assumes that the road can take the weight of the vehicles

used and the relatively benign impact on the lane itself with the constant usage.

Despite assurances we know only too well that developers create noise and dust. Continuous noise from the construction work when the Fitzroy Farm site was being developed was a constant irritant. High pitched drills and sounds as well as banging noises, with impact noises from pile driving, are at complete variance with the tranquility that is part of the huge attraction of the ponds. Despite assurances that the vegetation and fencing would in some way alleviate the sounds, this has never been our experience. Women, throughout the year, come to the pond for peace and quiet. We consider that the assurances about noise and dust, given in the CMP, are overly optimistic and will not be borne out in reality.

Jane Shallice