

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/0501/P	Caradoc King	11 West Hill Court Millfield Lane London N6 6JJ	27/03/2016 16:34:25	COMMNT	<p>For twelve years we have owned and occupied two adjacent flats on the ground floor of the southern West Hill Court block overlooking the gardens between West Hill Court and Millfield Cottage and towards No 1 Pond. I strongly object to the proposed re-siting of the flood-retaining wall/fence to the boundary between between West Hill Court and Millfield Cottage, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Original Approved Scheme of positioning the Wall along the strip City of London land between the western border between Millfield Lane garden and the Pond was the most logical and protective position with minimum intrusion upon Millfield Cottage. To move it to the upper eastern edge of Millfield Cottage's garden seems a total contradiction of the Hampstead Heath Ponds Project to safeguard houses and neighbouring occupants from possible flood risk. If Millfield Cottage is a Grade 2 building of high significance as a heritage asset presumably the maximum protection of house and garden from possible flood damage should be the priority. 2. It would also cause maximum disruption to Millfield Cottage and West Hill court to instal pile driving equipment into the a gardens in order to build the wall when there is no access apart from through the gardens. The original plan would make possible access from the Pond as with work in other Hampstead Heath Ponds to install the protective wall. 3. The principal objection from Millfield Cottage to the original approved scheme was that a flood wall along the Pond boundary of its garden would slightly block the view from the garden across the pond. As Millfield Cottage and its garden are already in such an enclosed setting to ensure privacy from the Heath, its objection seems unreasonable and far-fetched. 4. On the other hand, replacement of an overgrown and almost invisible boundary fence and some unobtrusive trellis work with a 1.8m+ solid wall /fence along the WHC/Millfield Cottage boundary will obstruct WHC's limited but pleasing view of Pond 1 and is of a proportionally greater disadvantage to the c.100 occupants of WHC than the minimum effect on sightline for the owners of Millfield Cottage under the original approved scheme. 5. The felling of two significant trees and the huge disruption of contractors working in the gardens of both Millfield Cottage and WHC to erect the flood barrier is another strong objection to the current revised plan. <p>Several WHC owners have already conveyed the strong concern to the Camden Planning Office in the way the views of WHC have been misinterpreted and misreported during the consultation process over the last two years. I appeal strongly to Camden Planning Office not to approve this revised scheme.</p> <p>Caradoc King, Flats 11 and 12A West Hill Court</p>
2016/0501/P	Sheila Macrae	37 West Hill Court Millfield Lane Highgate London N6 6JJ	27/03/2016 03:34:44	INT	<p>Along with other residents of the 39 flats in West Hill Court, I am strongly opposed to the planned route of the dam wall. It seems that, after several meetings with relevant parties, two of which I attended, our views have not only been ignored but misrepresented. The proposed location of the wall, involving felling of two of WHC's trees, adversely affecting our outlook, and causing much disruption and noise in the process, is unacceptable to us. We have tried to accommodate the two owners of Millfield Cottage but this has now all gone too far, with our concerns being, it seems, totally ignored. There has to be a better compromise solution; please find it.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/0501/P	David Papineau	48 Montpelier Grove NW52XG	28/03/2016 03:25:49	COMMNT	As an owner of one of the flats in West Hill Court, I would like to object to this because the works will be very disruptive near to our property and we will lose a tree that is much appreciated by the West Hill Court residents
2016/0501/P	Michael Hall	14 West Hill Court Millfield Lane N66JJ	26/03/2016 11:45:41	OBJEMPER	Dear Sirs As a resident of WHC I would like to object most strongly to this application. The original and I understand AGREED plan by Camden for this flood wall was to site the wall along the side of the pond some distance from and out of sight of West Hill Court. ONLY the two residents of Millfield Cottage objected to this plan on the grounds it would 'spoil' their view and the CoL seem to have bent over backwards to appease the millionaire owner of Millfield Cottage! Now the 100 residents of WHC are presented with a new plan which not only involves the removal of a mature tree from WHC land but also two more trees within Millfield Cottage which will adversely affect the view from WHC for years but will also involve the building of a substantial wall on our boundary and within a few feet of Flats 1-10 WHC with all its associated noise and disruption over a considerable time. I understand that there were other alternatives suggested but the owners of Millfield Cottage have persuaded the CoL to persist with this version to their own selfish advantage and to the detriment of the my fellow 100 residents of WHC. Please note my request to attend the committee hearing.
2016/0501/P	Deborah and John Andrews	30 west hill court millfield lane london n66jj	26/03/2016 09:38:12	COMMNT	We object to these changes to the work as strongly as we objected all along to the works on the Heath. They represent a scheme that was ill judged in its conception and unwelcome by a large body of residents both at West Hill Court and in the wider area of lower Highgate. For a 'flood' wall to be built in such proximity to our block is unacceptable. Whilst we understand and sympathise with the desire of the residents of Millfield Cottage not to have a wall built between their garden and the pond our sympathy has to and does rest squarely with our friends and neighbours in West Hill Court. John and Deborah Andrews Flat 30 West Hill Court
2016/0501/P	Marie Th. Heemels	Flat 34 West Hill Court Millfield lane N6 6 Jj	28/03/2016 17:28:20	OBJ	To whom it may concern, I oppose this plan. It will affect my enjoyment of our garden, and I don't want our tree to go. Kind regards, Therese Heemels
2016/0501/P	Sarah Papineau	34 West Hill Court Millfield Lane London N6 6 JJ	28/03/2016 03:14:37	COMMNT	I object to felling the sycamore tree which is on West Hill Court property.
2016/0501/P	Sarah Papineau	34 West Hill Court Millfield Lane London N6 6 JJ	28/03/2016 03:14:15	COMMNT	

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/0501/P	Armorer Wason	7 West Hill Court Millfield Lane London N66JJ	28/03/2016 20:43:01	COMNOT	<p>I am a director of the company, Spiraline, that owns the freehold of the 39 flats that make up West Hill Court, and I sit on the West Hill Court Management Committee. In this capacity I set up a working group with fellow residents, which requested that West Hill Court be represented on the CoL Ponds Project Stakeholder Group. We were eventually admitted, and for the last couple of years I, and fellow resident Muriel Mitcheson, have attended CoL meetings to discuss the Ponds Project.</p> <p>The position of the West Hill Court freeholder and Management Committee on the proposed rerouting of the floodwall has been made clear in our letter to the City of London of 22nd February 2016, which was forwarded to LB Camden. I make the following points simply in a personal capacity, as a resident owner of one of the 39 flats at West Hill Court.</p> <p>I was very shocked by the pretence at a consultation process that the CoL and Atkins undertook with us, and the way that they have completely misrepresented our views in this proposal. This is set out in detail in the West Hill Court Management Committee's letter to the City of London of 22nd February.</p> <p>We now note, not just an inaccurate representation of our views in the proposal, but also a refusal to correct a misrepresentation of the facts. One of our main concerns is the felling of the mature sycamore. The applicant's plan locates all the trees that are proposed for felling in the grounds of Millfield Cottage. The ivy that clad the trees has now been removed by the City of London, however, and this clearly reveals that the main sycamore is in fact on our side of the boundary, and therefore in our grounds. I wrote to Gideon Whittingham, Camden's planning officer, to alert him to this. He responded that he had consulted the applicant, who simply denied this, and referred him back to the tree plan. I have now provided Mr Whittingham with photographs that substantiate my assertion. This fact surely invalidates the entire basis of the application – that the works are confined to the garden of Millfield Cottage.</p> <p>With regard to the proposal as a whole, we understand the value to Heath users of diverting the wall away from the pond itself, and reducing the felling of trees around the pond. We also understand and indeed were sympathetic to our neighbours' desire to protect the view in front of their house.</p> <p>We therefore discussed with our West Hill Court residents the option of being prepared to agree to the new route, if the owners of Millfield Cottage and the CoL would consider an amendment that would take the route just behind the mature sycamore and ash tree, that the proposal seeks to fell – and thereby spare them. This option would still have meant our taking the full brunt of the works, just a few feet from our buildings – and it would have retained the major advantage to our neighbours of the option set out in the proposal, with no impact on the Millfield Cottage building or its sightlines. It would have meant a very slight rerouting of the wall within the furthest part of our two neighbours' very large garden - an area that they do not overlook and rarely use or walk to.</p> <p>With the assent of our residents we put this option at our January 2016 site meeting with the City of London, Atkins and the owners of Millfield Cottage, and, subsequently, once the applicant's plans were sent to us, further suggested that they be withdrawn and redeveloped on this basis. But the parties involved refused to consider even this small, but to us very significant compromise.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>I therefore feel I have no choice but to object most strongly to the proposal as a whole. We are not simply Heath users, but a significant number of council-tax paying Camden residents, whom we urge the Council's planning committee to support. If this proposal goes ahead, we will have to live with the significant disruption and noise of the works, right up against our buildings, and the major long-term negative impact of the works on our garden and the views from our flats. This is not, for us, a "residential minor alteration".</p> <p>Most of all, I feel strongly about the completely unnecessary tree loss in our garden that this proposal requires. Given the risks of Chalara ash dieback to the ash population overall, it is surely wrong to remove a healthy tree. And sycamores, which are disparaged as they are not an indigenous tree, are in fact of key ecological importance. Dr Meg Game, the City of London ecologist, has described to me the importance of sycamores to bees, which are, of course, under significant threat, but in fact thrive in the West Hill Court garden. The large numbers of aphids and caterpillars that flourish on sycamores also support a range of bird species. One study has shown them to be second only to oak in the importance of the food source they provide.* But apart from these ecological considerations, the two mature, healthy sycamores that would be felled produce a magnificent blaze of yellow foliage in the autumn, and are the last trees in our garden to lose their leaves. It is quite unacceptable that no compromise has been found, and that the c. 100 adults and children resident at West Hill Court should lose this important feature.</p> <p>I would like to be notified of the Committee date, and to attend and speak at the meeting.</p> <p>*Andrew Leslie, 2005, The Ecology and Biodiversity of Sycamore (<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i> L) with particular reference to Great Britain http://www.cumbria.ac.uk/Public/SNRO/Documents/Research/ALeslie2005EcologyBiodiversity.pdf</p>
2016/0501/P	Elsbeth Lawlor	24 west hill court Mill field lane N6 6JJ	28/03/2016 22:39:47	COMMNT	I object to the work proposed to the pond. The chopping down of the trees and the building of the wall between no.1 the cottage millfield lane N5, next to west hill court.
2016/0501/P	SUSAN ROSE HIGHGATE CAAC CHAIR	Heathwinds Merton Lane N6 6NA	27/03/2016 10:37:12	OBJ	Highgate CAAC has some important concerns about this application. While we appreciate that the Council approved the ponds project as a whole the purpose of this new application is not clear. Clearly the wall proposed offers no protection to Millfield cottage; what exactly is intended to do? it should not be permitted just because it is part of a larger scheme but must be assessed on its own merits. it also seems that the consultation process had been deeply flawed with one landowner receiving more consideration than the other. No adequate reason is given for the loss of six healthy trees other than that this solution is preferred by the advantaged landowner. The loss of vegetation at this location has already gravely impacted on the character of this pond and the availability of suitable sites for the many nesting water fowl. The increased damage to the landscape and the ecology is not justified.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/0501/P	Andrew Jarvid	8 West Hill Court Millfield Lane london N6 6jj	28/03/2016 22:03:58	INT	I write as a resident of West Hill Court to endorse 100% the views expressed by Armorer Wason and Caradoc King and others in their letters which comprehensively and compellingly explain why the current plan for the Works is unacceptable based as it is on inaccurate facts and lack of proper hearing for the West Hill Court community.
2016/0501/P	Andrew Jarvid	8 West Hill Court Millfield Lane london N6 6jj	28/03/2016 22:03:28	INT	
2016/0501/P	Priya Mitchell	Flat 6 west hill court Millfield lane N6 6JJ	28/03/2016 12:32:00	OBJ	I completely object to the proposals and am horrified of what this means for residents of West hill court on many levels. These have already been outlined eloquently by my neighbours and I strongly appeal to Camden planning office to reconsider and not to approve this revised scheme that will have such serious repercussions for all residents of WHC.
2016/0501/P	Rebecca Clay	9 West Hill Court Millfield Lane N6 6JJ N6 6JJ	27/03/2016 23:09:10	OBJLETTE R	I would like to object to the works proposed, which will affect all residents of West Hill Court, and their enjoyment of the garden. I feel we have not been kept properly informed and consulted during this process, and it has been handled purely on the basis of it affecting the residents of Millfield Cottage, which is not true. I object to the felling of the mature sycamore tree in our garden, I think we have lost enough trees in the local area and don't believe it is entirely necessary. I strongly believe no further work should take place without proper consultation of all residents at West Hill Court and suitable compromises reached, agreed upon by the majority, rather than assumptions made on our behalf.
2016/0501/P	Rebecca Clay	9 West Hill Court Millfield Lane N6 6JJ N6 6JJ	27/03/2016 23:08:48	OBJLETTE R	
2016/0501/P	Dame Philippa Russell	4 West Hill Court Millfield Lane London N6 6JJ	24/03/2016 17:31:27	OBJJEMPER	I object to the proposed felling of the sycamore tree on the boundary of West Hill Court and the neighbouring cottage. The tree is healthy, it forms an important part of our local environment and its destruction will have a major impact on our outlook and garden. Considering Camden's welcome commitment to protecting trees as part of a healthy urban environment, I hope that the current decision can be reversed.
2016/0501/P	Dame Philippa Russell	4 West Hill Court Millfield Lane London N6 6JJ	24/03/2016 17:31:26	OBJJEMPER	
2016/0501/P	Dame Philippa Russell	4 West Hill Court Millfield Lane London N6 6JJ	24/03/2016 17:31:26	OBJJEMPER	

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/0501/P	Dame Philippa Russell	4 West Hill Court Millfield Lane London N6 6JJ	24/03/2016 17:31:13	OBJEMPER	I object to the proposed felling of the sycamore tree on the boundary of West Hill Court and the neighbouring cottage. The tree is healthy, it forms an important part of our local environment and its destruction will have a major impact on our outlook and garden. Considering Camden's welcome commitment to protecting trees as part of a healthy urban environment, I hope that the current decision can be reversed.
2016/0501/P	Dame Philippa Russell	4 West Hill Court Millfield Lane London N6 6JJ	24/03/2016 17:31:04	OBJEMPER	
2016/0501/P	Elizabeth Dore	35 West Hill Court Millfield Lane London N6 6JJ	25/03/2016 14:19:48	COMMEM AIL	As a long term resident of West Hill Court WHC I strongly object to this application. There are serious misrepresentations in Section 2.3 of the Planning Design and Access Statement, suggesting that WHC residents 'consider this proposal an acceptable option.' This is simply not true. I object to felling a mature tree in the collective garden enjoyed by 100+ WHC residents to improve the view of the 2 residents of Millfield Cottage. I object to the construction of a solid wall which would block the views of the 100+ WHC residents. I object to major damage to the physical environment and the massive amount of noise what would be involved in the work over a considerable amount of time. I object to the way this proposal has been handled, completely disregarding the suggestions made by residents of WHC. I urge the City of London to reconsider the proposal, taking into account the 100+ residents of WHC.
2016/0501/P	Mark Billingham & Anita Overland	36 West Hill Court Millfield Lane London N6 6JJ	27/03/2016 18:54:03	OBJ	We strongly object to the proposed erection of a flood containment wall and fence at Millfield Cottage, N6. We are residents at West Hill Court [WHC] and we believe this work will have a negative impact on WHC. The proposal to remove trees alters views, natural habitats and the overall vernacular currently enjoyed daily by the WHC residents. This work is based on a theoretical proposition which cannot be proven to be of greater benefit than the existing structure. In addition, this proposal does not consider the majority at WHC and is only to the benefit of the minority at Millfield Cottage. We also take issue with the incorrect information about the structure that was provided and the lack of due process in consideration of the views of WHC residents.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/0501/P	Muriel Mitcheson	16 West Hill Court Millfield Lane London N6 6JJ	25/03/2016 16:34:15	INT	<p>I would like to oppose this revised application from COL. The proposed re-routing of the flood defence wall would involve it being built on the boundary of Millfield Cottage and West Hill Court. As the boundary is very close to WHC this would involve very serious intrusion to the residents of WHC, particularly those in the front block. It would involve the loss of two significant trees and much shrubbery and in addition to the disruption and noise of the installation of the wall it would permanently spoil the view.</p> <p>An alternative, which was proposed by the residents of WHC, would be to cut across the southern end of the garden of Millfield cottage. This would clearly be disruptive but it would be at some distance from the cottage and hence much less of a nuisance both during the construction and after completion. It would involve the continuation of the works from the existing dam and mean there was no reason to have access from WHC. It has previously been agreed that access to the dam works should not involve the use of Millfield lane as this is a much used access point to the Heath. So it is important that any works do not involve accessing the site from the Lane.</p> <p>The original proposal for the dam to Highgate Number 1 Pond would have taken the dam wall across the garden of Millfield Cottage by the edge of the pond. This would have spoilt the owners' view of the pond but would have had very limited impact on the amenity of West Hill Court. The residents of WHC were sympathetic to the reduction of the damage to the Millfield Cottage owners' views but they argued strongly at a site meeting for a compromise solution which would help protect their interests. It is this compromise solution that I would urge the Planning committee to consider.</p>
2016/0501/P	Robert Froomberg	Flat 10 West hill court	26/03/2016 08:57:59	OBJ	<p>I live at west hill court and strongly object to the flood wall defendes being built so close to our boundary wall and not immediately adjacent to the pond. I also object to the need to fell mature trees on our property to achieve this.</p>
2016/0501/P	John Weeks	35 West Hill court Millfield Lane London N6 6JJ	28/03/2016 14:04:53	COMMNT	<p>As a resident of West Hill Court (WHC) I strongly object to this application. There are serious misrepresentations in Section 2.3 of the Planning Design and Access Statement, suggesting that WHC residents 'consider this proposal an acceptable option.'</p> <p>This is not true. I object to felling a mature tree in the collective garden enjoyed by 100+ WHC residents to improve the view of the 2 residents of Millfield Cottage.</p> <p>I object to the construction of a solid wall which would block the views of the 100+ WHC residents.</p> <p>I object to major damage to the physical environment and the massive amount of noise what would be involved in the work over a considerable amount of time.</p> <p>I object to the way this proposal has been handled, completely disregarding the suggestions made by residents of WHC.</p> <p>I urge the City of London to reconsider the proposal, taking into account the 100+ residents of WHC.</p> <p>John Weeks, West Hill Court</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/0501/P	Marie Therese	Flat 34 West Hill Court Millfield lane N6 6JJ London	28/03/2016 09:01:47	OBJ	To whom it may concern, I oppose the proposed work, because the works will take place close to our flat, will affect our enjoyment of the garden and we will lose a lovely, established tree. Yours sincerely, Marie-Therese Heemels
2016/0501/P	Marie Therese	Flat 34 West Hill Court Millfield lane N6 6JJ London	28/03/2016 09:01:47	OBJ	
2016/0501/P	Marie Therese	Flat 34 West Hill Court Millfield lane N6 6JJ London	28/03/2016 09:01:46	OBJ	
2016/0501/P	Marie Therese	Flat 34 West Hill Court Millfield lane N6 6JJ London	28/03/2016 09:01:12	OBJ	

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/0501/P	Steve & Melanie Peacock	1 West Hill Court Millfield Lane London N6 6JJ	24/03/2016 17:52:20	OBJ	<p>Having studied the documents relating to this application, we wish to express the strongest possible objection to this proposal. We are left feeling so strongly, particularly by the way that the process of drawing up the proposal was carried out, that we are seriously considering approaching the media in an attempt to get the Sinclairs, City of London, Atkins and BAM Nuttall to reconsider.</p> <p>We live in West Hill Court, in the block adjacent to the boundary with Millfield Cottage, so are directly impacted by this proposal. In addition, one of us took part in discussions with the Sinclairs, Corporation of London and their contractors about the proposals.</p> <p>The grounds for our objection are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The sycamore tree that this proposal requires to be felled is on the West Hill Court side of the boundary, not in Millfield Cottage garden as represented in Atkins' drawings. I believe a neighbour has furnished you with photographic evidence of this. We would not agree to the felling of this tree. 2. The proposal to remove two much valued mature trees would significantly detract from the use and enjoyment of the West Hill Court garden for all (100+) residents. 3. Likewise the replacement of the current unobtrusive boundary railings with a solid wall constructed of metal and railway sleepers will also detract from the use and enjoyment of the garden. 4. The major construction work involved in these plans will involve major damage to the physical environment, the massive amount of noise involved in driving metal sheet piling deep into the earth using mechanical diggers, and a huge amount of disruption connected to the work over a significant period of time. The proposed wall will be within two metres of the western wall of our flat, directly in front of living room and bedroom windows. This is completely unacceptable. 5. The Sinclairs initially approved the original plans. They (two people) have subsequently decided that their view across their garden would be better if the wall were to be re-routed as proposed, causing disruption and degrading the outlook of the approximately 100 residents of West Hill Court. 6. Having myself led several significant public sector change programmes, involving major formal public consultation, and taken part in discussions with the Sinclairs, the Corporation of London and contractors, I make the following points which bring into question the integrity and validity of the process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 2.3 of the Planning Design and Access Statement states 'Since the determination of the planning application, the City of London (the applicant), the Atkins Design Team and BAM Nuttall (the contractor) have been working closely with ... the residents of West Hill Court (the adjacent property) to come up with a workable solution.' This is simply not the case. Despite repeated requests for a meeting dating from September 2015, a brief meeting was held early in January, and an on-site meeting in mid-January, after which none of our suggestions were acted upon. • The statement in table 2.1 of the same document, against option 3, that 'The residents of West Hill Court have been consulted and they considered this an acceptable option' with conditions relating to replanting trees and cosmetic change to the fence is simply not true. We were completely clear that we did not represent the views of all residents of West Hill Court, and that any proposal involving the felling of the Ash and Sycamore trees would be objected to. The condition that trellice be put on top of the solid wall is not one that we are familiar with, and is symptomatic of the lack of attention paid to our suggestions. • Having made considerable efforts to find the time to constructively engage in this process, we are left angry and disillusioned by the way our position has been grossly misrepresented to suit the convenience of the other parties, and how our suggestions, again made constructively, have been

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**

completely disregarded. This is an example of the worst type of behaviour by public bodies in their relations with members of the public.

Steve Peacock
Melanie Peacock
