

## DRAINAGE COMMENT / QUERY TRACKER - 01.11.2019

### INTRODUCTION

This tracker has been compiled to provide a detailed response to letters recently received by Camden Planning in objection the proposed development.

- David Rathbone's letter 11.10.19 for Alan Baxter Structural Engineers on behalf of the Fitzroy Park Residents Association.
- Karen Beare's email of 12.10.19, partly on behalf of the Fitzroy Park Residents Association.
- Nexus Planning's letter of 21.10.19 on behalf of the City of London Corporation

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

There are two aspects to the drainage.

Foul Drainage.

1. All foul drainage will be directed to the sewer beneath Fitzroy Park at the front of the property.
2. There are no proposals to construct drains or sewers on the Heath or to connect to the existing foul sewers that run beneath the Heath.

Surface Water Drainage.

3. The existing pattern of surface water run-off and drainage must be maintained for the sake of the Nature Reserve.
4. There is no plan to alter the existing discharge to the Heath unless requested to do so by the City of London Corporation.  
(The applicant awaits clarification in this respect from CoL.)

## DRAINAGE COMMENT / QUERY TRACKER

ITEM REF.	DOCUMENT	COMMENT	RESPONSE
ABA a)	<p>David Rathbone Letter 11.10.19</p> <p>for Alan Baxter Structural Engineers for FPRA</p>	<p>The covering letter and page 1 of the Coyle Kennedy report indicate that Bob Warnock agreed on 10 May 2018 that the current discharge across Millfield Lane could be eliminated and a new pipe installed from the attenuation tank and swale beneath the road to an outfall, with a stone diffuser, in the nature reserve on the heath. We have seen no evidence or correspondence to support this and the correspondence that we have seen from CoL indicates that they would not support the discharge of water onto the heath.</p>	<p>Agreed. We met on Bob Warnock of the City of London (and his then Hydrology advisor) on 1<sup>st</sup> May 2018 and discussed how best to deal with the water that runs across Millfield Lane.</p> <p>I think we mistakenly understood at the time that the CoL were indicating a preference that they wished to see it removed and dealt with by means of a drain installed under the carriageway of the lane.</p> <p>On 4<sup>th</sup> October 2018 we re-iterated to the CoL that we had no strong feelings on the matter but wished to accommodate whichever of the following options the CoL felt to be the most appropriate. 1) Leave as is 2) Replace with a pipe or 3) Replace with a more formal surface stone/concrete "ford/channel".</p> <p>Unfortunately, the CoL were unable to provide any clarification but have since indicated that they have commissioned an independent hydrological consultant.</p> <p>On 26<sup>th</sup> October 2018 the CoL wrote that they would not support a request to discharge water onto the Heath, but again were unable to clarify what they wished to happen with the existing discharge. However, it would seem somewhat unlikely that the historic discharge of an ancient watercourse would require CoL permission to flow. (Not the least because the flow must be seen as an important contribution to the wetland area of the nature reserve, and, ultimately, to the Highgate Pond chain.)</p>

## DRAINAGE COMMENT / QUERY TRACKER

ITEM REF.	DOCUMENT	COMMENT	RESPONSE
ABA b)	<p>David Rathbone Letter 11.10.19</p> <p>for Alan Baxter Structural Engineers for FPRA</p>	<p>The covering letter responds to a request from the Camden LLF A for outline flood mitigation measures for plot 4 and 5 by including a copy of section 7.8 (Risk Evaluation) of the proposals included in the Hydrological &amp; Hydro geological assessment. Essentially local landscaping is proposed to direct surface water flooding away from plots 4 and 5 to the existing run off route from the pond. This is all still very vague and unclear how the levels will work and we note that the runoff water is now to be collected and fed into the proposed swale along the boundary with Millfield Lane</p>	<p>The submitted drainage report, last update 5<sup>th</sup> July 2018 (over a year ago)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Explained clearly with a diagram how local landscaping will be used to direct any surface water flooding away from Plots 4 and 5 to the designated exceedance route.</li> <li>2. Explained clearly with a diagram how run-off water is to be collected and fed into the proposed swale along the boundary with Millfield Lane.</li> </ol>

## DRAINAGE COMMENT / QUERY TRACKER

ITEM REF.	DOCUMENT	COMMENT	RESPONSE
ABA c)	<p>David Rathbone Letter 11.10.19</p> <p>for Alan Baxter Structural Engineers for FPRA</p>	<p>Section 2-2 on drawing P -300 rev. B indicates an overflow pipe out of the top of the attenuation tank. If this is the only discharge pipe (and the drawing doesn't show any others) then the tank will fill up and then provide no further attenuation. This overflow pipe is also connected to the swale, which is shown outside the site boundary, under the road. If, as it appears, the swale is to be excavated below the road then the ownership of Millfield Lane should be clarified and confirmation sought that this has been agreed with the relevant authorities. We would also query whether the impact of the excavation of the deep swale on the roots to the retained trees on both sides of Millfield lane has been fully considered and agreed?</p>	<p>The storage area and swale will primarily act as a soakaway where the water will percolate via the sides and base into the permeable layer that currently exists. This will preserve the current situation on site whereby the water makes its way the heath via the permeable layer of soil. The main difference now is that Coyle Kennedy have provided additional storage which should eliminate the current discharge across Millfield Lane except possibly in extreme weather events – hence the insertion of the pipe to cater for these events and eliminate the discharge across Millfield Lane.</p> <p>The CoL originally requested the swale to be located outside the site fencing, so that it could be more easily maintained. Again, if there is now a preference for a different arrangement then this can be accommodated.</p> <p>It is understood that the property ownership of 55 Fitzroy Park extends halfway under Millfield Lane.</p> <p>The swale will be positioned on private land beside the carriageway and not under the road.</p> <p>The swale will be back-filled with free-draining material to allow infiltration of water rather than an open ditch. This will not affect the adjacent carriageway and will allow the hedge and trees to be planted alongside.</p>

DRAINAGE COMMENT / QUERY TRACKER			
ITEM REF.	DOCUMENT	COMMENT	RESPONSE
ABA d)	David Rathbone Letter 11.10.19  for Alan Baxter Structural Engineers for FPRA	The drainage proposals are very complex, extensive and congested. A number of figures (diagrams) are included in the report to show more clearly how the drainage to the car parking areas, access paths and the foul water network are dealt with. It would be useful if further separate figures could be produced to show how the pond, blue/green roofs and land drainage are dealt with. Drawing P301 rev. A seems to indicate that the land drainage around plots 1 to 3 peters out in the retained and reinstated orchard. The developer should clarify the details and what happens to the ground water.	<p>The drainage proposals are comprehensive. The surface water from the area of Plots 1 to 3 will be directed towards the pond in order to preserve the existing situation. At present there is no formal drainage network to the pond and it is intended that the land drainage system will allow the collected water to re-infiltrate the ground and, as at present, make its way towards the pond through the uppermost layers of soil.</p> <p>The land drainage will also collect any excess groundwater present in the front of Plots 1,2 &amp; 3 and, controlled by an in-ground weir to preserve the existing groundwater level, also direct this towards the pond.</p>

## DRAINAGE COMMENT / QUERY TRACKER

ITEM REF.	DOCUMENT	COMMENT	RESPONSE
ABA e)	<p>David Rathbone            Letter            11.10.19</p> <p>for</p> <p>Alan Baxter            Structural Engineers            for FPRA</p>	<p>The foul water flows (possibly incorporating some storm water flows) which currently pass below the tennis court are to be collected in a chamber and pumped, with the foul water from plots 4 and 5, up to Fitzroy Park where they are combined with the foul water flows from plots 1 to 3 and the storm water from the parking areas before discharging into the combined public sewer in Fitzroy Park. This represents a significant increase on existing flows which will need to be agreed with Thames Water or Camden. It is unlikely that either would be prepared to take on the responsibility for the pumping chamber and rising main. This would therefore be a private sewer with associated costs, which may have implications for the owners of properties connected to the sewer.</p>	<p>No. On the contrary great lengths have been taken to preserve the existing surface and groundwater regime. There will be no significant increase in the amount of water being discharged to the TW sewer as any additional flow here would detract from that being supplied to the Hampstead Heath Nature Reserve and the Highgate pond Chain.</p>

## DRAINAGE COMMENT / QUERY TRACKER

ITEM REF.	DOCUMENT	COMMENT	RESPONSE
ABA f)	<p>David Rathbone Letter 11.10.19</p> <p>for</p> <p>Alan Baxter Structural Engineers</p> <p>for FPRA</p>	<p>The original intention was to keep the proposed groundwater regime on the site the same as the existing. Given the complexity of the proposed arrangements it would be extremely difficult to demonstrate that this can be achieved. What was originally a very natural environment within a large garden area is now heavily controlled and engineered because of the extent of development on the site. A lot more water will be drained to the attenuation tank and to the swale which then discharges via a drain under Millfield Lane into the Heath. There is a risk that this could lead to contamination of the Ponds.</p>	<p>Great lengths have been taken to preserve the existing surface and groundwater regime. There will be no significant increase in the amount of water being discharged to the Heath.</p> <p>There will NOT be a significant increase in water being discharge to the Heath. The design philosophy is purely to maintain the status quo in a sustainable fashion.</p> <p>Great care has been taken to reduce the current risk of contamination reaching the Highgate Ponds from that which currently exists. All potentially contaminated water is being separated off from that which is clean and is being diverted to the sewer via interceptors, allowing only assuredly clean water into the pond system.</p>

## DRAINAGE COMMENT / QUERY TRACKER

ITEM REF.	DOCUMENT	COMMENT	RESPONSE
ABA g)	<p>David Rathbone            Letter            11.10.19</p> <p>for</p> <p>Alan Baxter            Structural Engineers</p> <p>for FPRA</p>	<p>The potential impact on the ground water regime in the temporary condition during construction is also likely to be extensive because of the scale of the proposed groundworks, which now includes the excavations for the attenuation tank and the pump chamber. The risk of contamination of the groundwater, feeding the pond and the nature reserve therefore remains high.</p>	<p>No.</p> <p>The attenuation tank is 1m deep and the reference to “the scale of the groundworks” is misleading – Plots 1, 2 and 3 have minimal ground works and considering that the lower level of these plots will be level with the existing ground at the rear of same confirms this. Likewise for the of excavation for 4 and 5</p> <p>The pump chamber is located in the existing garage driveway from Millfield Lane and as a result will require minimal excavation. The pumping chamber will be a precast/preformed chamber that will be dropped into the excavation.</p> <p>There is absolutely no increased risk of contamination of the groundwater, the pond or the nature reserve.</p>
FPRA i)	<p>Karen Beare            Email            12.10.19</p>	<p>water from roofs &amp; hard landscaping will be collected in a new, large attenuation tank that will require yet more engineering/excavation on site in addition to all that has been proposed so far. This attenuation tank is likely to be at least as deep, but more likely deeper than basements on Plots 4 &amp; 5 which already risk permanent dewatering of the spring-fed pond.</p>	<p>No.</p> <p>The attenuation tank is 1m deep.</p> <p>The water in the pond is fed by near-surface seepage. It is technically misleading to equate this to a spring.</p> <p>Plots 4 &amp; 5 will not “risk permanent dewatering” of the pond. The evidence is that the pond water is not at present in continuity with the groundwater in these plots.</p>



## DRAINAGE COMMENT / QUERY TRACKER

ITEM REF.	DOCUMENT	COMMENT	RESPONSE
FPRA ii)	Karen Beare Email 12.10.19	the attenuation tank as drawn is untenable as it does not detail any sort of hydro-brake. As drawn, while the overflow continues to run, the tank will never empty and simply continue to surcharge the Heath in an uncontrolled manner. Maximum rainfall events will only exacerbate this problem with the potential of causing localised flooding along the Lane and surcharging Bird Sanctuary	<p>The storage area and swale will primarily act as a soakaway where the water will percolate via the sides and base into the permeable layer that currently exists. This will preserve the current situation on site where the water makes its way the heath via the permeable layer of soil. The main difference now is that we have provided additional storage which should eliminate the current discharge across Millfield Lane except possibly in extreme weather events – hence the insertion of the pipe to cater for these events and eliminate the discharge across Millfield Lane.</p> <p>It has been considered important to preserve the existing hydrological drainage regime so that “Maximum rainfall events” will maintain the same potential as at present for causing flooding along the Lane and surcharging the Bird Sanctuary.</p>
FPRA iii)	Karen Beare Email 12.10.19	the over-riding point however, is that the arrangement was not agreed with the City of London in May 2018 as wrongly stated in the submission documents. So for this to be suggested today, as an agreed way forward, feels deeply disingenuous.	<p>No. To be fair the CoL have found themselves subject to changing guidance and have understandably now elected to appoint an independent hydrological consultant to advise them.</p> <p>For our part we accept the misunderstanding that appears to arisen but have always offered, and will continue to offer, to deal with the pond discharge in whatever manner best suits the CoL.</p>

DRAINAGE COMMENT / QUERY TRACKER			
ITEM REF.	DOCUMENT	COMMENT	RESPONSE
FPRA iv)	Karen Beare Email 12.10.19	The City has confirmed to stakeholders that they wrote to the developer himself in June 2018, copying in LBH Wembley, Coyle Kennedy and SM Planning, setting out quite clearly that any such proposal to construct drainage connections would be in conflict with the primary principles of the 1871 Hampstead Heath Act. Third party consent would therefore not be granted for any such drainage works. No doubt the City will provide the necessary evidence to confirm this should it be deemed necessary by the Council.	The Col have indeed indicated that they would not support a drainage connection to be made to the foul sewers beneath the Nature reserve. No such connection is planned.

DRAINAGE COMMENT / QUERY TRACKER			
ITEM REF.	DOCUMENT	COMMENT	RESPONSE
FPRA v)	Karen Beare Email 12.10.19	the drainage proposals, as set out here, detail flows from this large attenuation tank being directed into a new, deep external swale, to be excavated along the outside fence boundary with and under Mill field Lane, with an additional pipe under ML to support flows. This proposed pipe would be at the eastern end of the site ie: at the opposite end to the current overflow from the spring-fed pond.	TK INPUT PLEASE  The attenuation tank is 1m deep.  The linear swale is not new.  At the initial meeting In May 2018 The CoL requested the linear swale beside Millfield Lane to be located outside the site fencing, so that it could be more easily maintained.  The overflow pipe beneath Millfield Lane, if desired, can be installed at more or less any point.  The water in the pond is fed by near-surface seepage. It is technically misleading to equate this to a spring.

## DRAINAGE COMMENT / QUERY TRACKER

ITEM REF.	DOCUMENT	COMMENT	RESPONSE
FPRA vi)	Karen Beare Email 12.10.19	the overflow from the pond will also be directed to join this new external swale. Existing flow rates of this existing overflow are likely to be increased due to on-site drainage proposals mitigating 5 basements and various other engineering proposals.	<p>This swale is not a new feature. It has been there since the initial meeting in May 2018 with the CoL and has featured in every report since then.</p> <p>Great lengths have been taken to preserve the existing surface and groundwater regime. There will be no significant increase in the amount of water being discharged to the Heath.</p>
FPRA vii)	Karen Beare Email 12.10.19	the proposed new pumping station, like the attenuation tank, will require yet more engineering/excavation on site in addition to all that has been proposed so far. This pumping station is also likely to be at least as deep, but more likely deeper than basements on Plots 4 & 5, which already risk permanent dewatering of the spring-fed pond. Of course both will significantly increase spoil on site and HGV numbers.	<p>No.</p> <p>The attenuation tank is 1m deep.</p> <p>The pump chamber is located in the existing garage driveway from Millfield Lane and as a result will require minimal excavation. The pumping chamber will be a precast/preformed chamber that will be dropped into the excavation.</p> <p>There no significant increase in spoil or HGV numbers to be associated with either the attenuation tank or the pumping chamber..</p>

## DRAINAGE COMMENT / QUERY TRACKER

ITEM REF.	DOCUMENT	COMMENT	RESPONSE
FPRA viii)	Karen Beare Email 12.10.19	<p>this pumping station would need to serve the Bowling Club, the Lodge, Fitzroy farm, Wallace House, the Water House plus proposed plots 4 &amp; 5. If it were for foul water only, the size could be relatively modest, but still representing extensive extra excavation onsite. But is is not. Four of these dwellings have swimming pools that need to be regularly back-washed. Plus of course if any of these properties have historic combined rain/foul water systems then extreme rain fall events would need to be factored in, so the size of it would need to be exponentially increased to prevent sewage overflow onto the Heath.</p>	<p>In relation to backwash from swimming pools – this equates to approximately 2 m<sup>3</sup> per week per pool – considering these volumes and the volumes from the houses – the pumping chamber will be relatively modest. Furthermore to elevate any uncertainty, the flow in this pipe will be monitored over a period to accurately assess the size of pumping chamber required.</p>
FPRA ix)	Karen Beare Email 12.10.19	<p>consent from Thames Water would also be needed and it is considered highly unlikely that they would be prepared to take on the responsibility for the pumping station and rising main. This would therefore be a private sewer with associated service costs which those dwellings it serves would be required to fund.</p>	<p>The granting of any new drainage connection consent is a matter for Thames Water and the concept of a private sewer is not a cause for any concern.</p>

DRAINAGE COMMENT / QUERY TRACKER			
ITEM REF.	DOCUMENT	COMMENT	RESPONSE
FPRA x)	Karen Beare Email 12.10.19	these new drawings/documents do not address the pond being spring fed vs surface water fed, a false premise that underpins the entire application.	The submitted hydrological & hydrogeological assessment, last update 5th July 2018 (over a year ago) explained at considerable length and with plans and diagrams the surface water catchment for the pond and the construction of the pond and fact that although today there remains no well-defined watercourse feeding the pond it is patently clear that it is being fed by this catchment. There is no spring versus surface water premise, false or otherwise.
FPRA xi)	Karen Beare Email 12.10.19	nor do these new proposals address the risk of contamination of the Heath or neighbouring properties.	The submitted hydrological & hydrogeological assessment, last update 5th July 2018 (over a year ago) identified and assessed in detail all of the potential risks of contamination that could conceivably be associated with the proposals and explained at considerable length and with plans and diagrams the precautions that will be taken to reduce or remove the present risk of contamination of the Heath or neighbouring properties.

DRAINAGE COMMENT / QUERY TRACKER			
ITEM REF.	DOCUMENT	COMMENT	RESPONSE
FPRA xii)	Karen Beare Email 12.10.19	it goes without saying the deep swale, along with further permanent excavations for two new underground tanks (and associated pipes and engineering), will decimate any tree RP As that have been lucky enough to survive the original clearance. The suggestion that large trees can be planted along the boundary with the Heath to screen plots 4 & 5, where there is now to be an extensive deep swale is, quite frankly, laughable.	The tanks will be located outside the root protection areas and will be deep enough to allow new trees to be planted above. The swale will be hand-dug within root protection areas to avoid any damage to roots it will be back-filled with free-draining material and will allow infiltration into the ground. The proposed hedge and tree planting will be located alongside the swale.
FPRA xiii)	Karen Beare Email 12.10.19	Exactly how cars to and from the Water House will interact with this extensive swale (beside the Lane narrowing it further and under the Lane risking subsidence) has also not been addressed.	The new swale is to be positioned on private land beside the carriageway and not under the road and will not in any way restrict or affect the stability of Millfield Lane.  The CoL requested the swale to be located outside the site fencing, so that it could be more easily maintained from Millfield Lane. Again, if there is now a preference for a different arrangement then this can be accommodated.
FPRA xiv)	Karen Beare Email 12.10.19	In addition to all these points, ABA also t1ags land drainage around plots 1, 2 & 3 petering out in the area of the reinstated orchard, which is not a sensible proposal as it poses a high risk of these orchard trees developing root rot and dying.	The surface water from the area of Plots 1 to 3 will be directed towards the pond in order to preserve the existing situation. Ideally the orchard area will receive exactly the same amount of water as at present. The drainage system will allow water to re-infiltrate the ground and as at present make its way towards the pond through the uppermost layers of soil.

DRAINAGE COMMENT / QUERY TRACKER			
ITEM REF.	DOCUMENT	COMMENT	RESPONSE
NP Page 1 Para 3)	Nexus Planning Letter 21.10.19  for  City of London Corporation	Whilst these representations relate solely to the recently submitted flood and drainage information, the City Corporation would still like to take this opportunity to reiterate that the concerns previously expressed in the representations made to the Council by Nexus Planning on behalf of the City Corporation on 17 December 2018 (enclosed at Appendix A) and 02 July 2019 (enclosed at Appendix B) still stand.	The Nexus Planning letters of 17 <sup>th</sup> December 2018 and 2 <sup>nd</sup> July 2019 have already been comprehensively addressed.



## DRAINAGE COMMENT / QUERY TRACKER

ITEM REF.	DOCUMENT	COMMENT	RESPONSE
<p>NP            Page 2            Para 3)</p>	<p>Nexus Planning Letter 21.10.19            for            City of London Corporation</p>	<p>First and foremost, the City Corporation would like to object to the claims made within Coyle Kennedy's Drainage Report that the City Corporation consented to the discharge proposal to Hampstead Heath.</p> <p>Specifically, the Drainage Report indicates that the Superintendent of Hampstead Heath agreed on 10 May 2018 that a new pipe could be installed from the attenuation tank and swale beneath the road to an outfall, with a stone diffuser, in the nature reserve on Hampstead Heath. This is not the case. Whilst these representations relate solely to the recently submitted flood and drainage information, the City Corporation would still like to take this opportunity to reiterate that the concerns previously expressed in the representations made to the Council by Nexus Planning on behalf of the City Corporation on 17 December 2018 (enclosed at Appendix A) and 02 July 2019 (enclosed at Appendix B) still stand.</p>	<p>We met on Bob Warnock of the City of London (and his then Hydrology advisor) on 1st May 2018 and discussed how best to deal with the water that runs across Millfield Lane.</p> <p>I think we mistakenly understood at the time that the CoL were indicating a preference that they wished to see it removed and dealt with by means of a pipe installed under the carriageway of the lane.</p> <p>On 4th October 2018 we re-iterated to the CoL that we had no strong feelings on the matter but wished to accommodate whichever of the following options the CoL felt to be the most appropriate. 1) Leave as is 2) Replace with a pipe or 3) Replace with a more formal surface stone/concrete "ford/channel".</p> <p>Unfortunately, the CoL were unable to provide any clarification but have since indicated that they have commissioned an independent hydrological consultant.</p> <p>On 26th October 2018 the CoL wrote that they would not support a request to discharge water onto the Heath, but again were unable to clarify what they wished to happen with the existing discharge. However, it would seem somewhat unlikely that the historic discharge of an ancient watercourse would require CoL permission to flow. (Not the least because the flow must be seen as an important contribution to the wetland area of the nature reserve, and, ultimately, to the Highgate Pond chain.)</p>

DRAINAGE COMMENT / QUERY TRACKER			
ITEM REF.	DOCUMENT	COMMENT	RESPONSE
NP Page 2 Para 4)	Nexus Planning Letter 21.10.19 for City of London Corporation	The Superintendent attended a site meeting 01 May 2018 with the applicant's planning consultant and engineer, and received a briefing on the proposed drainage arrangements. However, no agreement was reached nor consent given at this time. Furthermore, the Superintendent attended the Neighbours Consultation on the evening of 07 June 2018. Following this meeting, the superintendent wrote to the applicant, Mr Springer, to confirm that City Corporation would not consent to the drainage proposal, specifically stating "in relation to the primary principles of the 1871 Hampstead Heath Act, the City Corporation would not permit a third party consent to construct drains or connections across the Heath".	No drains or connection are planned across the Heath

## DRAINAGE COMMENT / QUERY TRACKER

ITEM REF.	DOCUMENT	COMMENT	RESPONSE
<p>NP Page 2 Para 5)</p>	<p>Nexus Planning Letter 21.10.19  for City of London Corporation</p>	<p>We would like to emphasise to the Council that in accordance with the Hampstead Heath Act 1871, any encroachment into the Heath, including drains or connections, would require consent from the City Corporation. The City Corporation is not supportive of the drainage proposal indicated for Application No. 2018/3672/P and would not consent to this encroachment into the Heath. As such, the currently proposed drainage solution is considered to be unfeasible, because without the City Corporation's consent, it cannot be lawfully be constructed.</p>	<p>On 26th October 2018 the CoL wrote that they would not support a request to discharge water onto the Heath, but were unable to clarify what they wished to happen with the existing discharge.</p> <p>It does seem somewhat unlikely that the continued discharge of an historic watercourse will require CoL permission, because the flow is an important contribution to the wetland area of the nature reserve, and, ultimately, to the Highgate Pond chain beyond.</p>

## DRAINAGE COMMENT / QUERY TRACKER

ITEM REF.	DOCUMENT	COMMENT	RESPONSE
NP Page 2 Para 6)	<p>Nexus Planning Letter 21.10.19</p> <p>for</p> <p>City of London Corporation</p>	<p>Furthermore, the proposed encroachment into the Heath is in direct conflict with Policy A2 of the Camden Local Plan (2017). Policy A2 (Open Space) states that "The Council will protect, enhance and improve access to Camden's parks, open spaces and other green infrastructure". Policy A2 also requires the Council to resist development which would be detrimental to the setting of designated open spaces, such as Hampstead Heath.</p> <p>It is considered that drainage solution put forward by the applicant, which seeks to discharge into the Heath, would be contrary to Policy A2 insofar as it does not protect or enhance Hampstead Heath, and would be detrimental to its setting.</p>	<p>There is to be no encroachment into the Heath. From the very outset of planning, this development has been designed to recognise, protect, enhance and improve the local environment and in particular Hampstead Heath.</p> <p>There is no plan to alter the means of discharge to the Heath unless requested to do so by CoL. The scheme design has gone to great lengths to conserve and preserve the existing pattern of drainage. On the contrary, if this important discharge is not carefully maintained, the wetland nature reserve could be threatened.</p>

DRAINAGE COMMENT / QUERY TRACKER			
ITEM REF.	DOCUMENT	COMMENT	RESPONSE
NP Page 3 Para 1)	Nexus Planning Letter 21.10.19  for  City of London Corporation	As noted, these representations are supported by a letter prepared by Alan Baxter Associates (Appendix C), which raises several concerns (points b – g) regarding the technical aspects of the Applicant's Drainage Report and the response to the Camden LLFA. The City Corporation reiterates all concerns raised within this letter, and trusts that Camden Council will investigate the issues raised in the Alan Baxter Associates letter fully.	These concerns have all been individually addressed above

## DRAINAGE COMMENT / QUERY TRACKER

ITEM REF.	DOCUMENT	COMMENT	RESPONSE
NP Page 3 Para 2)	Nexus Planning Letter 21.10.19  for  City of London Corporation	Point f from the Alan Baxter Associates letter is of particular concern to the City Corporation, and is discussed in further detail here. As noted at point f, the application site's predominantly natural environment would be altered significantly by the proposal. Specifically, the development proposal will result in considerable changes to the application site, with the existing garden area becoming overly engineered with various drainage solutions. As a result it is considered that discharge volumes are likely to increase, with flow on effects to Hampstead Heath, including potential contamination risks.	Great lengths have been taken to preserve the existing surface and groundwater regime. There will be no significant increase in the amount of water being discharged to the Heath.  Great care has also been taken to reduce the current risk of contamination reaching the Highgate Ponds from that which currently exists. All potentially contaminated water is being separated off from that which is clean and is being diverted to the sewer via interceptors, allowing only assuredly clean water into the pond system and thereby ultimately to the Heath .
NP Page 3 Para 3)	Nexus Planning Letter 21.10.19  for  City of London Corporation	The application site is located in close proximity to a number of ponds within Hampstead Heath. Specifically, the site is located approximately 85 metres from the Bird Sanctuary Pond and 90 metres from the Kenwood Ladies' Bathing Pond. In addition, the site is also within close proximity to the chain of ponds further south, including Model Boating Pond, Highgate Men's Bathing Pond and Highgate No 1 Pond, which together form the Highgate chain of ponds.	Noted. From the very outset of planning, this development has been designed to recognise, protect, enhance and improve the local environment and in particular the adjoining areas of Hampstead Heath.  It should be recognised that the Kenwood Ladies Bathing Pond per se has nothing to do with this application as it lies significantly upgradient of the site.

## DRAINAGE COMMENT / QUERY TRACKER

ITEM REF.	DOCUMENT	COMMENT	RESPONSE
<p>NP            Page 3            Para 4)</p>	<p>Nexus            Planning            Letter            21.10.19            for            City of London            Corporation</p>	<p>Contamination concerns associated with the drainage solutions could have detrimental impacts for the Hampstead Heath Ponds. It is of the utmost importance to the City Corporation that potential impacts on hydrology are addressed comprehensively, given the significant harm that disruption to, and contamination of, the hydrology in the area could have on the Bird Sanctuary and the Kenwood Ladies' Bathing Pond which, with their associated habitats, form probably the most important area for wildlife on the whole of Hampstead Heath. A detailed account of the important habitats within the Heath and the wildlife that resides in them was included in our original representations letter (December 2018).</p>	<p>The submitted hydrological &amp; hydrogeological assessment, last update 5th July 2018 (over a year ago) identified and assessed in detail all of the potential risks of contamination that could conceivably be associated with the proposals and explained at considerable length and with plans and diagrams the precautions that will be taken to reduce or remove the present risk of any contamination of the Heath or neighbouring properties.</p> <p>The Kenwood Ladies Bathing Pond per se has nothing to do with this application as it is significantly upgradient of the site.</p>

## DRAINAGE COMMENT / QUERY TRACKER

ITEM REF.	DOCUMENT	COMMENT	RESPONSE
NP Page 3 Para 5)	Nexus Planning Letter 21.10.19  for  City of London Corporation	For these reasons, the City Corporation considers that that proposal is contradictory to Priority 1 of the Hampstead Heath Management Strategy (2018), as it would not maintain the natural habitats of the Heath, as well as being contrary to Policy A3 (Biodiversity) of the Camden Local Plan, as they do not protect Hampstead Heath, which includes sites in nature conservation and of valuable biodiversity.	From the very outset of planning, this development has been designed to recognise, protect, enhance and improve the natural habitats and biodiversity of the Heath.
NP Page 3 Para 6)	Nexus Planning Letter 21.10.19  for  City of London Corporation	The City Corporation objects to the application due to the potentially adverse impacts that the proposed development may have on Hampstead Heath, and particularly the Bird Sanctuary Pond and Kenwood Ladies' Pond.	This is an exemplar scheme that has been developed around a desire to remove existing contamination risks to the Heath and to enhance the ecology through removing habitat barriers, broadening accessibility of wildlife to and from the adjacent Heath nature reserve and the Bird Sanctuary Pond beyond. There can be no adverse impact upon the Kenwood Ladies Bathing pond as it is situated upgradient of the watercourse.



DRAINAGE COMMENT / QUERY TRACKER			
ITEM REF.	DOCUMENT	COMMENT	RESPONSE
NP Page 3 Para 7)	Nexus Planning Letter 21.10.19  for  City of London Corporation	As noted within these representations, the City Corporation does not support the proposed discharge to Hampstead Heath, and would not permit a third party consent to construct drains or connections across the Heath. The proposal is considered to conflict with Policies A2 and A3 of the Camden Local Plan 2017 in this regard.	There is no plan to alter the existing discharge to the Heath unless requested to do so by CoL. The scheme design has gone to great lengths to conserve and preserve the existing pattern of drainage. On the contrary, if this important discharge is not carefully maintained, the wetland nature reserve could be threatened.  There are no plans to construct drains or sewers on the Heath, or to make new connections to the existing drains or sewers beneath the Heath..
NP Page 4 Para 1)	Nexus Planning Letter 21.10.19  for  City of London Corporation	Additionally, the City Corporation reiterates the concerns raised by Alan Baxter Associates in their letter dated 11 October 2019, which is enclosed at Appendix C. It is respectfully requested that Camden Council fully investigate all matters raised in this correspondence.	These concerns have all been individually addressed above

## DRAINAGE COMMENT / QUERY TRACKER

ITEM REF.	DOCUMENT	COMMENT	RESPONSE
NP Page 4 Para 2)	Nexus Planning Letter 21.10.19  for City of London Corporation	Furthermore, the City Corporation is very concerned that the proposal has the potential to contaminate the Hampstead Heath chain of ponds, which would have detrimental impacts for the natural habitats of the Heath. Accordingly, the proposed development is contrary to Policy A3 of the Camden Local Plan 2017.	The submitted hydrological & hydrogeological assessment, last update 5th July 2018 (over a year ago) identified and assessed in detail all of the potential risks of contamination that could conceivably be associated with the development proposals and explained at considerable length and with plans and diagrams the precautions that will be taken to reduce or remove the present risk of contamination of the natural habitats of Heath.
NP Page 4 Para 3)	Nexus Planning Letter 21.10.19  for City of London Corporation	Finally, no other changes have been made to the proposal, nor any additional materials submitted, since our previous representations were made, and therefore the concerns raised in these letters still stand. We therefore ask that Camden Council not only pay due consideration to the concerns raised in this letter, but also to those raised in our previous letters dated 17 December 2018 and 02 July 2019, which has been included at Appendix A and B for ease of reference, and that the application is not determined until these concerns have been satisfactorily addressed.	The Nexus Planning letters of 17 <sup>th</sup> December 2018 and 2 <sup>nd</sup> July 2019 have already been comprehensively addressed.