

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/2452/P	Lucy Zanetti	23/07/2022 16:19:02	OBJ	Regarding the Ladies' pond in particular, is the steward's hut additional to the storage shed mentioned in the access statement? The existing steward's hut and barriers cause difficulties for those with disabilities, the proposal is no better. In the drawings, existing and proposed, the aforementioned hut looks to be behind the fence, but it is encroaching on the pathway as we can see in the photos. The hut is basically a paybooth that contradicts the ethos of the space and has resulted in much disappointment for the swimmers. These swimming spots in London are unique, it is our duty to retain them thus. The City of London Corporation proposals are eroding the natural environment and spoiling the joy of swimming on the heath. The 2m fence along the back of the pond is an eyesore. The existing fence and gate is ample, even before, without the ugly barriers slung up now, it is rare that people would come in over the locked back gate. Extending the fence to 2m creates something that looks like a prison camp, not a natural swimming spot. Before we know it they will be adding a 2m fence all around the pond and probably around the boating lake and any other pond on the heath. The user group has not been consulted on the fence or the shed (steward's hut?) and I would suggest that Camden Council carefully reviews this application in line with its own good policies regarding inclusion, SINC and Metropolitan Open Land policies. I object to this proposal.
2022/2452/P	Lucy Zanetti	23/07/2022 16:19:07	OBJ	Regarding the Ladies' pond in particular, is the steward's hut additional to the storage shed mentioned in the access statement? The existing steward's hut and barriers cause difficulties for those with disabilities, the proposal is no better. In the drawings, existing and proposed, the aforementioned hut looks to be behind the fence, but it is encroaching on the pathway as we can see in the photos. The hut is basically a paybooth that contradicts the ethos of the space and has resulted in much disappointment for the swimmers. These swimming spots in London are unique, it is our duty to retain them thus. The City of London Corporation proposals are eroding the natural environment and spoiling the joy of swimming on the heath. The 2m fence along the back of the pond is an eyesore. The existing fence and gate is ample, even before, without the ugly barriers slung up now, it is rare that people would come in over the locked back gate. Extending the fence to 2m creates something that looks like a prison camp, not a natural swimming spot. Before we know it they will be adding a 2m fence all around the pond and probably around the boating lake and any other pond on the heath. The user group has not been consulted on the fence or the shed (steward's hut?) and I would suggest that Camden Council carefully reviews this application in line with its own good policies regarding inclusion, SINC and Metropolitan Open Land policies. I object to this proposal.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/2452/P	Ruth Petrie	22/07/2022 11:19:39	PETITNOBJ E	<p>I am appalled to learn that the City of London is now proposing to erect a permanent stewards hut near the entrance area of the Ladies Pond.</p> <p>The proposed permanent stewards hut will harm the natural aspect of the Heath which the City of London is obliged to maintain under the 1871 Hampstead Heath Act, and it will create an ugly approach to the Ladies Pond.</p> <p>The permanent stewards hut will further enforce social and financial exclusion at the Ladies Pond which should be of concern to Camden Council. Access to the bathing ponds on the common land of Hampstead Heath was entirely free until 2005 and based on voluntary charges until 2020. The Heath is being monetised increasingly and this creates exclusion in the borough. This appears to contravene the aims of the Camden Local Plan.</p> <p>I understand that the City of London did not consult the user group, the KLPA, about the erection of a stewards hut, and only admitted to it reluctantly when details were seen in committee papers by KLPA members. This appears to breach Camden's policy on pre-application consultation.</p> <p>The proposed new fence and gate are yet another indication of the mismanagement of the Heath. There is absolutely no need for a higher fence and gate, which would simply increase the overall sense that the Heath is being turned into a closed, private domain, subject to endless unnecessary and intrusive rules.</p> <p>The City of London did not consult the user group, the KLPA, about the rebuilding of the rear fence and gate, which has only been made explicit in the planning application registered on 11 July 2022. This appears to breach Camden's policy on pre-application consultation.</p> <p>The proposed new fence and gate will have a significant visual impact facing onto the main body of Hampstead Heath, giving a fortified appearance. This goes against the requirements of the 1871 Hampstead Heath Act to preserve the natural aspect of the Heath. Such a fence will be ugly and intrusive.</p>
2022/2452/P	Charles Marks	22/07/2022 12:27:04	SUPPRT	<p>As a daily swimmer on the heath for the past 5 years or so, I fully support this application which appears to improve the available facilities by improving accessibility and safety/security for those swimming and working on the sites.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/2452/P	Ruth Petrie	22/07/2022 11:19:57	PETITNOBJ E	<p>I am appalled to learn that the City of London is now proposing to erect a permanent stewards hut near the entrance area of the Ladies Pond.</p> <p>The proposed permanent stewards hut will harm the natural aspect of the Heath which the City of London is obliged to maintain under the 1871 Hampstead Heath Act, and it will create an ugly approach to the Ladies Pond.</p> <p>The permanent stewards hut will further enforce social and financial exclusion at the Ladies Pond which should be of concern to Camden Council. Access to the bathing ponds on the common land of Hampstead Heath was entirely free until 2005 and based on voluntary charges until 2020. The Heath is being monetised increasingly and this creates exclusion in the borough. This appears to contravene the aims of the Camden Local Plan.</p> <p>I understand that the City of London did not consult the user group, the KLPA, about the erection of a stewards hut, and only admitted to it reluctantly when details were seen in committee papers by KLPA members. This appears to breach Camden's policy on pre-application consultation.</p> <p>The proposed new fence and gate are yet another indication of the mismanagement of the Heath. There is absolutely no need for a higher fence and gate, which would simply increase the overall sense that the Heath is being turned into a closed, private domain, subject to endless unnecessary and intrusive rules.</p> <p>The City of London did not consult the user group, the KLPA, about the rebuilding of the rear fence and gate, which has only been made explicit in the planning application registered on 11 July 2022. This appears to breach Camden's policy on pre-application consultation.</p> <p>The proposed new fence and gate will have a significant visual impact facing onto the main body of Hampstead Heath, giving a fortified appearance. This goes against the requirements of the 1871 Hampstead Heath Act to preserve the natural aspect of the Heath. Such a fence will be ugly and intrusive.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/2452/P	Ruth Petrie	22/07/2022 11:19:54	PETITNOBJ E	<p>I am appalled to learn that the City of London is now proposing to erect a permanent stewards hut near the entrance area of the Ladies Pond.</p> <p>The proposed permanent stewards hut will harm the natural aspect of the Heath which the City of London is obliged to maintain under the 1871 Hampstead Heath Act, and it will create an ugly approach to the Ladies Pond.</p> <p>The permanent stewards hut will further enforce social and financial exclusion at the Ladies Pond which should be of concern to Camden Council. Access to the bathing ponds on the common land of Hampstead Heath was entirely free until 2005 and based on voluntary charges until 2020. The Heath is being monetised increasingly and this creates exclusion in the borough. This appears to contravene the aims of the Camden Local Plan.</p> <p>I understand that the City of London did not consult the user group, the KLPA, about the erection of a stewards hut, and only admitted to it reluctantly when details were seen in committee papers by KLPA members. This appears to breach Camden's policy on pre-application consultation.</p> <p>The proposed new fence and gate are yet another indication of the mismanagement of the Heath. There is absolutely no need for a higher fence and gate, which would simply increase the overall sense that the Heath is being turned into a closed, private domain, subject to endless unnecessary and intrusive rules.</p> <p>The City of London did not consult the user group, the KLPA, about the rebuilding of the rear fence and gate, which has only been made explicit in the planning application registered on 11 July 2022. This appears to breach Camden's policy on pre-application consultation.</p> <p>The proposed new fence and gate will have a significant visual impact facing onto the main body of Hampstead Heath, giving a fortified appearance. This goes against the requirements of the 1871 Hampstead Heath Act to preserve the natural aspect of the Heath. Such a fence will be ugly and intrusive.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/2452/P	Ruth Petrie	22/07/2022 11:19:42	PETITNOBJ E	<p>I am appalled to learn that the City of London is now proposing to erect a permanent stewards hut near the entrance area of the Ladies Pond.</p> <p>The proposed permanent stewards hut will harm the natural aspect of the Heath which the City of London is obliged to maintain under the 1871 Hampstead Heath Act, and it will create an ugly approach to the Ladies Pond.</p> <p>The permanent stewards hut will further enforce social and financial exclusion at the Ladies Pond which should be of concern to Camden Council. Access to the bathing ponds on the common land of Hampstead Heath was entirely free until 2005 and based on voluntary charges until 2020. The Heath is being monetised increasingly and this creates exclusion in the borough. This appears to contravene the aims of the Camden Local Plan.</p> <p>I understand that the City of London did not consult the user group, the KLPA, about the erection of a stewards hut, and only admitted to it reluctantly when details were seen in committee papers by KLPA members. This appears to breach Camden's policy on pre-application consultation.</p> <p>The proposed new fence and gate are yet another indication of the mismanagement of the Heath. There is absolutely no need for a higher fence and gate, which would simply increase the overall sense that the Heath is being turned into a closed, private domain, subject to endless unnecessary and intrusive rules.</p> <p>The City of London did not consult the user group, the KLPA, about the rebuilding of the rear fence and gate, which has only been made explicit in the planning application registered on 11 July 2022. This appears to breach Camden's policy on pre-application consultation.</p> <p>The proposed new fence and gate will have a significant visual impact facing onto the main body of Hampstead Heath, giving a fortified appearance. This goes against the requirements of the 1871 Hampstead Heath Act to preserve the natural aspect of the Heath. Such a fence will be ugly and intrusive.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/2452/P	Maisie Lawrence	22/07/2022 13:35:05	INT	<p>There is no Equality Impact Assessment included in a planning application which is supposed to be about improving accessibility to the Hampstead Heath bathing ponds. The planning application 2022/2452/P in respect of the Ladies' Pond focuses on "security" and infrastructure used to enforce payment by swimmers but much of the accompanying documentation still appears to highlight improved accessibility. This is misleading.</p> <p>I am particularly concerned about the accessibility of the buildings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Ladies' Pond buildings went up in 2016 with planning permission from Camden Council, but they were non-compliant for disability access. The City of London ignored feedback from users and lifeguards at the time. A report commissioned by the City of London in 2018 confirmed the non-compliance and recommended building a new section to house compliant WC and shower facilities. The City of London is instead going for the cheaper option of carving out an accessible WC-shower room in the existing building's spaces. I would like this done properly instead. The City of London is planning to make adaptations to the changing room buildings before addressing the underlying damp and drainage issues. This will be self-defeating as any adaptations are likely to fail if these problems are not resolved first. The buildings are likely to remain non-compliant if these adaptations fail. This appears to breach the aims of the Camden Local Plan in respect of accessibility. Fundamental problems with drainage and damp still need to be addressed properly, and currently put both staff and swimmers at risk e.g. through the presence of black mould. Perhaps you'd like to get your environmental inspectors in. It looks like the proposed new WC-shower room will still not comply with Changing Spaces standards. The plans submitted with the application are ambiguous about any measurements. The combined WC-shower will reduce availability of an accessible toilet when in use as a shower and changing room. This is totally unacceptable. The planned grab rails in one of the existing cubicles of the main toilet block will be of limited use, and will not meet accessibility standards. Overall, the failure to address accessibility in a logical manner appears to be a breach of the requirements of the Camden Local Plan in respect of planning applications. A test of relevance was not produced before any consultation with user groups, about adaptations to the building. Then no test of relevance or Equality Impact Assessment is included with the planning application 2022/2452/P, despite a claim that a significant part of the works across the Heath being to improve disability access. <p>Rear Fence and Gate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The City of London did not consult the user group, the KLPA, about the rebuilding of the rear fence and gate, which has only been made explicit in the planning application registered on 11 July 2022. This appears to breach Camden's policy on pre-application consultation. The proposed new fence and gate will have a significant visual impact facing onto the main body of

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>Hampstead Heath, giving a fortified appearance. This goes against the requirements of the 1871 Hampstead Heath Act to preserve the natural aspect of the Heath. Such a fence will be ugly and intrusive.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was an entrance at the back for years which was significantly closer to home for many swimmers, cutting about 20 minutes off their walk. The City of London should re-instate this entrance instead of closing it off.
2022/2452/P	Ruth Petrie	22/07/2022 11:19:36	PETITNOBJE	<p>I am appalled to learn that the City of London is now proposing to erect a permanent stewards' hut near the entrance area of the Ladies Pond.</p> <p>The proposed permanent stewards' hut will harm the natural aspect of the Heath which the City of London is obliged to maintain under the 1871 Hampstead Heath Act, and it will create an ugly approach to the Ladies Pond.</p> <p>The permanent stewards' hut will further enforce social and financial exclusion at the Ladies Pond which should be of concern to Camden Council. Access to the bathing ponds on the common land of Hampstead Heath was entirely free until 2005 and based on voluntary charges until 2020. The Heath is being monetised increasingly and this creates exclusion in the borough. This appears to contravene the aims of the Camden Local Plan.</p> <p>I understand that the City of London did not consult the user group, the KLPA, about the erection of a stewards' hut, and only admitted to it reluctantly when details were seen in committee papers by KLPA members. This appears to breach Camden's policy on pre-application consultation.</p> <p>The proposed new fence and gate are yet another indication of the mismanagement of the Heath. There is absolutely no need for a higher fence and gate, which would simply increase the overall sense that the Heath is being turned into a closed, private domain, subject to endless unnecessary and intrusive rules.</p> <p>The City of London did not consult the user group, the KLPA, about the rebuilding of the rear fence and gate, which has only been made explicit in the planning application registered on 11 July 2022. This appears to breach Camden's policy on pre-application consultation.</p> <p>The proposed new fence and gate will have a significant visual impact facing onto the main body of Hampstead Heath, giving a fortified appearance. This goes against the requirements of the 1871 Hampstead Heath Act to preserve the natural aspect of the Heath. Such a fence will be ugly and intrusive.</p>