



Ponds Project Stakeholder Group

Monday 18 March 2013, 6.00pm
Parliament Hill meeting room

Present:

Ian Harrison	IH	Vale of Health Society (Chairman)
Jeremy Simons	JLS	City of London (Deputy Chairman)
Karen Beare	KB	Fitzroy Park RA
Tom Brent	TB	South End Green
Mary Cane	MC	Kenwood Ladies Pond Association
Rachel Douglas	RD	Mixed Pond Association
Michael Hammerson	MH	Highgate Society
Harriet King	HK	Brookfield Mansions RA
Simon Lee	SL	Superintendent, Hampstead Heath
Charles Leonard	CL	Oak Village RA
Mary Port	MP	Dartmouth Park CAAC
Ellin Stein	ES	Mansfield CAAC
Robert Sutherland-Smith	RSS	Highgate Men's Pond Association
Peter Wilder	PW	Strategic Landscape Architect, Wilder Associates
Jeremy Wright	JW	Heath & Hampstead Society
Jennifer Wood	JMW	Communication Officer, City of London (notes)

Alternate members observing

Harley Atkinson	HA	Fitzroy Park RA
Mary Cane	MC	Kenwood Ladies Pond Association
Tony Gilchick	TG	Heath & Hampstead Society
Ed Reynolds	ER	Oak Village RA
Susan Rose	SR	Highgate Society

Atkins

Andy Hughes	AH	Panel Engineer
Tony Bruggemann	TB	Principle Engineer on Ponds Project, Atkins

City of London (CoL) officers observing:

Richard Chamberlain	RC	Senior Project Liaison Officer, City Surveyors
Declan Gallagher	DG	Operations Service Manager, Hampstead Heath
Paul Monaghan	PM	Assistant Director Engineering
Peter Snowdon	PS	Projects Director, City Surveyor's Department
Peter Young	PY	Corporate Property Director

1. Apologies

Marc Hutchinson	Highgate Men's Pond Association
Nick Bradfield	Dartmouth Park CAAC

2. Approval of previous note and matters arising

- Note accepted as an accurate record.

3. Presentation on results of Fundamental Review or Design Flood Assessment by Dr Andy Hughes

- AH gave presentation on the findings of the Design Flood Assessment (slides to be circulated)
- He said Atkins reviewed Haycock's data, which had used bespoke methodology and was predicting high-run-off figures. Atkins have looked at different storm durations and have used industry standards for assessing hydrology and methods for analysing hydraulic methods. Their studies show lower run-off percentages and design rainfall depths resulting in lower flood peaks and potentially less intrusive work on Heath.
- But work is still required as all of the ponds can overtop even in smaller rainfall events. With earth dams (such as those on the Heath) overtopping can cause erosion and potentially lead to dam failure.
- AH said one table in the report – table 5.7 will be replaced as it is misleading as does not show effects of the chain of ponds. Updated report will be circulated.
- IH asked if the Kenwood ponds had been taken into account. AH said yes, they were included in the catchment area for Stock Pond. Table 4.1. The catchment areas are cumulative going down the pond chains.
- JW asked if upstream spills had been included. AH said yes.
- MH asked why does velocity vary so much? AH said reflection of volume of water and width of the dam and downstream slope.
- HK asked what about if the ground is dry rather than saturated? AH said they calculate with both dry and wet ground conditions (which give fairly similar results) and take worst case. The design flood is for summer event for the Heath.
- AH said the type or rainfall events we need to design against are happening with more frequency and even though peak flood is less than previously considered – risks to CoL are still unacceptable.
- AH said Model Boating Pond is a potential site for storing more water and reducing work further down the chain, as is creating a storage area at Catch-pit.
- RSS asked how much storage can be created at Model Boating Pond? AH said this is still to be calculated and there were various ways he can create more storage. He can raise dam and dig out area on west-side of the pond to get the fill to build this bigger dam. He could create a larger area for potential storage of water and allow water to spread further in a safe way during extreme rainfall events.
- HK asked what happens when the bottom pond in the chain overtops? AH said the bottom ponds will still overtop and water will pass downstream in the larger flood events, but after the work takes place the dams will not fail, which is the responsibility CoL have in meeting its legal obligations and duty of care.
- ES asked about the maps and whether they could see a map with the residential areas marked so they can see which areas the Atkins review shows too be at risk of flooding. AH said the Environment Agency have published maps but said that they were to be used with caution as they are not precise enough to show a specific address. AH said CoL had not asked for maps but they could be provided. CL and MP said they would also like to see maps; IH hoped the CoL would be able to see that such maps are provided. PM said the Haycock maps are on the website as well as the Environment Agency maps.
- It was noted that all of the stakeholders would like to see maps showing the extent of flooding. AH advised caution with mapping as it could not predict with absolute accuracy the extent of flooding.
- MH asked if the works would require cutting into the ground. AH said much of the work could take place on the surface and invasive works would be avoided where possible.
- TB said the report is clear and reassuring and asked if Atkins were looking at two 'sacrificial areas,' also were Atkins coordinating with Camden Council? AH said Atkins would get most 'bang for their buck' or best solution possible within budget.

- CL asked AH to confirm that the works on the Heath will not leave downstream communities worse off in terms of risk of being flooded downstream than current situation for all levels of storm but especially the smaller storm events, not just the ones that would threaten dam failure. AH said that works on the Heath would not make the situation worse downstream in any level of storm including the smaller flood events.
- KB asked why Haycocks infiltration figures were so much higher, and why national rainfall data had been used over local. AH said Haycock did some tests for infiltration on the Heath and assumed the whole Heath was very compacted due to high number of visitors. AH said they looked at soil results which have been gathered in 1km squares across the country. He then calculated how much of the Heath was paths to come up with their figure which is less than Haycock. As regards rainfall, it was more statistically sound to use national data sets which have more figures and from a longer duration from a larger number of rainfall gauges.
- JLS said the run-off rate depends on the rainfall event.
- IH asked if AH is confident the data takes into account the micro-climate effects. AH said the Institute of Hydrology realized there are unusual events, such as the 1975 event and the data takes this into account.
- JW said Haycock had calculated the PMF event and asked what are the comparable figures for Atkins. AH said the calculations had been made using varying durations and different rainfall events which is the correct way to make this calculation.
- JW asked how to calculate the PMF. AH said you can do this on table 4.7.
- Tony Bruggemann said Probable Maximum Precipitation was calculated using a deterministic approach by looking at meteorology and physics, not statistical.
- HK asked if possible to look at smaller events and how the sewers and drainage would cope. AH said it was complex to look at drainage and out-side the scope of this project but data from their study can be shared with Camden Council and Thames Water.
- CL asked if it was too late to for Camden Council to potentially get involved with the project to help solve their surface water problem at the same time. AH said not too late but Camden would need to move quickly.
- IH asked if maps and data could be shared with Camden. SL said this was possible.
- JS said the people who live in Camden should lobby them.
- CL said he thought more works on Heath could solve the surface water flooding.
- JS said any works on the Heath are going to raise huge objections and great care was needed in terms of what is proposed.
- JW said surrounding areas will flood in even small events.
- IH said we need to know what possible solutions look like before they can be accepted or rejected.
- CL said it would be good if CoL gave Camden all the data and the residents could encourage them to act now.
- KB said if we do the works we will be helping the situation for the residents. AH said yes but said Atkins are not there to build a surface water flood alleviation scheme for Camden and that for some the 1871 Act is likely to be a major concern.
- SL said he was aware that there were potential issues arising from the revised methods used by Atkins to determine the quantum and referred to H&HS concerns and their role in protecting the Heath.
- PW asked if the scheme was now going to cost less does that mean more for environmental improvements. SL said he needs to have that discussion with CoL.
- AH said if there is delay by a legal battle he might have to go through the legislative route and call a Section 10 as he cannot continue to continue with the liability.
- JW asked if there will be a Quantified Risk Assessment. AH said yes on situation now and on the different solutions.
- JW asked if he could submit formal queries? SL said yes and he would attach queries to paper going to HHCC and his deadline is **March 27**.

4. Consultation and Communication

- SL said he had held meeting with more groups and was attending a meeting of the Highgate Area Action Group to talk about the project.
- JMW said the website was being updated and the project name had been changed.

5. Update on programme

- Contractor will now hopefully be appointed in time for the shortlisted solutions so will be able to give a more accurate costing for the project.

6. AOB

IH noted that the HHCC meeting at 7.00pm on April 8 at the Education Centre (at the Lido) is open to the public if other SG members want to attend.

Dates for future meetings:

- Monday, 15 April
- Monday, 13 May
- Monday, 17 June
- Monday, 22 July

JMW/IH 22/03/13