

# Hampstead Heath Ponds Project

## Information Giving and Consultation

### 26 November 2013 – 17 February 2014

## Report

---

### Executive Summary

#### Purpose

This report covers the main findings from a non-statutory process of information giving and consultation (which ran from 26 November 2013 – 17 February 2014, i.e. 12 weeks) carried out as part of the Hampstead Heath Ponds Project with support from Resources for Change ([www.r4c.org.uk](http://www.r4c.org.uk)), a specialist engagement organisation employed by the City of London to offer expert and independent advice.

There were two parts to the process which were:

- Information giving: To raise awareness of the project among a wide range of Heath users and local residents.
- Consultation: To gather feedback from the public to inform the option selection process for the project.

#### Background

The ponds on Hampstead Heath are all man-made. They were built as reservoirs for drinking water around 300 years ago and are fed by natural springs. There are substantial dams on most of Hampstead Heath's ponds and most of these are made of earth. Over the years, the ponds have been constantly maintained and some of the dams have been reinforced with concrete and metal sheet piling.

Although there are around thirty ponds on the Heath, this project focuses on eleven, which form two 'chains' of ponds: the Highgate chain and Hampstead chain.

The Hampstead Heath Ponds Project is intended to meet the City of London's legal obligations to improve the safety of dams in both the Hampstead and Highgate chains of ponds to prevent them from failing in extreme rainfall and major storms, whilst maintaining the natural environment.

Two options for the works were produced for each chain of ponds. These options have been produced in consultation with the Ponds Project Stakeholder Group (formed of local amenity and residents' groups), with advice from environmental specialists such as ecologists, landscape architects, heritage experts and water quality experts.

### **Consultation Purpose**

The consultation was to get views on the two options for each chain of ponds considered by engineering consultants Atkins, engaged by the City of London to provide the best solution to the problem. Each chain of ponds has been considered as a whole system. Water flows down through the ponds from the top pond to the bottom pond and eventually off the Heath. This means that any work done to a pond affects all of the ponds below that pond in the chain.

All the options reduce flooding downstream. New temporary water storage areas will be created in the middle of each pond chain to control flooding. Raising the heights of some dams and building a new dam will be done to create these storage areas. Floodwater will then be stored temporarily in the ponds in the centre of each chain.

It was decided early on that increased storage of water should be focussed on those ponds that are in less sensitive locations, in order to limit the visual impacts and tree loss elsewhere.

After the flood has passed, the stored water will be released into the River Fleet tunnel system. This is a tunnel that runs under the city and carries the old river. The excess flood water in the biggest floods will pass along open shallow grassed overflow channels called spillways, which are designed to pass floodwater safely around or over a dam. By storing more water in the ponds, the speed and volume of this excess floodwater will be less, and there will be less risk of damage to the dams.

### **Who Was Informed and Who Responded?**

The consultation and information giving has successfully raised awareness of the Ponds Project and a large number of people have been informed about the proposed work.

During the 12 weeks of the process, a huge amount of information was disseminated through Displays on the Heath (over 4000 people face to face) and personnel giving out information on the street (over 800 people face-to-face), information in local newspapers (joint circulation of 120,000 readers) and web site information, direct postal mailing (over 79,000 households and businesses), emailing community and residents' groups and individuals, guided walks, distribution of many posters and postcards, use of social media and the production of a short video (receiving over 500 viewings). This ensured a large number of people were made aware of the project and given an opportunity to respond.

Many people did not respond. It may be, for example, because the project is not an important issue for them or that they have no particular views on the project. Others visited one of the two Heath displays or met staff giving out information on the street, to get more details, or to deal with a particular point or concern.

The comments made at the Heath displays were all recorded (approximately 1000 comments) and over 1000 people completed one of the more detailed questionnaires. It was observed by the staff manning the Heath Displays and by the consultation team when speaking to people on the street, that many of those people who were positive or had no particular view did not complete a full questionnaire. Those making the effort to complete a detailed questionnaire tended to be more representative of the people with a strong concern or view. Resources for Change have found that this is very common for this type of consultation.

Based on the comments and discussions made at the Heath displays, non-responses would appear to be due to:

- Just being interested and having nothing to say
- Feeling they do not understand or know enough to be able to make an informed comment
- Feeling the work is appropriate and needed and do not have any specific comments
- Not being interested.

### The Responses

Based on the numbers who wished to respond there is a strong body of concern against the whole project. The main concerns are primarily from people who live close to the Heath and / or are regular users.

Much of this dissatisfaction is common to the works being done at all, rather than directed at specific options. However, there are also a significant number of respondents who see the work positively, not only on the basis of reduction of dam failure risk and /or safety benefits, but also as an opportunity to improve the Heath and its ponds, especially for wildlife.

In broad terms for those dissatisfied with the project overall, the key issues are with regard to increases in dam height, disruption to, and negative impacts on, the Heath's amenity (particularly referring to swimmers), the landscape and to wildlife.

Many of these respondents also challenge the need and justification for the work. These challenges are mainly based on the following concerns:

- Legal justification
- Engineering justification
- Quality of data being used and / or the modelling
- That alternative water management options to dams should be considered
- That water management should be dealt with downstream (mainly through sewer and drain improvements)
- That water management for the area should be part of a more holistic approach, working beyond the boundaries of the Heath.
- Mistrust of the City of London its advisors and the engineers
- A belief that engineering is not the solution and the focus should be on emergency response.

There are a number of alternative options suggested which have been given to the engineers for consideration and are summarised in this report.

Those comments from people who say that they live in the downstream area in potentially impacted communities are more often in favour of the project based on the improved safety provided. There are a further number of people who feel that the proposed works could create an opportunity for enhancements to the Heath, especially for wildlife.

Some respondents challenge that the City of London is behaving appropriately and the more extreme views suggest conspiracy and / or illegal activity. There are also many who express trust in the City of London to 'do the right thing', the quality of the engineers and /or their work and the quality of information they have provided.

Views on the information giving and consultation process are also mixed; along with a large body of opinion commenting on the good quality of the consultation approach there are also many others that challenge the narrow scope of the consultation and the limited options. Similarly, the views on the quality of information provided vary from very positive to very negative.

### **Informing Options Preference**

Of the comments made on the Preferred Options for the Ponds Project, a limited number are specific in relation to option choice or their design elements. Many more are common to both options for both pond chains.

Views on all the individual options are a mix of positive and negative responses. There is no significant preference between the options for either pond chain, though the comments do give a clearer picture of which issues are important to the public in making the final decision.

So, the comments do help to inform a set of design criteria which would include:

- Preference for earth banks over walls
- Preference for natural style landscaping of dams and features over 'man-made' constructions
- Paths to have proper surfacing
- Access and safety of children and families needs to be shown, especially, but not exclusively for the Model Boating Pond
- The need to maintain the present visual rural / countryside landscape and current (or improved) amenity across the Heath
- Opportunities to create and enhance wildlife habitat should be taken where possible
- As far as possible views should be maintained.

There are then some specifics referring to the different option chains. These include the following:

#### **Highgate Options 4 and 6**

Many comments are made relating to the potential of the Model Boating Pond as providing an opportunity to work in improvements to landscape, wildlife and water quality. The specific emerging criteria for these ponds are:

- There is concern with increasing the dam height only on the Model Boating Pond rather than a more balanced approach between the ponds due to the increased visual impact.
- Landscaping works should be focused on the Model Boating Pond where landscaping can achieve positive benefit, rather than the Men's Swimming Pond where the preference is for minimal disturbance
- The island is generally favoured and that many respondents feel it should be kept free of people for wildlife
- Access for children, families and pushchairs to the Model Boating Pond needs to be clear
- Paths need to be surfaced to avoid mudding
- Spillways and other features need clarity of information or further detail.

#### **Hampstead Options M and P**

The preference within the comments for these options is less clear. The only other specific that can be derived over and above the common criteria identified above is that greater privacy could be afforded to the Mixed Bathing Pond.

### **Information Giving and Consultation Going Forward**

There are many specific requests for more detail on a number of aspects, particularly the spillways and the Catchpit.

A large number of people want to know a lot more about what will happen during the implementation of the work, how it will be managed and the impacts.

Finally, there is a request for the continuation of ongoing information sharing and dialogue opportunities.

## Contents

<b>1. Context for the Non-Statutory Information Giving and Consultation .....</b>	<b>6</b>
1.1 Purpose of the Non-Statutory Information Giving and Consultation Process.....	6
1.2 What the Information Giving Element Sought to Achieve .....	7
1.3 What the Consultation Element Sought To Achieve.....	7
1.4 Who the Information Giving and Consultation Sought to Reach .....	7
1.5 Baseline Data .....	8
<b>2. Information Giving and Consultation Methods .....</b>	<b>8</b>
2.1 Information Giving and Consultation Activities .....	9
2.2 Information Giving and Consultation Materials .....	12
<b>3. Awareness Raising Methods .....</b>	<b>13</b>
3.1 Awareness Raising Activities .....	13
3.2 Awareness Raising Materials .....	16
<b>4. The Results.....</b>	<b>16</b>
4.1 Questionnaires – Quantitative Feedback .....	18
4.1.1 Options Satisfaction .....	18
4.2 Questionnaires – Qualitative Feedback .....	19
4.2.1 Points Common to All Options.....	19
4.2.2 Highgate Chain Option 4 - Specific Points.....	22
4.2.3 Highgate Chain Option 6 - Specific Points.....	23
4.2.4 Hampstead Chain Option M - Specific Points .....	24
4.2.5 Hampstead Chain Option P - Specific Points.....	25
4.2.6 Questions .....	26
4.3 Questionnaires - Profile Information .....	26
4.4 Heath Displays - Comments .....	28
4.5 Heath Displays – Profile Information .....	31
4.6 Comments Sent by Email and Letter.....	32
<b>5. Analysis.....</b>	<b>34</b>
5.1 Challenges to the Context and Evidence for the Project .....	34
5.2 The Approach Taken to the Consultation and Information Giving.....	35
5.3 The Overall Response to the Consultation .....	35
5.4 The Consultation and Information Giving Within the Wider Context .....	36
5.5 Dam Nonsense Campaign .....	37
5.6 The Feedback .....	37
5.6.1 Option Preferences .....	38
5.6.2 Consultation and Engagement from this Point Forwards.....	39
<b>Appendix 1: Stalls at Strategic Public Locations Results Detail .....</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>Appendix 2: Highgate Option 4 Results Summary.....</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>Appendix 3: Highgate Option 6 Results Summary.....</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>Appendix 4: Hampstead Option M Results Summary .....</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Appendix 5: Hampstead Option P Results Summary.....</b>	<b>69</b>
<b>Appendix 6: Questionnaire Other Comments Results Summary.....</b>	<b>75</b>
<b>Appendix 7: Heath Displays Comments Results Summary .....</b>	<b>90</b>
<b>Appendix 8: Requests for Information and Questions Summary .....</b>	<b>96</b>
<b>Appendix 9: Postcodes Responses Detail .....</b>	<b>103</b>
<b>Appendix 10: Other Ethnic Backgrounds and Groups Detail.....</b>	<b>105</b>

## **1. Context for the Non-Statutory Information Giving and Consultation**

The Hampstead Heath Ponds Project is intended to meet the City of London's legal obligations to improve the safety of dams in both the Hampstead and Highgate chains of ponds to prevent them from failing, whilst maintaining the site's natural aspect as an open space.

This document outlines a non-statutory process of information giving and consultation carried out as part of the Ponds Project with support from Resources for Change ([www.r4c.org.uk](http://www.r4c.org.uk)), a specialist engagement organisation employed by the City of London to offer expert and independent advice.

The non-statutory process was intended to support a robust forward development of the Ponds Project, following the generation of Preferred Options for the project by the City of London's consulting engineers Atkins. It was guided by reference to the City of London's Communication and Engagement Strategy.

The Strategy provided a broad framework for the non-statutory process. The process was intended to support and compliment the range of other communication and engagement activities described in the Strategy. The Strategy's activities include the extensive and detailed engagement of the Ponds Project Stakeholder Group, which comprises local interest and residents' groups.

The non-statutory process ran from 26 November 2013 – 17 February 2014 (12 weeks). The first two weeks of the process from 26 November 2013 largely focused on information giving and consultation via online methods. This enabled the process to take account of the City of London's internal committees' approvals process, specifically the Hampstead Heath, Highgate Wood and Queen's Park Management Committee meeting of 25 November 2013.

### **1.1 Purpose of the Non-Statutory Information Giving and Consultation Process**

The City of London is proceeding with the Ponds Project on the basis that, if it does not do so, it will be legally compelled to carry out the necessary works in any event. Proceeding proactively with the Ponds Project gives the City of London maximum flexibility to carry out the works in a manner that is sympathetic to the Heath. The City of London also considers that this is ethically the right approach. Development of the engineering approach for the Ponds Project has already been progressed to the stage of Preferred Options. The approach has been developed on the basis of the need to meet the legal requirement to minimise risk while limiting the impact on the Heath and through detailed engagement with the Ponds Project Stakeholder Group. Full details of engagement with the Stakeholder Group and the previous consultative work can be found on the City of London's website ([www.cityoflondon.gov.uk/pondsproject](http://www.cityoflondon.gov.uk/pondsproject)). This means that the parameters of the consultation were limited to seeking feedback on these options only and did not include the scope to influence whether or not the project should proceed.

The primary purpose of the process therefore was information giving. This was in order to:

- Inform the public about what is being done and why
- Provide opportunities for the public to seek clarification.

The secondary purpose of the process was consultation. This was in order to:

- Provide opportunity for public comment on the Preferred Options to guide the design.

This information giving and consultation process is part of an ongoing programme of engagement by the City of London. There will still be a planning application stage when the final detailed plans are presented for approval to the London Borough of Camden, which will involve a formal statutory public consultation. In addition, the City of London intends to continue to work with the Ponds Project Stakeholder Group as it finalises the options and detailed plans and to continue to keep Heath users informed about the progress of the project and its implementation.

## **1.2 What the Information Giving Element Sought to Achieve**

The information giving was intended to raise awareness of the project among a wide range of Heath users and local residents. The Ponds Project is a significant piece of work that will have an impact on the Heath and on Heath users during its implementation. The purpose was to be open and transparent about the City of London's intentions; to generate good understanding about the rationale for the project; the principles behind it and the details of the engineering design and the associated environmental mitigation.

## **1.3 What the Consultation Element Sought To Achieve**

The consultation element sought to gather feedback from the public to inform the option selection process for the project. The intention was to gauge public feeling in reaction to the proposals; gather any indication of preference emerging towards the options for each of the pond chains; and to highlight any issues in relation to the impact of the works on the Heath that need to be taken account of by the City of London in approving or refining the options in order to address the concerns of the public.

Whilst all comments were invited and recorded, to avoid confusing the purpose of the non-statutory public consultation and / or raising unrealistic expectations the consultation did not specifically:

- Consult on the legal context. The consultation did not cover any challenge to the legality of the need to safeguard the pond dams. The process only consulted on the proposals to address the City's of London's legal obligations. It was not the intention to engage in consultation on the appropriateness or otherwise of current UK law since this would cause confusion as to the purpose and role of the consultation.
- Consult on the scientific or technical aspects. The consultation did not seek public views on the hydrology or associated modelling.

## **1.4 Who the Information Giving and Consultation Sought to Reach**

There had been significant engagement already with key stakeholders, which will continue. The purpose of this process, both its information giving and consultation, was therefore to reach out to others who may be affected and have had less involvement to date, with a focus on those with a defined interest in the issues raised by the Ponds Project work. These are identified as:

- Users of the ponds and immediate surrounds
- People living within the vicinity of pond chain areas
- Users of the Heath
- People having a specialist interest in the Heath (e.g. bird watchers)
- People in the flood risk area in the event of dam failure
- People who may potentially (or have reason to think they will) be impacted by the Ponds Project when works take place
- Members of the wider public

The non-statutory public consultation therefore focused on the following groupings identified within the City of London's Communication and Engagement Strategy. This was based on the nature of their interest in the issues raised by the ponds safeguarding work as listed above.

- Individual members of the public
- Recreational groups
- Advisory and user groups
- Neighbours and residents
- Wildlife and science groups
- Religious and ethnic groups
- Volunteers
- Local schools and youth groups
- People with local business interests

In addition to the work of this process to reach out as described above, the following groups are also relevant. These groups were either already involved or there are separate, defined mechanisms that already exist by which the City of London is able to engage them at the appropriate time.

- Hampstead Heath Consultative and Management Committees
- The Ponds Project Stakeholder Group, which has representatives from Heath user & interest groups and local residents' groups.
- City of London Staff
- Local, regional and national elected representatives
- Local Authorities with jurisdiction adjacent to the Heath
- Statutory Consultees.

## **1.5 Baseline Data**

The City's existing data was used to ensure that outreach to and coverage of the above listed groups in the roll out of the process was robust. This included:

- Contact data already supplied by individuals who have registered their interest in the Ponds Project via previous information giving and consultation exercises undertaken by the City of London.

In addition, contact data for a range of local interest, support, residential, religious and community groups including those who involve vulnerable people in the downstream area was sourced from the Camden Community Index.

## **2. Information Giving and Consultation Methods**

The topic consulted on is complicated and the level of knowledge required to gain an understanding of the project and to make an informed decision is significant. This presented a challenge for the development of information materials for the process and therefore a significant amount of effort was put into developing these. To ensure that the information given and the consultation questions asked were clear, the material developed used plain English and precise, non-ambiguous language to explain the context, situation and options. Technical terms were avoided as far as possible.

There was considerable detail available that informed the need for the project and its options development, which was too much to present in the information giving materials. However those reached by the process also needed to have easy access to all the more detailed background information, including that on the legal and scientific issues, should they wish to refer to it. This information was therefore provided via the Ponds Project pages on the City of London website.



Due to the establishment of clear design principals with the Ponds Project Stakeholder Group and the utilisation of national guidance, the two options for each pond chain were fairly similar with key differences in the lower parts of the chains. This also placed limitations on what could actually be consulted on.

The activities set out in this section were identified as the most appropriate to help ensure the public were informed and able to comment. These activities focused on those affected or potentially affected.

## **2.1 Information Giving and Consultation Activities**

### **Heath Displays at Parliament Hill and East Heath**

At Parliament Hill, a visual display, supported by the City of London's staff, was set up in a specially adapted building in the Staff Yard. The yard is located near the Parliament Hill café and pathways of high footfall. The display was made clearly visible and signposted from the path with large banners and flags.

The purpose of the display was to maximise public access to information about the project and an opportunity to give feedback on the Preferred Options at a very busy Heath location. The display and its facilities included the following material:

- Information boards which summarising the background, rationale and progress on the project to date; the options considered and what they involved. This included detailed diagrams and 'before and after' images.
- A detailed information leaflet, which encompassed the information board material on a handout for people to take away, including diagrams and before and after images.
- Questionnaires to give feedback on the options for people to fill in or take away
- A seated area with writing material where people could complete a questionnaire on the spot if they wished and a post box for questionnaires to be returned
- Postcards for people to take away, which signposted where further opportunities to get information and give feedback can be accessed.

In parallel, a caravan unit at East Heath, clearly signposted with banners and flags; encapsulating the same range of display information, supporting materials and also supported by City of London staff, was available to widen the coverage of the display facility across the Heath, particularly for the Hampstead chain of ponds.

The role of the City of London staff was to provide further explanation in support of the information materials, to answer visitors' queries and to attract people into the display. Staffing details were as follows:

- Education Rangers were allocated as the primary staff supporting the displays
- City of London officers involved in the project were used in rotation at the displays
- Both displays were double staffed whenever possible
- A duty officer who understood the project in some depth was available at the end of a phone to add support if required.

The Heath staff supporting the displays were also responsible for capturing data such as the number of visits the displays received and the quantity of information materials taken away. Not all visitors who came to the displays wished to complete a questionnaire or take one away, but they still made verbal comments about the project to the staff present. Therefore, staff also noted down the key points from these comments, in order that this verbal feedback from visitors could also be collected and acknowledged as part of this report.

To minimise the potential for bias the staff were briefed in the project purpose and clearly instructed to write down the essence of what was said without interpretation. This included an induction meeting, written instructions provided by Resources for Change, email updates throughout the process and constant monitoring/feedback from peers on the job. Judging by the range of comments recorded, both positive and negative Resources for Change is comfortable that this briefing was effective.

These facilities were open to the public from 11 December to the close of the information giving and consultation period. Opening details were as follows:

- Both displays were open on a daily basis from 10am-3pm
- The Parliament Hill display was open until 4pm at the weekend throughout the period.
- From 14 January 2014 the Parliament Hill displays increased their open times to include Tuesdays 3–4pm and Thursdays 8–10am in recognition of the numbers of dog walkers and other people found to be using the area at this time.

The table below summarises the level of contact that the Heath displays achieved. It set out the total number of visitors received and the materials distributed at each of the Heath displays for the duration of the information giving and consultation period. The *Postcards* figure includes many people who, while walking past the display, accepted a postcard handed out by staff, even if they did not want to stop and go in. Staff recorded the number of people visiting the displays with tally counters, so the *Visitor* figures should be read as approximate to allow a small margin for error.

Location	Visitors	Leaflets	Questionnaires	Postcards
Parliament Hill	2434	887	907	1406
East Heath	1718	671	732	457

The photographs showing external and internal shots of the displays at Parliament Hill and East Heath can be found at Annex 1. Detailed images of the information boards can be viewed at Annex 2.

### Site Information Boards

Information boards were produced and set up at all the ponds and locations along the Highgate and Hampstead chains where works are proposed. The intention was to engage Heath users attention in the Ponds Project at a specific point of interaction or interest for them. The purpose of the site information was to enable people to understand the Preferred Options in their immediate location and thus to get an enhanced understanding of what the impacts of them might be. The boards were erected on 5 and 6 December and remained in place until the conclusion of the process. The site information boards included:

- Summary information on the proposed works and environmental enhancements at the ponds and locations
- Information on the opportunity to give comment in relation to the proposed options
- The location of further information, including directing people to the two Heath displays at Parliament Hill and East Heath.

### **Guided Walks Around Key Areas**

The City of London's Superintendent and the Panel Engineer led two guided walks for the public. The walks covered the key areas on the Heath encompassed by the Ponds Project, such as the Model Boating Pond, Men's Bathing Pond, Highgate No. 1 Pond, the Mixed Bathing Pond, the Catchpit area and the Hampstead No. 2 Pond. The walks were intended to complement the other information giving and consultation work that the Heath's management team have already done.

The purpose of the walks was to enable people to put questions to and receive answers from the team responsible, first hand, about the options on the Ponds Project work and directly in the physical locations concerned. This 'on the spot' information sharing was intended to make the project and the details of the options more meaningful and easier for people to understand. Participants were then encouraged to complete questionnaires (i.e. the same as those provided at the drop-ins) at the end of the walk and talk, having had their interest and understanding stimulated by that.

The Guided Walks at Key Areas were advertised by the City of London in the local press, via social media, on boards at the Parliament Hill and East Heath displays and on notice boards around the Heath. These walks took place on Tuesday 11 February 9.30am and Saturday 15 February 9.30am.

On 11 February, twenty-five people attended the walk and on 15 February nine people attended the walk. Photographs of the walks can be found at Annex 1.

### **Ponds Project Web Pages**

The Ponds Project web pages contain all previous technical reports and other information on the Ponds Project such as the details of the Ponds Project Stakeholder Group and its activities. The pages are available on the City of London website, is accessible using the link [www.cityoflondon.gov.uk/pondsproject](http://www.cityoflondon.gov.uk/pondsproject) and is easily searchable using the words "Hampstead Heath Ponds Project".

The Ponds Project web pages and the link above were signposted in all the awareness raising and information giving and consultation materials. Summary text containing key information about the background, rationale and progress on the project to date, the options considered and what they involved, along with an online version of the questionnaire were also available as well as the more detailed information and technical reports. The intention was that having this material available electronically online would broaden the opportunity to access to the process and that some people would find it more convenient.

During the information giving and consultation period information was added to the City of London website on the following dates:

- 26 November 2013: Information highlighting the consultation and a link to the online questionnaire was posted on the front Hampstead Heath page of the City of London's website. Summary information and the online questionnaire were also added to the Ponds Project pages of the website.
- 9 January 2014: The information boards used at the Parliament Hill and East Heath displays were replicated on the Ponds Project web pages, posted as individual PDF documents.
- 9 January - 17 February 2014: Ponds Project web pages were made accessible from the front page of the City of London website.

The table below summarises the number of hits (i.e. times visited) received by key web pages relating to the Ponds Project.

Web Page	Total Hits
Ponds Project landing page	3,085
Information Giving and Consultation page	1,324
Online questionnaire	729
Detailed technical and scientific reports page	338
Preferred Options Report page	244

## 2.2 Information Giving and Consultation Materials

### Leaflet

An information leaflet was produced that the public could take away to read and refer to at their convenience. The purpose of this was to support people's understanding of the project and the proposed options and to help people to complete a questionnaire if they wished. The leaflet summarised:

- The background, rationale for the project
- The progress and timeline on the project to date
- How the development of the current proposals were framed by the site constraints, hydrology and the legal context
- The options proposed and what they involved, including detailed diagrams and 'before and after' images for the options.

A copy of the leaflet is can be viewed at Annex 3.

### Questionnaire

A consultation questionnaire focusing on the proposed options for Highgate and Hampstead pond chains was available both online via the City of London website and also as a paper take-away from street stalls, the Parliament Hill and East Heath displays and on the guided walks. A freepost address and freepost envelope was provided with the paper questionnaire to return it by post or it could be left at the Heath displays once completed. A copy of the questionnaire (online layout) can be viewed at Annex 4.

People were given the opportunity to inform the City of London's choice of solution based on the Preferred Options report, which identifies two options each for the Hampstead and Highgate pond chains. This involved a simple indication as to how satisfied they were with each of the options; as well as including an opportunity for open responses that allowed people to give the reason for their level of satisfaction with the options, and to raise any other comments or questions.

Both the leaflet and questionnaire materials adopted a common design style to help support public recognition of the Ponds Project and the information giving and consultation process and increase awareness. This included the development and incorporation of a common heading that conveyed what the Ponds Project was, what it was for and its design philosophy: "The City of London is responsible for ensuring that the pond dams on Hampstead Heath are safe. Works are needed to prevent the dams from failing in extreme rainfall and major storms. We aim to limit the works while making the dams safe and minimising the impact on the natural environment of the Heath."

## Video

A video was produced to complement the other information giving formats. It comprised a commentary covering a summary of the background, purpose and rationale for the project, the progress of the project to date, the design approach and principles, and what options were proposed, including before and after images. This was presented by a member of City of London staff filmed on the Heath at the various ponds and locations affected by the project. The purpose of the video was to provide another medium in which to convey information about the project to maximise interest since some people may prefer to watch and listen than to read through a document. In addition, it was intended that describing the project while showing the physical areas involved on film would help to enhance understanding of what was being proposed. The video also highlighted the opportunity for people to give their views through the consultation.

The video was available on the Ponds Project web pages of the City of London website from 17 December 2013. The number of views it received to the end of the consultation period was **580**. It was also available to view at the Parliament Hill display.

### 3. Awareness Raising Methods

In order to reach out to as many people as possible, it was necessary to raise awareness of the Ponds Project and its information giving and consultation process. Many of the information giving and consultation activities took place on the Heath. However some of those affected or potentially affected by the project would not necessarily be Heath users or visit the Heath regularly.

Awareness-raising was also important since, in order to meet the urgency to progress the project, requested by City of London's Panel Engineer advisor and stressed by legal advice, the process had fallen into the winter period when the Heath was less busy. Therefore some users who tended to visit the Heath in warmer weather might otherwise miss the opportunity to be involved. The project timetable had already been extended to allow for further consultation with the Ponds Project Stakeholder Group and it was not feasible to extend it further into the warmer months.

#### 3.1 Awareness Raising Activities

##### Stalls at Strategic Public Locations

Resources for Change's staff carried out five street stalls in the area around the Heath to raise awareness and hold informal conversations with members of the public.

Location	Date and Time of Day
At entrance to Farmers Market at Parliament Hill	Saturday 14 December - Morning
Outside Kentish Town Tube by the market area	Friday 7 February - Evening
Hampstead Heath, High Street opposite post office	Saturday 8 February - Lunchtime
Golders Green Tube Station environs	Monday 10 February - Afternoon
Next to Gospel Oak Overground Station	Monday 10 February - Evening

The aim of the stalls was to give the information giving and consultation process wider outreach. It would pro-actively reach people going about their daily business, who were users of the Heath or affected or potentially affected by the project, but who might not visit the Heath regularly or at all.

Initially it had been hoped to use the stalls as a consultation tool, however, the subject complexity and the level of information giving needed to inform responses meant that this was very difficult to achieve. Consequently, the stalls focused primarily on raising awareness, providing headline information on the purpose and rationale for the Ponds Project and distributing leaflets and questionnaires.

This method achieved the total results for all five locations set out in the table below. A more detailed breakdown by location can be found in appendix 1. Staff recorded the number of people spoken to with tally counters, so this figure should be read as approximate to allow a small margin for error. In addition, the Resources for Change staff were able to note a small number of comments made by people they spoke with. These have been incorporated into the overall analysis of the consultation feedback. The detail of the points captured is available in the above appendix.

People spoken to	Leaflets given out directly to people	Questionnaires given out directly to people	Postcards given out directly to visitors
829	612	499	29 (plus 160 given to local businesses)

### Local Media

**Camden New Journal** and **Ham and High**: Advertisements were placed in popular local papers that are well known, well read and have a large circulation, with the aim of attracting a high level of attention to the information giving and consultation process. A quarter page advertisement was placed in both the Camden New Journal (paper circulation 70,000) and in the Ham and High (paper circulation 42,000) on 12 December 2013 and a half page advert was placed in both publications on 16 January 2014.

Press releases were sent to both the Camden New Journal and the Ham and High on 26 November 2013 and again 27 January 2014.

**Camden Magazine**: A half page article publicising the Ponds Project and the information giving and consultation was published in the Camden Magazine December 2013-January 2014 edition. This was sent to all residents in the London Borough of Camden.

### Mail Shots

In order to help maximise the number of people reached, a number of different mailings were undertaken by the City of London that focused on different audiences.

**Interested Users Mailing**: Throughout the course of the Ponds Project, prior to this information giving and consultation process, there have been a number of other smaller scale publicity, information giving and consultation activities, focusing on the wider public. These include pop up consultation stalls, and the distribution of electronic bulletins. As part of these activities, the City of London had gathered contact details of Heath users who wished to be kept informed about the Ponds Project. This data has been used for emailing regular bulletins to the email addresses of approximately 150 interested Heath users. One email announcing the start of this information giving and consultation process and one further bulletin were sent out during the process.

**Residents and Business Mailing**: To reach local residents and businesses, a postcard headlining the Ponds Project and its information giving and consultation process was sent out the week of 2 December via a Royal mail post-drop to 79,000 residential properties and businesses in the N6, NW1, NW3 NW5, and NW11 areas as being adjacent to the Heath.

**Community Mailing:** To reach a range of local interest, support, residential, religious and community groups including those who involve vulnerable people in the downstream area, the following mailings were sent, using contact information sourced from the Camden Community Index. The data sourced focused on postcodes in closest proximity to the Heath and those that had been identified via the City of London's 2007 Management Plan Consultation as being locations where the most responses from users originated.

- 9 January – An electronic flyer (an electronic version of the postcard) was sent out to 536 email addresses and opened by **189** recipients
- 15 January - A postal mailing including a cover letter and postcard was sent out to **176** postal addresses

**Councillors Mailing:** The postcard was also sent to all London Borough of Camden and Barnet Councillors during the week following 27 November, 117 Councillors in total. This was intended to complement the ongoing engagement with Council Officers in the London Borough of Camden and as a relevant local issue of which Councillors should be aware, particularly as it may potentially affect their constituents.

### Local Distribution

**Heath Amenities:** The postcard was made widely available around the Heath from dispensers placed strategically at gathering points and areas of high footfall such as the café and the swimming ponds.

**Local Amenities:** Around **12,000** postcards, **1,000** A4 posters and **400** A3 posters were distributed to cafes, shops, community centres, libraries and other local venues. This was done early in the process, during the week of 9 December 2013 and then again further through the process in the middle of January 2014. The materials were distributed within the following local areas: South End Green, Highgate, Hampstead, Golders Green, Archway, Tufnell Park, Queens Crescent, Kentish Town, Muswell Hill, and Archway Road (Highgate).

**Schools:** To raise awareness among younger people and also as a way to reach their parents, on 22 January 300 postcards and 20 A4 posters were distributed between the three nearest local secondary schools to the Heath within the potentially affected areas (local vicinity of the works or potential areas affected by dam failure). These were Parliament Hill, William Ellis and La Saint Union.

### Heath Pop Ups

Heath staff conducted pop up information giving activities on the Heath around the Parliament Hill area to complement the other onsite information giving and consultation activities. This was an opportunity to field the most informed Heath staff and around 100 Heath users were pro-actively engaged at some of the busiest Heath locations to raise awareness of the project. These pop ups took place on 16 December 2013 and 30 January 2014.

### Heath Signage

Cabinet display signs were updated with information about the information giving and consultation on 1 December 2013 at Parliament Hill, Golders Hill Park and the Mens' Bathing Pond Bothy.

### Social Media

Facebook and Twitter were used throughout the process to add to the diversity of the awareness-raising activities to help cover a wide range of different audiences. A number of different postings were made as can be seen by the table below, which tracks how Twitter was used to highlight various aspects of the Ponds Project information giving and consultation.



Twitter Topic	Number of Tweets
General Consultation	13
Visit Displays	10
Video	6
Media and Press Releases	5
Guided Walks	4
Questionnaire	3
<b>Total Tweets</b>	<b>41</b>

### 3.2 Awareness Raising Materials

#### Postcard

This was a simple but attractive and colourful card with a set of visual images of the ponds on the front, which showed the ponds at a number of periods in history. It was used as an awareness-raising tool about the Ponds Project, the availability of information and the opportunity for people to give views. The postcards had a simple summary on the back, identifying where further information and opportunities to comment could be found, including the link to the City of London website's Pond Project pages and a map showing the locations of the Parliament Hill and East Heath displays.

The design of the post card and its key text followed the style common and textual heading used for the leaflet and questionnaire consultation materials in order to help maximise people's recognition and awareness. A copy of the postcard can be viewed at Annex 5.

#### Posters

Both A4 and A3 posters were produced and printed as another method of publicity to support the raising of awareness of the Ponds Project information giving and consultation period. Like the postcard, these contained a simple summary identifying where further information and opportunities for people to give views could be accessed and replicated the common design and wording used on other materials.

## 4. The Results

This section summarises the main results of the consultation element of the work.

All the online and paper questionnaires received, comments collected at the Heath displays and a small number of additional letters and emails sent directly to City of London from individuals and organisations or groups have been collated as part of this process. They are far too extensive to present in full in this report and there is considerable repetition in many of the points raised. We therefore provide an overview in the main text of this report along with summaries of all the results in the appendices. The full details of the collation have been made available to the City of London so that they can refer to them as necessary. All collated individual responses have been kept anonymous, as was explained in the information giving and questionnaire materials.

The consultation methods also allowed people to give their contact details should they wish to be kept informed about the Ponds Project. These have been collated separately and passed to the City of London so that they can keep people informed of future developments as well as sending them a summary version of this report.



The consultation and information giving has successfully raised awareness of the Ponds Project and a large number of people have been informed about the proposed work.

During the 12 weeks a huge amount of information was disseminated through the displays on the Heath (over 4000 people face to face) and personnel giving out information on the street (over 800 people face to face), information in local newspapers (joint circulation of 120,000 readers) and web site information, direct postal mailing (over 79,000 households and businesses), emailing of community and residents' groups, guided walks, use of social media and even the production of a short video (receiving over 500 viewings). This ensured a large number of people were made aware of the project and given an opportunity to respond.

Many people did not respond for whom it is assumed it is not an important issue and they are ambivalent. Others visited one of the two Heath displays or met interviewers on the street, just to get more information, often just to deal with a particular point or concern.

The comments made at the Heath displays were all recorded (approximately 1000 comments) and over 1000 people completed one of the more detailed questionnaires. It was observed by the staff supporting the Heath Displays and by the consultation team when speaking to people on the street, that many of those people who are positive or ambivalent did not complete a full questionnaire. Those making the effort to complete a detailed questionnaire tended to be more representative of the people with a strong concern or view. Resources for Change have found that this is very common for this type of consultation.

Based on the comments and discussions made at the Heath displays, non-responses would appear to be due to:

- Just being interested and having nothing to say
- Feeling they do not understand or know enough to be able to make an informed comment
- Feeling the work is appropriate and needed and do not have any specific comments
- Not being interested.

Based on the numbers who wished to respond by questionnaire, there is still a strong body of concern against the whole project. The main concerns are primarily from people who live close to the Heath and / or are regular users.

Much of the dissatisfaction is common to the works being done at all, rather than directed at specific options. However, there are also a significant number of respondents who see the work positively, not only on the basis of reduction of dam breach risk and /or safety benefits, but also as an opportunity to improve the Heath and its ponds, especially for wildlife.

In broad terms, for those dissatisfied with the project overall, the key issues are with regard to increases in dam height, disruption to, and negative impacts on, the Heath's amenity (particularly referring to swimmers), the landscape and wildlife.

Many of these respondents also challenge the need and justification for the work. These challenges are mainly based on the following concerns:

- Legal justification
- Engineering justification
- Quality of data being used and / or the modelling
- That alternative water management options to dams should be considered
- That water management should be dealt with downstream (mainly through sewer and drain improvements)

- That water management for the area should be part of a more holistic approach, working beyond the boundaries of the Heath.
- Mistrust of the City of London its advisors and the engineers
- A belief that engineering is not the solution and the focus should be on emergency response.

Many respondents said that they supported the improved safety that the work would bring to those in the potentially impacted downstream communities. There are a further number of people who feel that the proposed works could create an opportunity for enhancements to the Heath, especially for wildlife.

#### 4.1 Questionnaires – Quantitative Feedback

The total number of 1155 questionnaire responses received comprised 732 online and 423 hard copy responses.

##### 4.1.1 Options Satisfaction

The questionnaire asked people to show how satisfied they were with the options presented for the Heath by selecting a number on a scale of 1-5 for each of the options for the Highgate and Hampstead pond chains. Point 1 in the scale was to reflect the least satisfaction and point 5 the most. Respondents could also select “Don’t know/ none of the above” as an alternative. The following summary table sets out the results for all the questionnaires, both online and paper version. It shows the total number of people who selected a particular point on the 1-5 scale and how that is reflected as a percentage of the total number of responses given. Please note that not all those who responded to the questionnaire gave answers to all of the questions.

Scale of 1-5	Highgate Pond Chain Options				Hampstead Pond Chain Options			
	Option 4 Total	Option 4 %	Option 6 Total	Option 6 %	Option M Total	Option M %	Option P Total	Option P %
<b>1</b>	746	<b>66.55</b>	710	<b>65.14</b>	632	<b>60.36</b>	688	<b>66.03</b>
<b>2</b>	43	<b>3.84</b>	59	<b>5.41</b>	61	<b>5.83</b>	68	<b>6.53</b>
<b>3</b>	62	<b>5.53</b>	58	<b>5.32</b>	80	<b>7.64</b>	57	<b>5.47</b>
<b>4</b>	106	<b>9.46</b>	65	<b>5.96</b>	93	<b>8.88</b>	61	<b>5.85</b>
<b>5</b>	103	<b>9.19</b>	133	<b>12.20</b>	100	<b>9.55</b>	89	<b>8.54</b>
<b>Don't know/ None of the above</b>	61	<b>5.44</b>	65	<b>5.96</b>	81	<b>7.74</b>	79	<b>7.58</b>

This numeric aspect of the consultation element sought to gauge where public feeling is in its reaction to the proposals and to give an indication of any preference emerging towards either of the options for each of the pond chains. It also acted as a prompt for respondents to highlight any issues to be taken account of, as the questionnaire then asked respondents to give the reason for their choice of scale point. These accompanying comments are discussed in the next section.

Numerically overall there is no very significant preference indicated for any one option for either of the pond chains. Those figures that indicate greater satisfaction for one option over another are quite small or marginal, as are those that indicate greater dissatisfaction with one option over another. The numeric results therefore are not very indicative or especially informative for City of London in selecting a final option.

The table also shows that there are a high proportion of responses that have selected a scale point of 1, indicating that well over half of those who responded were not at all satisfied with the options presented. Further detail on the possible reasons behind this is presented in the subsequent sections.

## 4.2 Questionnaires – Qualitative Feedback

This section sets out an overview of the comments given in response to the options, gathered from the questionnaires. The number and range of responses is too considerable to show them here in full detail. The following is a presentation of the main points raised. More detailed summaries are provided in the appendices.

The points have been organised under the key themes that emerged from the analysis of the comments. These are:

- Necessity (the context for the work to be undertaken in the first place)
- Visual impact of the options
- Environment impact of the options
- Engineering approach being taken
- Information or the opportunity to comment provided with / by the consultation process;
- Impact on the Heath's amenities (longer term rather than during the implementation works)
- Implementation of the project
- The cost of the project.

These themes appear in both a positive and negative context, according to the response made.

### 4.2.1 Points Common to All Options

A significant number of the issues raised were common to all options and pond chains. These have been grouped together and are covered in this section. Issues specific to each option are then covered in the subsequent sections.

#### **Necessity – Points reflecting dissatisfaction**

- The works are unnecessary.
- The premise that the current dams are adequate and all that is necessary could be achieved by maintenance, dredging and re-enforcing what is there already at existing heights.
- There should be greater focus on up-stream or downstream options.
- More consideration should be given to other methods of water control than dams and a number of people challenge how well dams work to manage water.
- The legal context is being misinterpreted. For example: Misunderstanding of legal obligations. Too narrow an interpretation of the legislation. The work is unnecessary according to expert legal authority. Statutory law never requires the removal of all possible risk. Lawyers for the City of London have been over-zealous. The Reservoirs Act does not require works of this size. The height of the dams should be limited to the absolute minimum to comply with legislation.

The ponds are not working reservoirs and so fall outside the legal requirement. Building dams is not a given legal requirement.

- That some options are too small, insufficient, provide less storage and should be bigger; conversely, that the proposed scale of work is too big; and finally, that neither option is liked.
- The engineering calculation is wrong. For example: Planning for a 1 in 400,000 year event does not respect risk/reward principles. The 1:400,000 year flooding scenario is extreme, unrealistic and hypothetical. The professional guidance behind the calculation is questioned within the engineering profession.
- The legal case should be challenged. For example: The City of London should seek a Judicial Review; Challenge the ruling. The legislation should be tested in court. Legal confirmation by the High Court is needed.
- The level of risk is overstated and /or is based on poor quality data, including weather forecasting data and therefore the modelling is unsound.
- That City of London and / or its agents are biased or there is a conflict of interest.

#### **Necessity – Points reflecting satisfaction**

- These mainly reflect a support for considerations of safety, a regard for the project as a sensible, rational undertaking and the view that taking no action would be irresponsible and unacceptable.
- Some comments suggest:
  - The work is needed to conserve the Heath and will improve downstream resident safety.
  - That there will be an improvement to amenity, wildlife and / or landscape.
  - There is a sense of trust expressed in the City of London to ‘do the right thing’.
- Some feel it provides an opportunity to make improvements to the Heath overall

#### **Visual Impact – Points reflecting dissatisfaction**

- The work is too visually intrusive; mainly referencing impact in terms of dam height and break in the visual connection between the ponds and /or across the Heath.
- There is also a concern around tree loss and loss of vegetation during and after the works.

#### **Visual Impact – Points reflecting satisfaction**

- A number of comments refer to visual benefits if there is to be good landscaping and that the work will improve the look of some artificial features, with Boating Pond often being specified
- There is also a reflection that the changes would not be noticeable in the long term.

#### **Environmental Impact - Points reflecting dissatisfaction**

- An overall concern that the work will negatively impact on the wildlife / natural environment and wildness / rural nature of the Heath.
- Concern for the impact on wildlife during the work and that it will take years to recover.

#### **Environmental Impact – Points reflecting satisfaction**

- The work provides an opportunity for improved habitat-creation; improved water quality, the landscape and wildlife enhancement.
- The wider proposals that would create a fixed island on the Stock pond and the wet woodland on the Sanctuary pond will improve the wildlife habitat.

#### **Engineering Approach - Points reflecting dissatisfaction**

- The approach proposed is excessive and beyond what is needed, being over-designed, over-engineered and over-built.
- Water management on Hampstead Heath demands a multiplicity of approaches. To confine to a single approach, i.e. the dams, does not provide a resilient water management plan.

- The choice of options given is too limited and alternative suggestions range from reinforcing existing dams at the current height, alternative spillway routes / more spillways; up-stream catchment methods such as swales and bunds, soakaways, key line ploughing, temporary overspill areas with sluice gates.
- Health and Safety was mentioned as a consequence of dam raising – in particular, that children falling in the boating pond could not be seen due to high dams (likewise, swimmers who are in trouble).
- A range of concerns over how much more the work would actually achieve to reduce flooding.
- Downstream off Heath issues raised, such as insufficient drainage in the areas of concern below the Heath, lack of sewage capacity (including the need for coordination with LB Camden and Thames Water); and weak planning regulations around management of gardens, developments and hard standing.
- Some suggest a focus on emergency planning and response rather than engineering.
- A general dislike of any proposals for walls and a preference for more natural looking earth features.

#### **Engineering Approach - Points reflecting satisfaction**

- Pleased the work is being done and safety improved.
- Some trust that City of London are doing the right thing and a number of comments complimenting the City and suggest that both options and plans are well balanced and sensible.
- The storage proposal is a sound concept overall

#### **Information Giving and Consultation - Points reflecting dissatisfaction**

- Visual representations are misleading, biased, confusing or incomplete.
- A lack of information on the justification for the work and the calculations *behind* the justification.
- A lack of information on various aspects of the proposals such as:
  - Surface water drainage
  - The Catchpit
  - The spillways
  - How the works will be implemented.
- The consultation is being held during a rainy, cold season, when the vast majority of people who use the ponds and the Heath are not so active.
- There should be public meetings and a full public enquiry.
- A number of concerns over the scope of the consultation and that it has only dealt with a small range of options.

#### **Information Giving and Consultation - Points reflecting satisfaction**

- The impact is less than expected before viewing the plans.
- Positive comments on the effort being put into involving the public and the range and quality of information provided.

#### **Information Giving and Consultation – Other comments**

- A number of people say it is hard to respond until they know how it will look, or they find the choice hard but would go for best flood protection and / or trust in City of London to make the right decision.

#### **Implementation - Points reflecting dissatisfaction**

- There is dissatisfaction with the potential disruption to amenity; there are a number of specific references to impact on swimmers and a small number relating to children, pushchairs and cyclists.

- There is also concern about disruption to landscape and wildlife during the work.
- There are specific concerns over construction phase impacts such as noise, visual, vehicle movements and the duration of works.

#### **Amenity - Points reflecting dissatisfaction**

- Dams are too high, will spoil views and swimming.
- A concern that the higher dams will mean people who fall into the ponds will be out of view creating a health and safety risk.

#### **Amenity - Points reflecting satisfaction**

- Some like the increased size of some of the dams with earth banks as an area for sunbathing.

#### **Cost - Points reflecting dissatisfaction**

- For some the costs deemed excessive and waste of taxpayers' money or are out of proportion to need. There was an opinion that the money should be spent on other things, for which there is a long list ranging from feeding poor children to improving on Heath facilities.

#### **Cost - Points reflecting satisfaction**

- Others feel it is a good project and worthy of the money spent.

### **4.2.2 Highgate Chain Option 4 - Specific Points**

*Differences for Option 4 include: Model Boating Pond: Dam raised by a 2 metre grassed embankment. Men's Bathing Pond: Dam raised with a 1.5 metre wall on top of the dam.*

The following is a presentation of the main points raised by respondents that relate specifically to Option 4. The points are organised using the same set of key themes as set out above. A more detailed summary is provided in the appendices.

#### **Visual Impact - Points reflecting dissatisfaction**

- Impact on the Men's Bathing Pond in terms of dam height and break in the visual connection between the ponds.

#### **Visual Impact - Points reflecting satisfaction**

- A general reflection was that to have the dam height increase on the Men's Bathing Pond was preferential over the Model Boating Pond as it would be less intrusive to the overall views on the Heath than would be the case with Model Boating Pond.

#### **Visual Impact – Points reflecting preferences about the details**

- Preference for an increase in dam height on the Men's Bathing Pond by a natural bank rather than construction of a high wall, as it involves less visual impact and can benefit user access at the same time.

#### **Environmental Impact - Points reflecting satisfaction**

- The view that Option 4 would have less wildlife impact and some even welcomed the works for their improvement to water quality.

#### **Engineering Approach - Points reflecting dissatisfaction**

- The choice of options given is too limited and alternative suggestions range from provision of sandbags in a shelter nearby for the Model Boating Pond as it is not classed as a reservoir; through to dredging the ponds to their original depth to reduce the present height of the water. This would reduce the current water pressure on the dams and increase the potential capacity of the ponds should a temporary need arise.
- Concern about water from spillways flooding the Brookfield estate and a preference for the water to be discharged to the west or south and west of Highgate No. 1 Pond and /or the Men's Bathing Pond instead.
- Retain the existing diversion pipe than runs below Brookfield Mansions to maintain the current level of protection to the building.

#### **Engineering Approach - Points reflecting satisfaction**

- Option 4 gives the best option for storage gain against dam height rise.
- The Option would give long-term improvement in safety.

#### **Amenity – Points reflecting dissatisfaction**

- It would be better to use the whole west side of the Model Boating Pond as a pond.

### **4.2.3 Highgate Chain Option 6 - Specific Points**

*The key differences for Option 4 include: Model Boating Pond: Dam raised by a 2.5 metre grassed embankment. Men's Bathing Pond: Dam raised with a 1 metre wall on top of the dam.*

The following is a presentation of the main points raised by respondents that relate specifically to Option 6. The points are organised using the same set of key themes as set out above. A more detailed summary is provided in the appendices.

#### **Visual Impact - Points reflecting dissatisfaction**

- This option is more visually intrusive than Option 4, since the Model Boating Pond is more visible than Men's Bathing Pond.
- The view that to have a higher dam on the Men's Bathing Pond (as for Option 4) would be less obvious or may even be preferred by bathers who want privacy.
- Concern over the visual impact of spillways.

#### **Visual Impact – Points reflecting satisfaction**

- The Model Boating Pond is the most artificial of the ponds and so most works should occur there and that Option 6 appears quite attractive.
- The impact on the Men's swimming pond would be less significant with this option, which is the most important pond visually.
- A number of comments refer to visual benefits if there is good landscaping
- *And for both Highgate Options* - that both Options 4 and 6 improve the appearance of the Model Boating Pond.

#### **Engineering Approach - Points reflecting dissatisfaction**

- Concern about the extent of the slope between the Model Boating Pond and Men's Bathing Pond.
- The Model Boating pond is used by more people and so should not take the most impact.



- *And for both Highgate Options* - Specific concerns are made relating to the negative impacts of proposed overflows on Brookfield.
- Living at Brookfield we are concerned about the spillway water flooding our estate. It seems to us to make more sense for the water to be discharged to the west or south and west of Highgate No. 1 Pond and /or the Men's Bathing Pond to reduce potential flooding of Brookfield.
- *And for both Highgate Options* - as well as preference to use the whole west side of the Model Boating Pond as a pond (i.e. do not have the island).

#### **Engineering Approach - Points reflecting satisfaction**

- Preference for a higher bank than a higher wall.
- Preference for the perceived improved protection from Option 6.

#### **Amenity – Points reflecting satisfaction**

- A number of comments were made supporting the work and particularly favouring Option 6 for its perceived benefits to family amenity and visual appearance and reduced impact on swimming.

#### **4.2.4 Hampstead Chain Option M - Specific Points**

*The key differences for Option M include: From Hampstead No. 2 Pond: The dam towards the Mixed Bathing Pond is raised by a 1 metre grassed embankment. The dam towards the Hampstead No. 1 Pond has a loss of 2 trees.*

The following is a presentation of the main points raised by respondents that relate specifically to Option M. The points are organised using the same set of key themes as set out above. A more detailed summary is provided in the appendices.

#### **Visual Impact – Points reflecting Dissatisfaction**

- Greater visual impact than Option P
- *For both Hampstead Options* - The Catchpit dam will have a particularly negative impact.

#### **Visual Impact – Points reflecting satisfaction**

- Less obtrusive option and more appealing than Option P.
- 1metre mixed bathing pond is OK as it maintains visual connections.

#### **Visual Impact – Other Comments**

- There is less option to landscape than with the Highgate chain options, so want the dam to be as low as feasible.
- The sense of continuity between these three Hampstead Ponds is critical. The views from Hampstead Pond No. 2 are therefore very important. Unfortunately Hampstead Pond No. 2 would be most affected by the proposed changes. Option M is preferable, as the dam would only be raised by 1metre. Could the two trees, which would be lost, be replaced by planting others nearby? i.e. closer to Hampstead Pond No. 1? This would help reduce the gap.

#### **Environmental impact – Points of Dissatisfaction**

- A preference for whichever option results in loss of the least trees.
- There was also a proposal to move the catchment of water further upstream to avoid tree loss.
- Overall negative impacts on wildlife
- *And for both Highgate Options* - negative impacts on wildlife particularly in the Catchpit area were noted.



### **Environmental impact – Points of Satisfaction**

- Option M involves the least disturbance and some commented that is better environmentally.
- Preference for banks and natural features rather than walls and some responded they would prefer the loss of a few trees rather than the construction of new walls.

### **Engineering Approach – Points of Dissatisfaction**

- Mixed Bathing Pond: Length and narrowness of the chain pond gives it a river like feeling. This impression has a lot to do with the level of the footpath across the common being at the same level as the ground area outside the changing rooms. Raising the level of this causeway would destroy this very attractive feature and be avoided if at all possible.
- **For both Hampstead Options** - Think the overall appearance of the dam between the Mixed Bathing Pond and Hampstead No. 2 Pond is poor with too harsh an edge, which makes it less attractive. One respondent even suggested a more visionary approach: with a timber walkway above a more fixed/engineered dam instead.
- **For both Hampstead Options** - No need to further dam up. The Catch Pit is also being dammed up so why not increase that capacity? Allow spillage dam to Hampstead No. 1 pond and contain it there, as there is potential for high capacity by damming up its North and West sides.

### **Engineering – Points of Satisfaction**

- Considered preferable to P, as less impact and less impact on Mixed Bathing Pond.
- Many feel this is a sensible option and create significant safety gains for limited impacts.
- One respondent goes so far as to say that from the report, this option reduces Peak Maximum Flood (PMF) by a factor of 2, which, given that the existing protection is better than 1 in 1000 seems sufficient. Given the risks seems not worth extra cost and effort on the other option to raise dams even further.

### **Information Giving and Consultation– Points of Dissatisfaction**

- A number of comments were made that relate to insufficient information. This included the Catchpit works, spillways, tree felling impacts.

### **Amenity – Points of Dissatisfaction**

- Raising the height of the dam on the mixed bathing pond will significantly alter the character of this part of the Heath. The proximity of the water when crossing the path between these ponds is an attractive aspect of this part of the Heath, which will be lost under this proposal.

### **Amenity – Points of Satisfaction**

- Favouring a grass bank by the Mixed Bathing Pond, which will be an improvement on the current hard edge.
- Some feel the swimmers would have a preference for a 1metre high raising.

#### **4.2.5 Hampstead Chain Option P - Specific Points**

*Key differences for Option P include: From Hampstead No. 2 Pond: The dam towards the Mixed Bathing Pond is raised by a 1 metre grassed embankment plus a 1 metre wall. The dam towards the Hampstead No. 1 Pond has its height restored with a 0.5 metre wall and there is a loss of 1 tree.*

The following is a presentation of the main points raised by respondents that relate specifically to Option P. The points are organised using the same set of key themes as set out above. A more detailed summary is provided in the appendices.

#### **Visual Impact – Points of Dissatisfaction**

- Dislike both the man-made walls for Option P.

#### **Visual Impact – Points of Satisfaction**

- Work would improve screening and is well hidden. Would not be a problem for most people and any aesthetic impact will rapidly be forgotten. The wall along the alignment of the present dam is not ideal but is to be preferred to Option M since the impact on the more visible Hampstead No. 2 Pond will be minimised.

#### **Environmental Impact – Points of Satisfaction**

- Option P is preferable to M as only loose one tree. It can be accommodated within the contours. Conserves the Heath.

#### **Engineering Approach – Points of Dissatisfaction**

- Changes the ponds' present primary role as recreational resources to create a massive storm water catchment facility with high embankments. This option is even worse than option M.

#### **Engineering Approach – Points of satisfaction**

- Walls are OK if they are structurally sound. This option gives the longest-term protection
- This option gives more water in Mixed Bathing Pond and greater storage.

#### **Engineering Approach – Other preferences**

- It would be possible and more environmentally reasonable to re-instate the last pond that used to be at Southend Green to make it an area to hold excess water.
- Would it be possible to divert some of the expected flooding via channels or overflow in the park?

#### **Amenity – Points of Dissatisfaction**

- Dam between Mixed Pond and Hampstead No. 2 Pond is too high; it will spoil views and swimming. Work should concentrate on non-swimming ponds.

#### **Amenity – Points of Satisfaction**

- Some like the increased size of the dam between the Mixed Pond and Hampstead No. 2 Pond as an area for sunbathing.

### **4.2.6 Questions**

As part of the questionnaire, respondents were asked (other than what was on the City of London website or the summary leaflets) whether there was any other information they would like to be provided to help inform their understanding of what was happening or why. Please view appendix 8 for a detailed summary of the requests for information made and questions that were raised.

### **4.3 Questionnaires - Profile Information**

Profile information of those responding was also collected as part of the questionnaire. This included home location, Heath visitor frequency, age, gender, ability or disability and ethnicity. This was to enable an understanding of the range of involvement in the consultation from the local community. Not all those who completed a questionnaire provided these details.

## Respondent Postcode Summary

	London Postcodes											Other
Postcode	E	EC	EN	N	SE	W	WC	HA	W	WC	NW	Other
Total	20	5	6	260	12	6	3	5	6	3	655	11

It is noted that the areas that lie within postcodes N and NW have received a high proportion of the responses. A more detailed breakdown of the response figures for these particular postcodes is set out below showing those closest to the Heath. A full summary of responses by postcode can be found in appendix 9.

	NW and N Postcodes Closest to the Heath						
Postcode	N6	N19	NW1	NW3	NW5	NW6	NW11
Number of responses	96	43	25	327	202	30	41
Overall totals	For all N postcodes = 260			For all NW postcodes = 655			

## Frequency of visits

	Daily	Once a week or more	Once a month or more	Once a year or more	Every few years	Not visited
Total	346	478	158	33	5	2

It is noticeable that a significant number of questionnaire respondents are regular users of the Heath.

## Ethnic Groups

Asian / Asian British	Totals
Indian	11
Pakistani	0
Bangladeshi	0
Chinese	1
Other Asian background	10
Mixed / Multiple ethnic groups	Totals
White & black Carribean	4
White & Black African	1
White & Asian	8
Other Mixed / Multiple ethnic background	11
Black / African / Caribbean / Black British	Totals
African	3
Carribean	6
Other Black / African / Caribbean background	5

<b>White</b>	<b>Totals</b>
English / Welsh / Scottish / Northern Irish / British	720
Irish	22
Gypsy or Irish Traveller	0
Other White background	124
<b>Other Ethnic Group</b>	<b>Totals</b>
Other Arab	1
Any other ethnic group	11

The details of other ethnic backgrounds and groups that people described can be viewed at appendix 10.

The range of different ethnic groups responding to the questionnaire was very limited. There is a low response from ethnic groups other than White, which fits with our Resources for Change's previous experience of consultation responses on the Heath in this area. Note that the range of different ethnic groups is more diverse in the downstream area than is reflected by these responses.

### Age and Gender

	<b>Under 16</b>	<b>17- 25</b>	<b>26- 35</b>	<b>36- 45</b>	<b>46- 55</b>	<b>56- 65</b>	<b>65+</b>	<b>Aged unspecified</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Male</b>	2	4	30	66	122	91	188	1	<b>339</b>
<b>Female</b>	2	1	36	42	85	90	149	10	<b>266</b>
<b>Gender not specified</b>	0	1	10	16	11	18	7	0	63
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>218</b>	<b>199</b>	<b>344</b>		

Substantially more men than women have responded. This is unusual in Resources for Changes experience. There are not many responses from people from the younger age groups, which is usual.

### Disability

Forty-three (43) respondents to the questionnaire out of the 1155 returned considered that that had a disability that affected their ease of getting to and using open space.

## 4.4 Heath Displays - Comments

This section sets out an overview of verbal responses to the Ponds Project and its Preferred Options proposals made by visitors to the Heath displays. The number of people recorded visiting the Heath display was approximately 4152, of which 1077 made verbal comments. The following is a presentation of the main points raised. A more detailed summary is provided in the appendices.

The points have been organised under same the key themes used in the previous section, as the range of comments noted was very similar to those via the questionnaires.

As mentioned earlier in this report, not all visitors who came to the displays wished to complete a questionnaire or take one away. In such cases, the best alternative method to gather feedback was for display staff to note down visitors' views from the conversations they had had with them, so that this information could be collected and included in the reporting.

During an internal debrief, one of the staff observed that some of the people they met at the displays appeared to visit primarily with the purpose of seeking information from the facility and staff, rather than to give immediate feedback or express an opinion. Secondly, many people seemed to come to the display with a neutral frame of mind rather than already holding a strong opinion on the project or options.

#### **Visual Impact – Points expressing concern**

- Visual amenity and landscape impact
- Men's pond will look too municipal and people would be able to see in to the men's pond
- Impact during the works.

#### **Visual Impact – Points expressing approval**

- It's an improvement, particularly boating pond
- Visual impact is less than media implied, its not excessive and the Heath is always changing anyway.
- The island is a good idea
- Some people simply state they are looking forward to the new embankments.

#### **Visual Impact – Other comments**

- Protect the lovely clearing in Catchment 1. [R4C Ed. Assume this is the Catchpit]
- Make sure the work enhances the Heath.
- Build dams as high as possible.

#### **Environmental Impact – Points expressing concern**

- Visual amenity and landscape impact.
- The need to minimise the impact that the works will have on wildlife, both during the works and after, through disturbance. Wanting to know where the pond life will go during works, and afterwards.
- Remove the reed bed in the Model Boating Pond.
- Number of trees being removed and the impact on trees in the Catchment. [R4C Ed. Assume this is the Catchpit]

#### **Environmental Impact – Points expressing approval**

- The works will improve opportunities for wildlife and the trees will grow back.
- The wildlife benefits, including the new island (if kept free from people).

#### **Environmental Impact – Other comments**

- Minimise landscape impact.
- More information wanted on the environment impacts of the options.
- Use horses to do the clearance.
- Dislike of fences.

#### **Engineering Approach – Points expressing concern**

- The view that works are not sufficient along with suggestions to increase Highgate No. 1 Pond dam further, and the contrary view from others, who think that the Ponds Project is overkill.
- The effect of blocking the outflow of Highgate No. 1 Pond being consequent flooding.

#### **Engineering Approach – Points expressing approval**

- Positive comments about targeting Model Boating Pond for work, making it more natural and the addition of an island.

#### **Engineering Approach – Other preferences**

- Challenges to the entire concept of the project or proposals that there are other lower impact options that would suffice, such as dredging the ponds or digging them deeper; letting the water escape faster; putting in longer pipes; where there are 2 pipes per ponds, just make 4 pipes per pond; installing sluices.
- A focus on downstream improvements; sorting out the drains and sewers.
- The preference for earth dams to walls
- Some specific suggestions, for example that the dams should be in a straight line, not curved.

#### **Engineering Approach – Other Comments**

- Trust in the City of London to make the right choice.
- Not seeing what the concern is about; the plans are better than current situation; an opportunity to make improvements.
- A general point that it's all about striking the right balance between those who want to protect the Heath and those who live downstream.
- Use alternative technologies rather than dams.
- The avenue at South End Green should become a pond again.

#### **Necessity – Points expressing concern**

- Challenging the need based on its being unjustified, unproven, or the lack of evidence for it.
- That the legal justification should be challenged.
- The work being out of scale to the need.

#### **Necessity – Points expressing approval**

- Understanding or agreeing with the need for the work. Support based on variety of reasons including climate change, downstream benefits, legal need and past storm or flood impacts.

#### **Necessity – Other comments**

- Would the work be needed or implemented if the ponds were natural.
- Challenges to the data used to establish the need
- Only maintenance work is required; not accommodation for extreme weather events

#### **Information Giving and Consultation – Points expressing concern**

- Options are almost identical and therefore this does not comprise a consultation
- Information visuals and or boards are biased, misleading and / or unclear
- That the questionnaire comprised the main means offered to give feedback to City of London
- The consultation gives no opportunity to challenge the need for the work

#### **Information Giving and Consultation - Points expressing approval**

- An appreciation of what is being done and the quality of the display and the information given. Many positive comments given about the approach and information provision methods.

- The view that the City of London's approach is good and that the rumours about the scale of the works are unjustified.

#### **Information Giving and Consultation - Other comments**

- A diagram of the potential flood area would be useful.
- Many people did not previously realise that the footpaths are actually dams.
- Wanting to see a model of how Heath will change
- Key project personnel from the City of London, their engineers, architects and other project advisors, should have talks where people can ask questions directly.

#### **Implementation – Points expressing concern**

- The extent of change, disturbance, and the duration of works
- Extent of the impact on amenity due during the works (general and to fishing).

#### **Implementation – Points expressing approval**

- Pleased to know that there will be minimal disruption.

#### **Amenity – Points expressing concern**

- Extent of the impact on amenity due to the scale of the change and the disturbance (general and to fishing).
- Whether access for children and pushchairs to Model Boating Pond will be affected.

#### **Amenity – Other comments**

- Please do not change/ replace the rustic nature of facilities on the swimming ponds.
- Satisfaction expressed with the way The City of London has managed the Heath.
- The addition of cycle routes.

#### **Cost– Points expressing concern**

- Better things to spend money on.
- Believing there to be a conspiracy by contractors to make money from City of London.

#### **Cost– Points expressing approval**

- Though some expressed satisfaction that it is money well spent on safety improvements.

#### **Information Requested**

- Questions were raised on dam details, access, tree root damage, the potential for positive impact of dredging as well as some specifics on water flows and capacities.
- More information was required on the works and how they will take place.
- Information boards on the Heath explaining how the water would be slowly released onto the Heath and how this would work.

### **4.5 Heath Displays – Profile Information**

Staff also recorded profile information of those who made comments. Initially pin boards were provided as a response method to encourage all visitors to give profile information. However, it was found that these were not being used. Instead staff informally captured a limited amount of profile information from those visitors with whom they had discussions or who made comments. The profile information for these respondents showing age and gender is set out in the table below. Note that the age ranges shown were those estimated by the staff.

	Under 16	17-25	26-35	36-45	46-55	56-65	65+	Total
Male Age	1	1	77	138	122	128	105	572
Female Age	3	2	54	124	117	109	84	493

#### 4.6 Comments Sent by Email and Letter

In addition to the questionnaires and drop-in comments, 9 individual and 5 group responses were received to the consultation as letters, e-mails and other written comments.

##### Individual Responses

Of the individual responses, 3 raised suggestions, 1 stated they feel unable to comment due to lack of knowledge, 3 are strongly against, and 1 strongly in favour of the work. In addition to raising some of the same points as have already been summarised above, they included the following points:

- Different sections of the Heath should be ploughed each year to increase diversity and de-compact soil.
- Like catchment area [*R4C Ed. assume this refers to the Catchpit*] but don't understand how wet woodland will be achieved. More in favour of raising Viaduct pond and allow flooding into Siskins wood by building up path in Lime Avenue and positioning a dam at the back of the mixed swimming pond.
- Suggest flood storage reservoir be considered for Highgate Chain which would enable the proposed 2.5m dam height to be reduced on the Model Boating Pond. This would not negate the existing design work but augment it. The proposed emergency flood storage on the Highgate chain would be located on the tennis courts and extending north. This is a municipal feeling area and a tree lined grassy knoll could also improve view and shield from traffic. Specific map and drawings provided with letter.

##### Group Responses

A number of responses were also received from groups, though the degree of representation of all of the members cannot be guaranteed (in at least one instance a group response has been challenged by an individual response who did not feel it was representative). It should also be clarified that individuals may also have responded to the questionnaire in their own right.

##### Brookfield Mansions Freehold Limited:

- Support the principle to strengthen the dams.
- Raise concerns in respect of one of the proposed spillways on the Highgate chain, considering that it would discharge water directly into Brookfield Mansions.
- Propose that the spillway concerned should instead discharge water to the grassed area from the Men's Bathing Pond to the west of Highgate No. 1 Pond or to the south and west from the lowest pond.
- Suggest that other alternatives are to create an underground storage area under Duke's Field or to discharge the surface water into the Thames Water sewage system via the existing scour pipe or via a new overflow pipe.
- Consider that the City of London should not detach itself from responsibility for surface water that is linked to the effects project.



**Croftdown Road Residents Association:**

- Request the City of London to work urgently with the Heath & Hampstead Society and other members of the Dam Nonsense Campaign to clarify the legal basis of the project so that works on the Heath can be minimised

**Dartmouth Park Conservation Advisory Committee:**

- Accept the legal obligation but want the dam height to be significantly lower.
- The group question the focus on ponds for water storage and seek additional other approaches which can manage the water and deliver the City of London obligations.
- More information is necessary about the size, location and exact function of the proposed spillways.
- They point out the uncertainty about the present capacity of the sewerage system, inability to cope with floods of surface water and suggest that whilst distinct from the overflow of the Heath ponds, it is one of vital concern to Dartmouth Park and adjacent areas.
- Whatever scheme is chosen, there must be enough redundant capacity within the dams system to store sufficient water to ensure that the flow from the dams into the Fleet does not exceed the capacity of the culverts.

**Fitzroy Park Residents Association:**

- Broadly supports the City of London's consultation process and the legal requirement for the proposed works.
- Believes the Preferred Options for each chain are holistic.
- Reserves judgement on the spillways until firm designs are published.

**Hampstead Garden Suburb Residents Association:**

- However complete clarity is requested around the underlying need for the work being done as summarised in the following paragraph.
- "The scale of the work required to the ponds depends very much on the legal position. This in turn rests on the advice of professional engineers and the industry guidance... it is highly desirable that these issues are resolved before decisions are taken on exactly what work is required."
- Assuming the work is required, a number of points are raised in support of how it is proposed the work will undertaken; its focus on the middle of each pond chain and resulting options is positively commented upon.
- Other points are raised which chime with those already summarised from individuals.

**The Pryors Ltd Management Board:**

- There is a general concern about the scale of the proposed works and the need for them in the first place, though they state individuals are likely to comment on this separately.
- State they do not feel able to comment on the technical aspects of diverting water for the Vale of Heath pond but that the proposals seem appropriate.
- A number of points are raised in relation to the scale of the works and specific aspects of the designs all of which are already summarised in the responses from individuals.
- Whilst recognising that details of the actual works cannot be defined until the options are chosen and designs drawn up in detail, they specifically raise concern about the traffic and other impacts during the actual works. There is a request that they be consulted and involved from an early stage and some specific access point issues are noted.

## 5. Analysis

### 5.1 Challenges to the Context and Evidence for the Project

A number of the responses reflecting strong dissatisfaction received through the consultation were predicated on the basis that the legal context for the work should be challenged. That is, whether the work can be required or is permitted by law, to the extent provided for by the Ponds Project. Whilst this issue was not specifically consulted on, it is significant.

The following table summarises the number that questioned the legal requirement and specifically mentioning the Hampstead Heath Act 1871 or The Reservoirs Act 1975. The exact number of respondents raising this concern cannot be given exactly, because in relation to comments about the legal requirement, respondents are not always clear which context or Act they are referring to.

The Dam Nonsense campaign is a local action against the Ponds Project, which has been organised by an amenity group, the Heath & Hampstead Society. The campaign started in parallel with the information giving and consultation process on 27 November 2013 and gathered momentum with the increase of its publicity drive around 15 January. This campaign is probably also responsible for contributing to the number of responses received on this legal basis. Specific attribution is not possible, however some indication of trends can be gained from the table below. This table provides an indication of the numbers of respondents who challenge the legal context for the Pond Project's proposals, before and after the start of the publicity drive. It is based on responses to the questionnaire for Highgate Option 4 and the opportunity to give any other comments only.

<b>Challenges to the Legal Context</b>	<b>Mentions of the Hampstead Heath Act 1871</b>	<b>Mentions of the The Reservoirs Act 1975</b>	<b>Percent of Total Responses that Mention the Acts</b>
Before 15 January 2014 Dam Nonsense campaign drive	2	3	3%
After 15 January 2014 Dam Nonsense campaign drive	147	107	27%

In addition to the legal context, a number of the other wider issues raised do not relate to the specific options that were being consulted on. Some of these wider issues are outside the City of London's control. There is a significant amount of repetition in the contextual challenges and proposals. The majority of these refer to:

- The legal context and challenges to the legislation itself.
- Land, planning, drainage and other functions of other statutory and other bodies beyond the City of London's jurisdiction
- Disbelief in the data
- Disbelief in the structural assessments
- Mistrust of the City of London, its advisors and the engineers
- A belief that engineering is not the solution and we should focus on emergency response.

However, whilst these comments should not be overlooked, Resources for Change understands that the City of London and its advisors have looked at those issues that are within their remit prior to this phase of the information giving and consultation process. It was actually the results of this work, the design principles to protect the Heath while meeting the legal requirement to make the dams safe and the early involvement of the Ponds Project Stakeholder Group, which led to the options for the project and thus the consultation element, being so tightly defined.

One consequence is that many of the results do not actually inform the forward stage of the project, that is, what issues need to be taken account of in approving or refining the chosen options.

## **5.2 The Approach Taken to the Consultation and Information Giving**

The decision was taken that to base the consultation on asking for a general reaction to the project would be inappropriate, given the tight definition of the options. The consultation needed to be bounded, and to focus on taking account of those issues that could be acted upon. The provision of a more open-ended consultation would have been raising expectations that could not be delivered. For this reason the information giving has formed an important element in the process. This informed the design of this aspect of the work so that it included:

- Awareness raising
- Making all background and more detailed information available through the website
- Developing staffed displays and simplified summary information (supported by the guided walks and other activities) that could be understood readily by any non-specialist.

In addition, a means to respond both online and in hard copy was provided for those who wished to express a view.

The consultation was not intended or designed as a statistically based process. The numeric information collected was intended to be indicative and part of a broader picture formed by the qualitative information. The primary emphasis in the process was on providing information along with an opportunity to comment for as a wide a range of Heath users, residents local to the Heath and those potentially affected downstream of the ponds, as possible.

The effort and resource applied and the total numbers of people given an opportunity to comment was significant:

- Reaching out directly to over 79,000 households.
- Providing face-to-face opportunities for approximately 5000 individuals.
- As well as the wider number of people reached indirectly through the other methods.

This is a significant number of people and in Resources for Change's experience, represents a significantly greater effort than is normally placed upon these types of intervention in public spaces. This is perhaps reflected in the significant number of responses stating people's trust that City of London to do the right thing.

## **5.3 The Overall Response to the Consultation**

Over 1000 responses were received, which is a significant return. However, many more people who were reached out to, or who experienced the information through the displays, street stalls and other methods did not respond.

In Resources for Change's experience this is common, especially for subjects where few people feel it affects their daily lives or when it feels 'remote' to them. The majority of people tend to prefer to respond verbally and through informal talk. It is only those significantly motivated for or against an issue that respond through means that require more effort such as questionnaires. Different types of consultation opportunity provided tend to get different types of respondent and this is noticeable with the results obtained in this consultation:

- Questionnaires tend to be responded to by those with a significant interest and often who have a strong negative view to give.
- Drop-in facilities such as the Heath Displays tend to attract those who are interested but not necessarily with a strong view. Once information is given, people will usually give a clear response if they feel strongly about an issue, for example, prompting them to complete a questionnaire. Otherwise they are likely to give a comment and leave.
- Street stalls vary, but for complex subjects like this, they tend to simply be an effective way of raising awareness.
- Postcards, mailing and general media will raise awareness but tend to lead to limited numbers of responses unless people have a strong view one way or the other.

Finally, as a general rule, those with a negative view, tend to be more vocal than those with a positive view.

The purpose of the information giving and consultation was to increase understanding and to seek ideas and inputs to the final choice and development of options that would be used in the future planning application. The numeric information had the potential to provide some indication of any preference towards one option or another for each the pond chains. However, the results have not made a significant contribution in this respect, although they do highlight the presence of opposition to the project. The comments give the most valuable insights, though again, many of these points challenge the premise for the work, rather than help to inform the project.

In this respect, the level of response to the options is limited relative to the total received. Due to the restricted nature of the options available and therefore upon which any consultation could take place, this is to be expected. Within these parameters however, the consultation has achieved its objectives in helping to identify criteria to refine the design, those aspects that are of greatest concern and those that present the best or most favoured opportunities.

#### **5.4 The Consultation and Information Giving Within the Wider Context**

It is accepted that this phase of the consultation and information giving was not at an ideal time of year. However, the City of London considered it was obliged to progress the project, which has been ongoing for a significant period already. The engineering advice is that the dam structures are below the required safety standard. Therefore the City of London considered that further delay, for example to encompass the spring or summer season was unfeasible.

This process is part of a much longer-term and ongoing programme of engagement with the public and stakeholders. It has been rolled out on a much bigger scale than previous activities to reach the public. The process has been timed at a point when clarity about the possible solutions has been achieved, having worked through more detailed options development with the project's stakeholder group. It has been driven by an aspiration to achieve greater knowledge and understanding of the project among the wider population.

This consultation and information giving work should be seen as a stage in a process, not the end of it. City of London should consider continuing the Heath displays in an adapted and sustainable format that continues to be updated throughout the process, so that information sharing can be maintained and so that Heath users and visitors can have the latest knowledge of the ongoing works, changes and any current consultations.

In the experience of Resources for Change, such long, complex iterative processes as the Ponds Project need regular small amounts of information to be available and enable people to understand and therefore engage with it. Finally, the City of London should continue to remind people that the process is non-statutory at this stage and the formal planning process still has to be gone through.

### **5.5 Dam Nonsense Campaign**

It should be noted that when the Dam Nonsense campaign increased its publicity drive around 15 January 2014, it significantly affected the number of questionnaires being returned. This was seen by a significant increase in both online and hard copy questionnaire returns after 15 January.

It is reasonable from the above to interpret that the Dam Nonsense campaign had an influence on raising interest and also concerns amongst those who would otherwise not have got involved. It also contributed to a type of response being received, which comprised generic information from the campaign rather than individual responses to the options.

This was quite likely also a contributory factor in the City of London staff observation (taken from staff debrief at the end of the process) that many of those people who visited the Heath displays expecting something "far worse" and actually leaving saying they felt more at ease and in some cases "they couldn't see what all the fuss is about". In addition, City of London staff at the Displays noted a change after the start of the Dam Nonsense publicity activities which was that those people who visited and had a negative view, had already made up their minds by their arrival and wanted to complete a questionnaire without looking at the information or engaging in discussion.

### **5.6 The Feedback**

Much of the dissatisfaction expressed in the responses is common to the works being done at all, rather than directed at specific options. However, there are also a significant number of respondents who see the work positively, not only on the basis of reduction of dam breach risk and /or safety benefits, but also as an opportunity to improve the Heath and its ponds, especially for wildlife.

In broad terms for those dissatisfied with the project overall, the key issues are regard to increases in dam height, disruption to, and negative impacts on, the Heath's amenity (particularly referring to swimmers), the landscape and to wildlife.

In addition some felt that the water should be dealt with downstream of the Heath for example through better drainage or just dealt with through a much lower specification of works such as ongoing repairs, 'softer' engineering and water management such as planting, or simply that it was more appropriate to address the issue through better emergency response. There are a number of alternative options suggested which have been given to the engineers for consideration and are summarised within the appendices 2-7 to this report.

### 5.6.1 Option Preferences

In terms of the options preferences, there are arguments put forward both for and against all the options without any real clear preference. Many of the preferences given are also dependent on the respondents' personal perspective: whether this is downstream community, a swimmer, wildlife or other interest; or preference or association with a particular pond. In addition, the results are made less distinct by the number of generic negative opinions challenging the necessity for the work itself. Whilst these were not specifically consulted on as part of this information giving and consultation process, they still influence the overview of the results. However, since these views are given on all options it is fair to assume that their overall impact is to skew the results towards dissatisfaction, but that this is in equal measure for all options.

Beyond the wider issues already covered, the results raise a number of issues which help guide option choice as well as guidance on approaches to consultation and information giving from this point forwards.

While there is no clear option choice, there are some preferences that can help guide the design criteria used in developing detailed designs. The following is not an exclusive list and the engineers will need to go through the detail of this report to ensure they are clear on the detail of the opinions. However, this gives a flavour of the emerging option-specific findings. These preferences suggest the need for the City of London to maintain the flow of information about them to the public as they develop.

#### Common to All Options

Preferences that are applicable across the options include:

- A preference for earth banks over walls
- A preference for natural style landscaping of dams and features over 'man-made' constructions
- Paths to have proper surfacing
- Access and safety of children and families needs to be shown, especially, but not exclusively for the Model Boating Pond
- The need to maintain the present visual rural/countryside landscape and current (or improved) amenity across the Heath
- Opportunities to create and enhance wildlife habitat should be taken where possible
- As far as possible views should be maintained.

There are then some specifics referring to the different option chains. These include the following:

#### Highgate Options 4 and 6

Many comments are made relating to the potential of the Model Boating Pond as providing an opportunity to work in improvements to landscape, wildlife and water quality. The specific emerging criteria for these ponds are:

- There is concern with increasing the dam height only on the Model Boating Pond rather than a more balanced approach between the ponds due to the increased visual impact.
- Landscaping works should be focused on the Model Boating Pond where landscaping can achieve positive benefit, rather than the Men's Swimming Pond where the preference is for minimal disturbance
- The island is generally favoured and that many respondents feel it should be kept free of people for wildlife
- Access for children, families and pushchairs to the Model Boating Pond needs to be clear
- Paths need to be surfaced to avoid mudding

- Spillways and other features need clarity of information or further detail.

### **Hampstead Options M and P**

The preference within the comments for these options is less clear. The only other specific that can be derived over and above the common criteria identified above is that greater privacy could be afforded to the Mixed Bathing Pond.

## **5.6.2 Consultation and Engagement from this Point Forwards**

A significant number of people are requesting a wider range of options than those specifically consulted on, including those based on more holistic approaches. Some of these extend to matters beyond the City of London's control. However, consideration should still be given to whether they can be addressed. The main ones are:

- How can City of London better develop long-term water (and other) management interventions with surrounding statutory bodies and others where the impact of their work reaches beyond the boundaries of the Heath. These could include:
  - Off-Heath water management
  - Community emergency response plan
  - Vehicle and other movement during the works
- Whilst the engineers may have already considered many other options, these need to be continued to be explored as part of the process and incorporated into any public information processes. This should include the provision of information on non-storage based elements of water management as designs are clarified and detail added.
- Designs need to continue to develop detail clarifying specifics such as path surface, re-vegetation and landscaping detail; wildlife habitats; access points for children, wheelchairs, pushchairs, etc; cyclists; detail on new facilities (such as the swimmers changing rooms although there is a mixed reception to this idea from the consultation); and similar. These should be made available to the public to see as the project progresses, for example through an adapted ongoing display or other appropriate methods.
- The specific plans for actual works, timings, how they will be carried out and so forth needs to be part of the ongoing information and consultation process.
- City of London need to consider the best way to achieve integration with other organisations and departments responsible for the surrounding and downstream communities during the process, specifically in regard to water and drainage impacts and the management of the works.

There are also many specific requests for more detail on a number of aspects including the spillways and the Catchpit. A large number of people want to know a lot more about what will happen during the actual work, how it will be managed and the impacts. Finally, there is a request for ongoing information sharing and dialogue opportunities.

Whilst not everyone consulted or involved likes the plans, the consultation and information giving process has been successful in achieving its objectives. The response from the public to having the opportunity to learn more and comment has generally been positive and it would be worth continuing. The cost of continuing this at the same level is likely to be prohibitive, however, maintaining an un-manned display throughout the process could be very valuable. This could be updated as plans progress and manned at critical periods. In addition on Heath information should be continued. A wider audience could be kept informed through periodic updates in the press.

The City of London could then consider whether to maintain a permanent information share point on the Heath and on their website so that the process can continue and become an integral part of maintaining a flow of information between the Heath managers and its users.

# APPENDICES

---



## Appendix 1: Stalls at Strategic Public Locations Results Detail

Location	Date	Number of people spoken to	Leaflets	Questionnaires	Postcards	Notes
At entrance to Farmers Market at Parliament Hill	W/c 9 December - Saturday 14 Dec Morning	250	145	145	0	<b>Team remarks:</b> Most people knew about the project, though some didn't.
Outside Kentish Town Tube by the market area	W/c 3 Feb - Friday 7 Feb Evening	215	158	120	26	<b>Team remarks:</b> Lower proportion of people who knew about the project. <b>Comments given:</b> Concerns expressed about a perceived intention to charge for swimming or privatise the ponds with the project as a vanguard.
Hampstead Heath, Heath Street opposite post office	W/c 3 February - Sat 8th Feb Lunchtime	187	140	79	3	<b>Team remarks:</b> Lots knowing about the project but had not necessarily done the questionnaire <b>Comments given:</b> The project is a sledgehammer to crack a nut. It will spoil the Heath for no good reason. It's vandalism Perception that pressure from Brookfield Mansions is driving the project. No reason for the project – it's unnecessary. Have read the information and it's propaganda – it's specious. CoL are hiding behind Health&Safety Leave it alone
Golders Green Tube Station environs	W/c 10 Feb - Monday 10 Feb Early afternoon	69	169	155	160 (via shops, not direct to people)	<b>Team remarks:</b> Low level of interest so postcards given out to the library on Golders Green Road and a number of shops including: BetFred, Sainsbury's, Warman Freed Chemist, Costcutter, Boots the Chemist (x2), and 12 other independent shops on Golders Green Road
Next to Gospel Oak Overground Station	W/c 10 Feb - Monday 10 Feb Early evening	108			0	<b>Team remarks:</b> More people knew about the project than at Golders Green. <b>Comments given:</b> Too much money is being spent on the information giving and consultation.

## Appendix 2: Highgate Option 4 Results Summary

### Visual Impact Option 4

DISSATISFACTION – was a result of:

- Concern about the negative visual impact that would result on the Heath; that its natural aspect would be altered and that this was not in accordance with the Hampstead Heath Act.
- The dams being too intrusive and unsympathetic to the Heath's historic landscape due to their height or scale.
- The appearance of the dams being considered too intrusive from *within* the Men's Bathing Pond.
- The proposed appearance of the Men's Bathing pond dam was considered unsightly.
- Option 4 being considered more visually intrusive.
- The Men's Bathing Pond wall at 1.5 metres for Option 4 breaking up the continuity of views across the ponds
- The 2 metre Model Boating Pond bank breaking all visual connection across the Heath and in the area and preventing easily seen views at the pond from the south east side.
- Impact on the views of the Model Boating pond from its dam and from the Millfield Lane side.

SATISFACTION – was a result of:

- Option 4 having less visual impact on the Model Boating Pond, which was considered to be more visible on the Heath than the Men's Boating Pond which was more concealed from view.
- The Men's Pond dam being considered better able to accommodate the change in height proposed in Option 4 in terms of resulting visual appearance.
- The height of the tallest dam proposed (i.e. for the Model Boating Pond) is kept lower with this option.
- Option 4 being considered less intrusive overall on the Heath
- Option 4 being considered to have a more even spread of impact and height gain between the two ponds.
- Approval of the overall proposals for improving the Model Boating Pond, in particular it being made to look more natural than it currently does.
- The view that in the long run the changes would not be noticeable and the character of the Heath would be kept.
- The view that there is very little impact on the surrounding landscape.
- Option 4 seems to maintain better the character of this chain. The higher grassed embankment of option 6 looks very artificial, whereas the higher wall at the Men's Bathing Pond, which is the negative part of Option 4, seems less aesthetically problematic.

PREFERENCES – were expressed for:

- Preference for both dams to be strengthened or increased in height by a natural embankment rather than including a high wall, in order to lessen the visual impact of the dams. The wall was considered to be a hard, less natural feature, which did not appear elsewhere in the pond chains.
- Raising the path with a bank, rather than having a wall: it was considered that the wall at 1.5 metres for Option 4 would obstruct views, especially for wheelchair users and children.
- The wall on the Men's Bathing Pond dam should be covered by vegetation to hide it.

OTHER COMMENTS:

- That the chosen option should minimise visual impact on the ponds and to select whichever option kept the look of the Heath best.

## Environmental Impact Option 4

DISSATISFACTION – was a result of:

- Considering the Heath's environment would be negatively impacted and that the project did not preserve the environment and so was not in accordance with the Hampstead Heath Act of 1871.
- The view that the wildness and rural nature of the ponds would be affected by the ponds project.
- The view that wildlife would be disturbed or endangered, especially when nesting.
- That the natural habitat of many species would be disrupted while the work is carried out and the habitat of some would be destroyed.
- Considering that the works on the dams would cause damage to the Heath and that this would either take years to recover or would be irreparable.
- That dam building could result in the decline of bird species, flora and other fauna.
- Concern that once in place, shadow produced by a dam of 2 metres in height will block out the sun, make the immediate vicinity colder and consequently impact on the range of flora and fauna found there.
- Total loss of trees and vegetation along the earth dams.
- Earth excavation on the west side of the Model Boating pond having a negative impact on the hillside.

SATISFACTION – was a result of:

- Considering the ponds project would give the opportunity to fund or initiative other changes to improve the Heath and wildlife.
- The view that Option 4 would affect wildlife less.
- Considering that Option 4 would have less impact on the ecology of the Model Boating Pond.
- The view that the options maintain the integrity of the Heath's environment.
- Considering the works would be done with minimal impact on the natural habitat and would be environmentally sympathetic.
- Welcoming improvements in the water quality and planting as part of the works.
- Approval for the wider proposals that would create a fixed island on the Stock pond and the wet woodland on the Sanctuary pond to improve the wildlife habitat.

OTHER COMMENTS

- Concern expressed that there could be permanent damage to bird and plant life in the areas concerned.
- Confidence expressed that the ponds project team were being sensitive to the environment.
- The view that at the chosen option should be whichever one is best for the environment.

## Engineering Approach Option 4

DISSATISFACTION – was a result of:

- That the approach proposed was over-designed, over-engineered and over-built.
- A concern that the amount of work required would be increased from that stated.
- That the proposed heights of the dams for the Model Boating Pond and Men's Bathing Pond in Option 4 were too great.
- Making the dams higher and more extensive would render them more fragile.
- That the choice of options was too limited (neither being satisfactory) not all potential approaches had been accounted for and a second opinion from independent consultants or Dutch experience should be sought. Alternative suggestions put forward, which include those with lower-scale engineering are:

- o That repairs and reinforcing at the dams existing heights would be sufficient to provide protection
- o The provision of sandbags in a shelter nearby for the Model Boating Pond as it was not classed as a reservoir.
- o Increase volume capacity by deepening the pond or dig another overflow pond adjacent to it.
- o Make the dam safe with sheet piling designed to raise the height by an extra half metre (maximum).
- o Lowering the water level by enlarging the ponds.
- o The ponds should be dredged to restore the ponds to their original depth to reduce the present height of the water. This would reduce the current water pressure on the dams and increase the potential capacity of the ponds should a temporary need arise.
- o Insufficient drainage in the areas of concern below the heath and surrounding it should be addressed by planning controls e.g. front gardens being concreted over and basements being permitted.
- o Improving existing drainage systems and sewers on the street via Camden Council and Thames Water and improving drainage on the Heath via overflow pipes.
- o A high-powered pump and drainage system could be used to take away a quick volume of water and the availability of central London's resources utilised in the case of an emergency.
- o Putting in place rainfall management measures such as swales and key-line cutting above the ponds, designating temporary overspill areas, perhaps controlled by sluice gates, and planting new areas of vegetation to help to retain the water.
- o Water management on Hampstead Heath demands a multiplicity of approaches. To confine to a single approach, i.e. the dams, does not provide a resilient water management plan.
- o Use of weather forecasting, monitoring, early warning systems and evacuation.
- o Allow the ponds' natural drainage systems to take their course and the land to absorb any excessive water as in recent wet weather conditions; any interference with these is unnecessary and untested.
- o Take advantage of constantly improving technology and put in place automatically operating sluice gates
- Refinements or changes to the options were also suggested:
  - o Concern about water from spillways flooding the Brookfield estate and a preference for the water to be discharged to the west or south and west of Highgate No. 1 Pond and /or the Men's Bathing Pond instead.
  - o Retain the existing diversion pipe than runs below Brookfield Mansions to maintain the current level of protection to the building.
  - o It would be better to use the whole west side of the Model Boating Pond as a pond.
  - o Whether the proposed island for the Model Boating Pond was really necessary if storage capacity was being increased on the Men's Bathing Pond.
  - o It was more logical would provide more effective water storage to have a higher dam towards the end of the pond chain. This would enable lower dams further down e.g. the Men's Bathing Pond.
  - o A pathway should be provided on top of the dams so that they can be walked across.
  - o To reinforce the dams and make them impenetrable in a less visible way, at the present height.
  - o To focus on soft rather than hard landscaping.
  - o The proposals miss the opportunity to include further mitigating measures, which might further reduce the risks.
- A view that Option 4 was not the safest option and that the dams might not be high enough to be effective.

- The risk of drowning to swimmers or anyone accidentally falling into the ponds would be increased because anyone in difficulty would not be seen because of the dams.
- The increase in safety provided by the works would only be tiny and therefore were not worth doing.
- The maximum precautions should have preference. The work will only be done once so should be done to the highest specification.
- The proposals don't demonstrate clearly what happens to surface water discharged from the bottom of the chain.
- As recent flooding around the UK has shown, concrete dams do not work.
- These measures may not be sufficient on their own to prevent flooding.
- If the storage approach was introduced and it failed this would actually increase the flooding impact, so it therefore increased risk.
- Plans for overflow of any water from Highgate No 1 pond are unacceptable, as it will flood Brookfield.
- The dams would be ineffective against storm flooding.
- The proposals do not provide for the chances of overspill which a much more likely occurrence

SATISFACTION – was a result of:

- That Option 4 spread the work more equally, was fairer and a better balance of heights and the best compromise.
- That lesser earthworks were required for Option 4.
- That Option 4 would less significantly increase the depth of the Model Boating Pond
- That Option 4 was a professional solution and a good plan.
- Approval of the storage approach proposed by the Ponds Project as a sound concept.
- The design standard being proposed by the works was sufficient to reduce risk.
- That either option was satisfactory and provided protection from risk.
- Concern about risk to property; considering that safety of people was a priority and that dam safety would be improved.
- A view that the work would benefit the local area.
- The work would be a relatively small change to the Heath for a big impact on safety.
- Repairs were needed in any case and the works would provide a long-term improvement.
- The view that the current system does not provide adequate protection.
- Supportive that the City of London was taking action to prevent risk.
- Trust in the City of London's engineers and surveyors.

OTHER COMMENTS

- The view that if the work is required then it should be done properly and by experts.
- That the option should be selected on the basis of whichever offers the most protection against risk and provides the maximum storage capacity.
- That the increase in storage capacity or impact between the Model Boating Pond and Men's Bathing Pond should be balanced.
- That there was little difference between the two options proposed for the Highgate chain.
- Expressing confidence in the City of London's due diligence and judgement and that the team working on the project were making for the best and safest solution.
- It should be noted that the banks on the dams were already quite steep.
- Option 4 was better than nothing.
- Both options for the chain were well thought out.
- Marginal preference for the 2metre embankment means having to accept the 1.5 metre wall.

## Necessity for the Project Option 4

*The consultation material provided set out that City of London would not be able to act on comments that challenged the need for the work to be done which was outside the remit of the consultation. Nonetheless a large number of the comments received were related to this theme. These comments questioned the necessity for the project and were one of the key reasons given for dissatisfaction with the options.*

DISSATISFACTION – was a result of:

- Considering that the ponds project is unnecessary and the need for it remains unproven either in total or at the scale proposed.
- The view that the modelling that underpinned the need for work was flawed and should be reviewed.
- The view that the probability of risk regarding dam safety has been overstated and unproven; that it is very small or remote and the works are out of proportion to it.
- The City of London has based its response on one survey only; another is needed.
- The lack of impact from weather events on the pond dams on the Heath both historically and during recent months despite the record-breaking wet weather conditions.
- That overall rainfall shows that London is getting drier not wetter.
- The view that the interpretation of the Reservoirs Act 1975, as amended by the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, was incorrect and there was no legal basis to necessitate the works or at the scale proposed.
- There are no large areas of water catchment above the dams as there are for reservoirs elsewhere.
- Furthermore that the City of London should challenge the legal requirement for the work to be done and seek a judicial opinion.
- A public enquiry should be held to determine what is necessary.
- The current dams and other arrangements on the Heath to cope with overflowing water from the ponds are already adequate.
- The project would not address local surface water flooding and would not eliminate flood risk from the ponds altogether so there was no point to it.
- That the advice given to the City of London for the project has not been objective.
- That the City of London should take the approach of doing the minimum legally necessary.
- The proposals reveal strong bias and conflict of interest.

SATISFACTION – was a result of:

- Perceiving a risk of flooding from the ponds and wanting protection or a reduction of risk from it for themselves or others.
- An acceptance that the work was necessary and unavoidable.
- The view that it was appropriate to maintain and manage large bodies of water in urban areas. Taking no action was unacceptable and that the City of London had a moral and legal obligation to do the work.
- That the work was needed to conserve the Heath and its environment.
- An acceptance of the need to adapt to a changing climate.
- Experience of historical flooding incidents in the local area.
- That the project provided a long-term measure to improve safety.
- Experiencing difficulty in getting home insurance because of potential flooding risk from ponds.
- Living in the downstream 'at risk' area.

#### OTHER COMMENTS:

- Without knowledge of the hydrological survey and the climate studies it is not possible to comment rationally, it is an engineering question to choose a solution where safety is paramount.
- I hope that the City of London has consulted firms that are specialists in the matter of hydrology.
- Not convinced of need owing to press coverage

#### Information Giving and Consultation Option 4

DISSATISFACTION – was a result of:

- The information was confusing as to whether the dams were solid to full height or whether they had a wall on top and because different information was provided at the Heath displays and at pond locations.
- The proposals do not show what happens to surface water discharged from the bottom of the chain.
- The information does not illustrate clearly the works to the dams or to the spillways.
- The view that no pictures of what the dams will actually look like have been presented to the public.
- The representations of how the dams will look after the work is done are inaccurate, incomplete and do not show the extent of the impact (visual, environmental, size).
- There is no evidence of consultation specifically on the 5.6m high earth dam to be built on the Catch Pit, the raising of the dam at Highgate 1 Pond or the spillways.
- A view that the project should not proceed until the matter has been fully explained to the public.
- The view that public meetings should be held by the City of London to consult with people.
- The view that a public enquiry should be held.
- The view that the process of consultation was shoddy and tokenistic.
- The view that no public consultation has been done on the project for Heath users to draw any conclusions on it
- The view that the plan has not taken account of local people's views and the Corporation is not listening to people's concerns
- That further consultation should be considered by the City of London to be fair to all interested parties.
- Combining the consultation answer options "Don't Know" and "None of the Above" compromises the validity of any results.
- The nostalgic pictures used in the information and consultation materials present the project as a conservation project, when it is a transformative project.
- The City of London should engage in dialogue with contrary opinion about the need to raise the dams from professional civil engineers.
- Not enough information to make an informed decision.
- Information given does not cover all the proposed work.
- The scale of the mock-up pictures in all the City consultation documents gives the impression that the ponds will look much the same after the works. But the model boating pond, for instance, will roughly double in size with the dam running half way up the banks on either side.
- The technical calculations and reasoning as to why dams of 1.5 metres plus are required as the solution to the perceived scale of risk has not been communicated.
- There is inadequate information to support the assertion that works of this scale are necessary under the Reservoirs Act.
- There is insufficient detail given at the Heath exhibition display about the risk of flooding.



- It is impossible to gauge the level of protection required if the threat of flooding is not quantified by a risk assessment.
- The mock-ups do not seem to represent a true picture.

SATISFACTION – was a result of:

- The view was expressed that a lot of trouble had been taken to explain everything.
- A view that the City of London made every effort to consult local interest groups.

OTHER COMMENTS:

- Not sure of difference in height and effect between two options.
- Not familiar with the technical information.
- Difficult to give a view before knowing exactly what it will look like when finished!

#### Implementation Option 4

DISSATISFACTION – was a result of:

- Concern that movement of the contractors' lorries backwards and forwards over the Heath would be destructive.
- The work did not merit the disruption it would cause.
- The work would take a long time to complete
- There would be too much disruption to the Heath and its users, particularly users of the ponds including the following:
  - It would prevent swimmers from using the ponds while the work it happening.
  - Unacceptability to the Orthodox Jewish community, that the segregated swimming would be unavailable for a period of up to two years.

#### Amenity Option 4

DISSATISFACTION – was a result of:

- Dam height will result in loss of amenity.
- The works will ruin the natural appearance and therefore the people's enjoyment of the Heath.
- Concern that the Men's Bathing Pond would be 1.5 metres deeper.

SATISFACTION – was a result of:

- The proposals give consideration to visitors and local residents.
- Limited impact on use.
- The island created on the Model Boating Pond will be a welcome additional facility, especially if the footpath is actually made and useable.

#### Cost Option 4

DISSATISFACTION – was a result of:

- The project is a waste of public/taxpayers' money and not worth it.
- The cost of the project is too excessive and disproportionate to the need and benefit in terms of the small risk reduction gained.
- The cost is out of proportion for example in regard to that allocated to the Somerset levels.
- Lack of trust: A perception that there is a conflict of interest for the engineers that are gaining financial benefit from recommending the work to be done.
- Other projects would provide better value for money.
- The money allocated should go to children who need food.



### Information Requested

- Would like to know how local residents' views of the Heath will be affected by the works.
- A better understanding of how proposals for containing surface water downstream from Highgate No. 1 Pond will prevent flooding to Brookfield Mansions.
- An aerial view of the proposed new position of the path along the ponds would be useful.

## Appendix 3: Highgate Option 6 Results Summary

### Visual Impact Option 6

DISSATISFACTION – was a result of:

- Concern about the overall visual or aesthetic impact from the works and wanting it to be less.
- The concern that the scale of the works would change and spoil the historic landscape, character and natural aspect of the Heath and its views and would breach the Hampstead Heath Act 1871.
- Wanting to protect the current views around the ponds including: the northward view from the path between the Men's Bathing Pond and the Model Boating Pond, the view of both ponds from this path; the view from the Kenwood Ladies Pond looking south and the view of the Model Boating pond from the southern end.
- The heights of the dams for Option 6 being too high and intrusive; being out of proportion to the landscape and enclosing it.
- Considering that Option 6 is more visually intrusive than Option 4.
- The Model Boating Pond being highly visible and Option 6 changing the appearance of this pond most.
- The view that the greater amount work should be focused on the Men's Bathing Pond for aesthetic reasons and that the area around the Model Boating Pond would be spoiled.
- The view that to have a higher dam on the Men's Bathing Pond (as for Option 4) would be less obvious or may even be preferred by bathers who want privacy.
- The view that the Model Bathing Pond dam was too high and concern that the tallest dam overall would be made even higher with Option 6.
- The view that the Men's Bathing Pond would be disfigured.
- The spillways half way round the lower sides of each pond would disfigure the whole area.
- Neither Option 4 nor Option 6 being satisfactory.
- Although the wall on the Men's Bathing Pond is lower with Option 6, the wall will still break up the views and prevent light passing through that the fence allows at present.
- The view that to have a higher dam on the Men's Bathing Pond (as for Option 4) would be less obvious than the increase to the Model Bathing Pond dam's height in Option 6.

SATISFACTION – was a result of:

- The view that Option 6 is less visually different from the current appearance of the Heath than Option 4; has less impact on views and is less intrusive.
- Considering that the Model Boating Pond was the most artificial looking of the ponds and therefore Option 6 most appropriate as most work concentrated there.
- The view that the Boating Pond can visually absorb a higher dam than the men's Bathing Pond.
- The view that the vistas from the top of the Model Boating Pond dam will be popular.
- Considering that Option 6 gives maximum protection for minimum visual impact.
- The view that Option 6 appears to be quite attractive.
- Considering that the Men's Bathing Pond will be visible from the side path.
- Anticipating that the grassed dam at the Model Boating Pond would be pleasant and a good visual feature and enhance the bowl.
- The view that the overall impact on the Men's Bathing Pond and its surroundings would be less with this option.
- The view that the options are not extreme and retain the existing sense of Heath and have minimal visual impact.
- The view that aesthetics are more important on the Men's Bathing Pond
- The view that an enclosed space was appropriate to the Model Boating Pond.

- The view that Option 6 is preferable because the lower wall gives a better view for people swimming in the Men's Bathing Pond.
- The view that Option 6 is more aesthetically pleasing: The extra embankment height is better than the extra wall height and is more natural looking.
- The view that it is better to have more height on the Model Boating Pond dam due to its being less obtrusive because of its location at the 'top end'.
- The 2.5 metre walkway on the Model Boating Pond of Option 6 would provide good views.
- The view that the planned improvements to the Model Boating Pond will enhance the area and increase the rural feel.
- Minimal impact on views.
- From the boating pond there is minimal difference between a 2m and a 2.5m bank but from the path to the south of the men's bathing pond there is a big difference between a (too high) 1.5m wall and a "nice to look over" 1.0m wall.
- Option 6 would improve landscaping more.
- I don't have problem with either proposal, provided the proposed landscaping occurs. I trust that these dams will be landscaped and concealed as much as possible so as not to spoil the present setting
- The scale of the dam will fit the immediate landscape if planted and softened at the sides and shoulders.
- The large dam on the Model Boating Pond will require very careful detailing and planting to successfully blend into the local landscape but I am sure that it can be done.

#### OTHER COMMENTS

- Take care regarding the visual impact of the works for Option 6 from a distance; i.e. that views of the water levels are not compromised by the earthworks.
- The assumption that the proposed 1.5m wall on top of the Men's Bathing Pond dam would replace existing chestnut fencing, which if reinstalled could conceal the wall behind it.
- A liking for the improvements to be made to the Model Boating Pond in both options
- Concern was expressed regarding interruption to the views of the ponds that whatever could be done to minimise the impact of loss of continuity to the ponds would be appreciated.
- Views will be improved with both Options 4 & 6 and be made to look more natural.

#### Environmental Impact Option 6

DISSATISFACTION – was a result of:

- The view that the project will have a negative impact on the environment and would be in breach of the 1871 Hampstead Heath Act 1871.
- The works will present disturbance and endangerment to wildlife and no benefit to nature.
- The natural habitat of many species will be disturbed or disrupted while the work is carried out and be damaged.
- Option 6 will increase the volume of the Model Boating Pond and thus impacting more significantly on the ecological make up of the pond.
- Adverse impact on the wild, natural environment of the Heath and the rural nature of the pond chain.
- The negative environmental impact of the plan to cut into the hillside around the Model Boating Pond.
- The Heath's environment will take years to recover from the works or be permanently damaged.
- Loss of trees and vegetation along the earth banks.
- The risk is too small to warrant the impact.

SATISFACTION – was a result of:

- Keeping slow growing trees is important but losing ash or willow is not of concern as they are fast growers.
- The Men's Bathing Pond is surrounded by much more wildlife and vegetation, so therefore most work should be done on the Model Boating Pond.
- The Ponds Project gives the opportunity to fund other changes to improve the Heath and its wildlife.
- Both options maintain the integrity of the Heath's environment.
- Improvements in the water quality, planting and landscaping are welcomed.

OTHER COMMENTS

- The option to be selected should be whichever one best keeps the look of the Heath.
- The work should be done with minimal impact on natural habitats whichever option is chosen.

### Engineering Approach Option 6

DISSATISFACTION – was a result of:

- The proposed approach is over designed, over engineered and over built. If the approach was better informed it would have a much lighter touch. Go for soft rather than hard landscaping options.
- Scale of work disproportionate to reduction in downstream risk.
- Get a second opinion from independent consultants.
- Seek the help of Dutch experts who are very experienced.
- Concern about the extent of the slope between the Model Boating and Men's Bathing Ponds.
- Questioning whether enlargement of the Model Boating Pond is necessary if the Men's Bathing Pond capacity is increased.
- A lower dam preferred for the Model Boating Pond.
- The dam on the Men's Boating Pond is not high enough.
- Banks on these ponds are already quite steep.
- Cost and effort of increased dam height for Option 6 disproportionate to risks.
- Less balanced than Option 4. A much worse option overall.
- The Men's Bathing Pond could be deeper.
- Prefer the impact to be on the Men's Bathing Pond.
- The Model Boating Pond is used by more people.
- The embankment at 2.5m is very high and will mean people walk around the pond very high up.
- No evidence how people would be able to walk around the Model Boating Pond in future. Dislike that there is no pathway on top of the dam. There does not seem to be a plan to enable walkers to walk along the top of the dam.
- Dislike both Options 4 & 6 and don't want either of them or to choose between them or consider them to be an engineering solution.
- Water management on Hampstead Heath demands a multiplicity of approaches. To confine to a single approach, i.e. dams, does not provide a resilient water management plan.
- Alternative, lower impact or less invasive approaches should be explored by City of London and a number have been suggested as follows:
  - Create more spillways.
  - Improve overflows above and below ground. These need further research and consideration.
  - Enlarge or improve main drains; improve street drainage. Camden Council, Thames Water and the Corporation of London ought to oversee and fund the update of the drains and sewers systems as a priority, including improved management of the River Fleet.

- Repair and reinforcement of dams at existing heights. It should be possible to make them impenetrable without raising them.
- It would be sufficient action to mend existing sides of the ponds if eroded or decayed.
- The ponds should be dredged to restore the base of the ponds to their original level. This would reduce the present height of the water up the dams and pressure on them.
- Take into consideration the natural water courses and geology of Hampstead Heath: Introduce more reed beds and more tree planting.
- Dam can be made safe with sheet piling which could be designed to raise the height by an extra half metre at most.
- Living at Brookfield we are concerned about the spillway water flooding our estate. It seems to us to make more sense for the water to be discharged to the west or south and west of Highgate No. 1 Pond and /or the Men's Bathing Pond.
- Provide a use for the water downstream.
- Planning regulations need to be addressed: Too many front gardens have been concreted over and many basements are still being permitted.
- Install a high powered pump and drainage system to take away a quick volume of water
- Utilise Central London resources in the case of an emergency to prevent the overflowing or breakdown of the existing water barriers.
- Put in place rainfall management measures such as swales and key-line cutting above the ponds.
- Designate temporary overspill areas controlled by sluice gates.
- Planting new areas of vegetation to help to retain the water.
- Use weather forecasting and install an early warning system and consider evacuations.
- Survey and strengthen existing dams and dam crests without increasing the height of the dams.
- Small-scale excavations to create holding ponds.
- Use side ponds for overflow.
- Introduce the mechanisation of the sluices between the ponds and a purpose-designed early warning system to lower pond levels fast and make room for extra flood waters ahead of extreme weather. Then, of course, the problem occurs (as in reality it does now too, rather any threat to the integrity of the dams) with the capacity of the storm drains in the urban system adjacent to the Heath.
- Plans for overflow of any water from Highgate No 1 pond are unacceptable as this will flood Brookfield.
- The land already absorbs and deals with any excessive water through natural drainage so the Ponds should be permitted to allow their natural flow and seepage systems. Interference with these are unnecessary and untested.
- Option 6 is not as subtle as Option 4.
- Option 6 is worse than Option 4.
- Better to use the whole west side of the Model Boating Pond.
- An infrastructure project of this scope and scale needs to be reviewed.
- A private company, Thames Water plc, is being provided with a resource (i.e. the theoretical ability to store excess water at a time when its sewer system is unable to cope with a given volume of water) at the expense of the public good.
- Disagree with the approach to hold even more water with higher dams as a solution as there will be even more water to contend with if the new dam breaks and greater risk.
- Increasing the depth of the water increases the loading on the existing dams.
- Concern that the proposals for containing surface water are not sufficient to prevent Brookfield Mansions being flooded.

- The proposals would longer use the existing diversion pipe than runs below Brookfield Mansions, which would make the situation worse for this property.
- Raising the dams will not work to prevent flooding as water will flow round the sides.
- Not enough is being done.
- As recent flooding around the UK has shown, concrete dams do not work
- Better to spread the increased capacity more equally between the ponds.
- The proposals do not provide for the chances of overflow which is a much more likely occurrence

SATISFACTION – was a result of:

- Preference for a higher bank than a higher wall.
- Makes more sense to go for 2.5m rather than 2m dam in the scale of the whole project
- Option 6 has a bigger increase to water retention capacity thus giving increased safety in the case of extreme weather and give time for drains and sewers to cope.
- Either Option 4 or 6 is good.
- A view that Option 6 has the least intervention.
- Option 6 has the safest and the most permanent fix for the money and disruption
- The final result will be better than the existing one.
- The Model Boating Pond is a fragile area and paths are prone to flooding already: Option 6 should eliminate the problem for the longer term.
- The Men's Bathing Pond wall is lower on Option 6.
- A small change for a big impact on safety.
- Prefer works to be concentrated on Model Boating Pond than Men's Bathing Pond.
- Both Option 4 & Option 6 are compromises borne out of necessity and both work with minimal disruption and adjustment.
- Think the higher 2.5m dam reduces the flow rate downstream slightly more than the 2m one.
- Pleased that the work is being done.
- Safety comes first.
- Views from the Men's Swimming Pond for swimmers retained with Option 6.
- Preferable to have higher dam at the top end, as it's more effective and less obtrusive.
- Importance to ensure that dams cannot collapse and cause flooding.
- Taking no action would be unacceptable.
- Favouring whatever protects the dams and the downstream area the best.
- Agree that slipways are needed.
- Work should be done to give communities as much protection as possible.
- Option 6 would give more protection than Option 4.
- Option 6 is better because it maximises storage behind one significant dam thereby concentrating most of the work in one place.
- Trust in the City of London's surveyors and engineers.
- Option 6 provides the greatest future security.
- Option 6 is the most effective.
- The plans are well designed and either option is acceptable.

#### OTHER PREFERENCES

- Walls should be avoided where possible: grassed embankment preferable; prefer bigger natural embankment on Men's Bathing Pond and Model Boating Pond.
- Preference for whichever out of options 4 or 6 offer the maximum protection.
- OK with higher dam as long as there are walk ways on top.
- I would like the City of London to advise Heath users what they believe to be the best option. I trust the City of London to make the best decision and then get on with it

## OTHER COMMENTS

- Either Option 4 or 6 is OK.
- Option 4 & Option 6 are very similar.
- The plans look reasonable enough. I think it would benefit the area
- Accept the decision that is most favoured by the engineering advice.
- Comfortable with the storage approach provided there is sufficient capacity.
- Why not raise Model Boating Pond by 2.5 metres and Men's Bathing Pond by 1.5 metres to give maximum protection from flooding.
- There is a balance between providing a greater leisure area on dam and the need for greater earthworks
- Put the dams higher up the chain.
- Approaching from the south, I think the Model Boating Pond dam will look quite prominent in the landscape.
- The approach, whichever option is chosen, is good.
- Wherever possible, the maximum precautions should have preference. If there is a question as to which is preferable then the decision should always be, to take the option that offers greatest security against the unexpected.
- This work will only be done once so must be done to the highest specification. Do it properly and don't ignore the engineers' recommendations, hopefully these changes will not then require a re-visit on a few years time
- I understand that any water that isn't held back will miss the entrance to the Thames Water's Flood Alleviation Tunnels near Swain's Lane roundabout. If this happens then the water will overwhelm the sewers again as happened in 1975 and cause flooding lower down.
- The causeways and paths will have to be raised and modified to cope with higher water levels for Option 6.
- Not familiar with the technicalities; no engineering knowledge [Don't know / none of the above]
- Not in a position to choose a scheme but would like whichever is the most effective against future floods.

## Necessity for the Project Option 6

*The consultation material provided set out that City of London would not be able to act on comments that challenged the need for the work to be done which was outside the remit of the consultation. Nonetheless a large number of comments received were related to this theme. These comments questioned the necessity for the project and were one of the key reasons given for dissatisfaction with the options.*

DISSATISFACTION – was a result of:

- Ponds have small drainage catchments.
- The modelling work underpinning the project is flawed or unproven.
- Unconvinced by the justification presented; evidence lacking.
- City of London has based its response on one survey only; another is needed.
- The view that risk factors have been misjudged and are in reality low: the project is an over-reaction and is an extreme or disproportionate response to the actual risk. The approach far more cautious than any other of London's flood defences.
- The Reservoirs Act does not legally require the work to be done or done at the scale of the project, the City of London's /engineer's interpretation is wrong and the requirement should be tested.
- That the City of London should challenge or seek a judicial review on the need to take action.

- The lack of historical evidence for flooding on the Heath and lack of recent impact from the recent winter's record breaking wet weather.
- The basis of the need is a narrow engineering requirement.
- Questioning or lack of confidence in the City of London's engineering guidance and advice.
- Local flooding has never been caused by the ponds or the pond's dams failing on a previous occasion.
- Other contrary expert opinion on the legal position or engineering requirement.
- The view that measures such as better street sewerage and drainage would better address the risk of flooding and the deficiencies of which are regarded as having been the cause of flooding in the past.
- The project will not rule out the possibility of flooding downstream in extreme weather conditions.
- The current dams and spillways on the Heath are adequate as they are.
- The threat of flooding should be quantified by a risk assessment in order to gauge the level of protection required.
- The City of London should take an approach of doing the legal minimum.
- Alternative options for addressing the risk should be looked into.
- Refer to the arguments set out by the Heath & Hampstead Society / Dam Nonsense campaign.
- Concern that the plans are biased and influenced by a conflict of interest e.g. a financial benefit and connection between the survey and the work envisaged; and the question of who will gain financially. Many of those advising on the project cannot be thought to be neutral in the debate.

SATISFACTION – was a result of:

- Belief in the importance of the work.
- The project providing greater protection to people in the downstream area from flood risk.
- Option 6 providing the most increased capacity of the ponds and best protection from flooding.
- The benefit brought by the project to conserve the Heath and its environment.
- To future proof against a changing climate so that the work would not have to be repeated.
- The view that higher dams give better protection.
- Experience of historical flooding event in the area.
- A view that the ponds needed to cope with extreme weather.
- Approving of action is being taken against the risk of flooding.
- Experiencing difficulty in getting home insurance currently because of the risk from the ponds.
- To give protection against extreme weather.

OTHER COMMENTS:

- Without knowledge of the hydrological survey and the climate studies it is not possible to comment rationally, it is an engineering question to choose a solution where safety is paramount.
- I believe it is essential to raise the dams by 2.5m and 1.5m, if this is considered necessary to deal with excess rainfall.

### Information Giving and Consultation Option 6

DISSATISFACTION – was a result of:

- Proposals don't show clearly what happens to surface water discharged from the bottom of the chain.
- The information provided does not illustrate clearly the works to the dams or to the spillways.
- Impact on the view from the Men's Bathing Pond south is not shown clearly.



- No image of altered view from east of Model Boating Pond provided so makes options difficult to assess.
- Not clear how Option 6 will look.
- The view that the actual and visual/environmental impact of the size of the proposed dams is not accurately presented in the mock up photographs/illustrations, which give the impression that the ponds will look much the same after the works.
- It is not explained that a whole new dam is involved in the project which will impact on the landscape.
- The information is not clear that the Model Boating Pond will roughly double in size with the dam running half way up the banks on either side.
- The technical calculations and reasoning as to why Dams of 1.5 metres+ high are required to address the risk has not been communicated.
- No clarity about issues over options and no answers from City of London.
- Trying to force choice from unacceptable options
- You are inviting comments in a rainy, cold season, when the vast majority of people who use the ponds and the Heath are not so active.
- The view that the project should not proceed until it has been fully explained to the public.
- The City should be consulting properly at public meetings.
- City of London have stated they did not wish to hold open public consultations and do not wish in the future to hold public consultations.
- The visual representations should also show any changes from a closer view, not just from a distance.
- There has been no public consultation on this for the users of the Heath to draw any conclusions.
- A full public inquiry should be conducted instead of forcing through this work with a tokenistic consultative process such as this.
- This consultation should have been about whether either or no option was preferred. This choice has not been given.
- The representations of how the dams will look is inaccurate.
- Combining the answer options "Don't Know" And "None of the Above" compromises the validity of any results taken from this survey.
- Nostalgic pictures used are presenting the project as a conservation project, when it is in fact transformative.
- The City should engage in a proper dialogue professional engineers who have challenged the project rather than spend a great deal of unnecessary money on disfiguring the Heath.
- It is not right that this so called consultation assumes that the works are necessary.
- Not enough information given to make informed decision.
- The information giving has been misleading: the representations of how the dams will look and has been incomplete and does not fully show the extent of the impact.
- Information given does not cover all the proposed work
- The proposals don't demonstrate clearly what happens to surface water discharged from the bottom of the chain
- It is not clear where a point such as mine should be ticked [challenging the necessity of the project] - 'not satisfied' or 'none of the above'.
- A Public Enquiry should be held to determine what is necessary,

#### OTHER COMMENTS:

- The impact is less than expected before viewing the plans.
- Difficult to comment on the Options before knowing exactly what it will look like when finished

## Implementation Option 6

DISSATISFACTION – was a result of:

- Disruption caused by the building to the traffic and life generally
- As users we want minimal disruptions, ability to swim in any of the unaffected ponds.
- Concern that the project will ruin access for many year whilst the works are undertaken.
- It would prevent swimmers from using the ponds while the work it happening.
- There would be way too much disruption to the Heath and its users
- Long time deprivation for heath users.
- The project would disturb the men's swimming.
- Short term disruption.

OTHER COMMENTS

- The work should be done with consideration for visitors/local residents

## Amenity Option 6

DISSATISFACTION – was a result of:

- The proposed works would have a major impact on the amenity of the Heath.
- Raising the ponds will diminish the public's enjoyment of the ponds.
- The height of the dams will be too great to see a good view and enjoy swimming.
- Would not improve the aesthetic image of Kenwood and its amenities is one of the last true gems within London and it would be a true shame to ruin.
- The risk is too small to warrant the disruption.
- The project causes damage to the public realm.
- The proposed works are excessive to the distress of those of us who live around it and make regular use of it.
- This portion of the pond won't be accessible as it currently is.
- None of the options are desirable. As users we want improved swimming facilities at the end of the process.
- A large destruction of the amenities of present dams.
- It ruins the appearance of one of the last natural outdoor swimming facilities in London and surrounding area.
- If anyone falls into a pond, or is swimming, and is in the process of drowning, nobody would be able to see it because of the dams.
- Changes the ponds' present primary role as recreational resources to create a massive storm water catchment facility with high embankments.

SATISFACTION – was a result of:

- Less work required on the Men's Bathing Pond in Option 6 and therefore less likely to upset swimmers or change their view.
- The grass bank at the south end of the Model Boating Pond could be a pleasant place to lie down and admire the view.
- Option 6 does not seem to affect use unduly.
- The green embankments create an asset for leisure and lifestyle in the area. Extra grass is always good.
- Option 6 has more option for tourists in peak summer and their picnics.
- Bigger dam for Option 6 won't interfere with current use of pond.
- Smaller wall for Option 6; dam may be nice place to sit.
- Option 6 will not change the swimming experience as much.

- A 2.5m grass bank will be a pleasant place to lie and look over the boating pond. The higher bank will provide more space for relaxing between the path and the water.

#### OTHER COMMENTS

- The work should be done with consideration for visitors/local residents.

#### Cost Option 6

DISSATISFACTION – was a result of:

- Considering the project a misuse or waste of public money.
- Spend the money on improving drainage, which would be less expensive.
- Use funds for more useful projects to accommodate children's educational and teenage social projects.
- More money is being spent on the project than has been allocated to the Somerset levels.
- The project is too expensive.
- These proposals will give a tiny increase in safety at a very disproportionate cost; not good value for money.
- Unnecessary expense to taxpayers.
- The money allocated should go to children who need food!

#### Information Requested Option 6

- The new boundary of the proposed boating pond should be marked out on the ground with posts for a week or two. New paths and pond boundaries should also be marked out in the same way. If people object to that they will object far more to the project work.
- Need to know how local residents' views will be affected by the work.
- Would like to know which option reduces likelihood of flooding from Highgate No. 1 pond overflowing
- Would like to know which option reduces likelihood of surface water being discharged from bottom of the chain
- More information need as to what the works to the dams and spillways would involve
- It is still very unclear of exactly what the 'visual' impact be perhaps making a video giving a 'virtual tour' of the walkways before and after dam building might help.
- It is inevitable that these dam works will create shadow areas. How will this impact on swimmers in the Men's Bathing Pond?
- Concerned that the proposals for containing surface water are not sufficient to prevent Brookfield Mansions being flooded and would like a better understanding of how this will be effected.

#### Suggestions Option 6

- I like the idea to introduce the island. I am not sure about whether there should be public access. It would make a good wildlife sanctuary.
- Raising the path to the west of the pond so that views can be had over the dams is a nice idea.

## Appendix 4: Hampstead Option M Results Summary

### Visual Impact Option M

#### DISSATISFACTION EXPRESSED:

- The works and their size will have a negative, permanent impact on the beautiful, natural, wild, appearance of the Heath's historic landscape and its traditional features in breach of 1871 Hampstead Heath Act – even a 1 metre dam.
- The works will make the Heath like a municipal park or reservoir. Walkers will be looking down into water more than 1 metre below.
- The plan is too big for the area. Shocked at size and height.
- I cannot see for 1 metre dam. Beautiful vistas will be obscured.
- This option involves considerably more visual impact than Option P.
- Any raising of a pond dam will spoil the beauty and in fact hide the beauty of the pond from passers by.
- Raising the mixed pond will change the views. Would destroy the southward view enjoyed by swimmers and remove upstream views of the mixed bathing pond enjoyed by walkers from lower down the chain.
- The Heath as we see it today is a construct; it is not 'natural'. What we do with it and to it is a matter of judgement. We are the custodians of the future as well as guardians of our own interests. The proposed works are out of scale with the current and any reasonably foreseeable idea of the 'natural' appearance of the ponds.
- Will lose the open feeling of the heath.
- Don't want to look at concrete or manmade walls on the Heath.
- Spillways at the Mixed Bathing Pond would ruin the beauty of this area of the Heath.
- The Catchpit dam will have a particularly negative impact.

#### SATISFACTION EXPRESSED:

- The less obtrusive option. This option will have minimal impact on the appearance of the Heath.
- Less visible change, least visually intrusive, will least alter the landscape. Visually more appealing than Option P. Least visual impact while fulfilling the project objectives. Will look more in keeping than Option P. Option M more visually acceptable.
- Least raising of dams. Prefer lower dams. Better, as heights not raised so much. Raising the dam by 1m seems visually ok and acceptable.
- Walls in Option P look least attractive. Grassed embankment would look more natural than wall. Don't think wall would be nice. Prefer natural look. Looking at No.2 pond I prefer not to see a wall on the far bank.
- Less visual impact on Mixed Pond in particular, does not involve much alteration of the view. 1m mixed bathing pond is OK as it maintains visual connections.

#### OTHER COMMENTS:

- There is less option to landscape than with the Highgate chain options, so want the dam to be as low as feasible.
- The sense of continuity between these three Hampstead Ponds is critical. The views from Hampstead Pond No. 2 are therefore very important. Unfortunately Hampstead Pond No. 2 would be most affected by the proposed changes. Option M is preferable, as dam would only be raised by 1metre. Could the two trees, which would be lost be replaced by planting others nearby? i.e. closer to Pond 1? This would help reduce the gap.
- I trust that these dams will be landscaped and concealed as much as possible so as not to spoil the present setting.

## Environmental Impact Option M

### DISSATISFACTION EXPRESSED:

- Involves felling 2 trees. Prefer the Option that only loses 1 tree. Loss of trees not ideal, not warranted, not satisfactory. Regret loss of trees. Minimal tree loss is preferable.
- Works will significantly impact on heath contrary to 1871 Hampstead Heath Act.
- Better to preserve trees by moving water catchment upstream.
- The work is not environmentally necessary.
- The environment and topography will be changed.
- I object to the destruction of trees and wildlife in the 'catchpit dam' area
- The Heath should remain wild and natural.
- Total loss of trees and other vegetation except grass along the earth dams

### SATISFACTION EXPRESSED:

- This option disturbs the area by the least amount. Involves the least intervention. Less impact on the Heath's environment. Less disruptive. There would be little impact on the immediate vicinity. Restricts the damage to the Heath to a minimum.
- To conserve the Heath and environment.
- Give up a tree for the least walls. Loss of 2 trees does no permanent damage, the landscape changes all the time and new trees will grow. Opt for lower dams over trees for the trade off. Loss of two trees insignificant.
- Better environmentally.

### OTHER COMMENTS:

- Gives opportunity to fund other changes to improve Heath and wildlife.
- I prefer the more modest change.

## Engineering Approach Option M

### DISSATISFACTION EXPRESSED:

- Not the safest option
- Would like the ponds/dams to be bigger deeper.
- Provides less storage.
- Concentrate on Hampstead No. 2 Pond.
- Do not wish to choose either of the Hampstead Options.
- There are other ways of managing water than just building up huge dams. Not enough consideration has been given to these.
- Water management on Hampstead Heath demands a multiplicity of approaches. To confine to a single approach, i.e. dams, does not provide a resilient water management plan.
- The scale of the work is unnecessary.
- The proposed solution is over engineered. A lighter touch solution informed by greater information is a better approach than heavy interventionism.
- More environmentally sensitive solutions should be used.
- Evidence worldwide and in the UK shows that dams do not work and cause more problems than they solve. A dam may well make the situation worse: forcing water down new courses and causing floods
- TV footage of flood defences in the southwest shows them to be much less intrusive on the landscape. Is Atkins' solution up to date with current flood technology?
- Alternative approaches suggested:

- It would be better to consult with Thames Water about improvements to the sewage system, which houses the Fleet. Soakaways and sewage improvements could be carried out without damage to the environment.
- Camden Council and the Corporation of London ought to oversee and fund the update of the drains and sewers systems.
- Improving overflows above and below ground should be enough.
- Remove all storm water connections to the sewer system and increase the storm water capacity.
- Repair and reinforcing the dams at their existing heights
- Using the water further downstream
- Putting in place rainfall management measures such as swales and key-line cutting above the ponds
- Designating temporary overspill areas controlled by sluice gates.
- Take advantage of modern technology and install automatically operated sluice gates
- Planting new areas of vegetation to help to retain the water.
- The ponds should be dredged to restore their base to the original level. This would lower the height the water comes up the dams and would thereby reduce water pressure on the dams. It would also increase the capacity of the ponds if the need arose.
- Ensure that the dams are strong enough at their present height.
- Retain rainfall at it's point of contact in the landscape to reduce run off, creating a buffer and protecting downstream engineered dams and piped drainage systems from extremes of flow. Sumps, swales, key line ploughing, and strategic planting can all contribute to the retention of water in the landscape. Happy to provide further details [*Consultation Ref. O676*]
- There is plenty of area behind the Mixed Bathing Pond for natural soak away
- Use of weather forecasting, early warning systems and evacuations.
- Proper maintenance of the dams.
- Drain the water off behind the ponds.
- Works disproportionately too large in comparison with a hypothetical reduction on downstream risk.
- The figures used to calculate the height of the dams are based on an incredibly unlikely storm scenario. Using less outlandish figures would surely still allow for a high standard of safety.
- Don't think the dam raising will make a positive impact, nothing is best in this case.
- No evidence that higher dams, which will presumably only give the ponds greater capacity, will reduce the risk of flooding every 400,000 years.
- The higher and more extensive the dams, the more fragile they will be.
- Dissatisfied although it is least worst option.
- Mixed Bathing Pond: Length and narrowness of the chain pond gives it a river like feeling. This impression has a lot to do with the level of the footpath across the common being at the same level as the ground area outside the changing rooms. Raising the level of this causeway would destroy this very attractive feature and be avoided if at all possible.
- Think the overall appearance of the dam between the Mixed Bathing Pond and Hampstead No. 2 Pond is poor: Too harsh an edge makes it less attractive. Would have hoped for more visionary approach: earth dam? A timber walkway above a more fixed/engineered dam?
- All options unacceptable.
- Nothing explicit is said about surface water drainage.
- If they are raised, more water will be stored behind them, if the dams are nevertheless overtopped and fail, the resulting flooding downstream would be disastrous.
- Capture and slow release is a key principle in water management today -but there must be somewhere for the water to go. The rainfall event that the engineers have designed for would

massively stress the entire drainage system downstream and it would be most unfortunate if a further rainfall event occurred before the level of water in the ponds had been free to return to normal.

- Not enough to prevent flooding southwards.
- The work does not adequately reduce flooding risk for Oak Village.
- Not sufficient in safeguarding my home.
- Insufficient height to be effective. Not high enough to ensure safety. Protection potentially insufficient. Not enough to prevent a flood.
- Ineffective against flash floods.
- This Option does not give us any extra protection. It would almost be negligent not to increase downstream flood protection whilst doing these essential works on the Heath.
- No need to further dam up. The Catch Pit is also being dammed up so why not increase that capacity? Allow spillage dam to Hampstead No. 1 pond and contain it there, as there is potential for high capacity by damming up its North and West sides of No 1 Pond.
- Prefer more protection if the work is to be done.
- Drainage improvements are needed to prevent the reoccurrence of the 1975 local flooding. Improving safety of the dams does not ensure no flooding below the Heath, which must be a priority if any work is done.
- Early warning systems are needed to prevent loss of life not just reduce the risk of it.
- Concerned that there is a connection between the survey and the work envisaged i.e. financial benefit/conflict of interest.
- In any circumstance in which the dams will be breached, there will be much more severe direct impacts from surface water in the area. Will not be effective in preventing flooding in the freak events.
- This creates a very dangerous Health & Safety problem because if anyone falls into a pond, or is swimming, and is in the process of drowning, nobody would be able to see it because of the dams and the City would be at great risk of being sued.
- Regarding the concern that in the event of the dams being over topped, water moving around trees would wash away the earth dam more quickly. I think it more likely that the current web of tree and other roots provide extra stability to the dams and removing trees and bushes would weaken the earth structures.
- I am concerned by overtopping and think Option P would provide better protection.
- The raise in level of the dam isn't as great as in the previous options [Highgate] and therefore won't hold back as much rainwater should it be needed.
- A lot of work for little effect.
- I would prefer the maximal approach to the dam in order to prevent flooding given the increase in rainfall we are expected to experience in the future.

#### SATISFACTION EXPRESSED:

- The option involving the least work, so preferable to Option P
- From the report, this option reduces PMF by a factor of 2, which, given that the existing protection is better than 1 in 1000 seems sufficient. Given the risks seems not worth extra cost and effort on the other option to raise dams even further.
- The plans look reasonable enough. Good plan. Looks well thought out. Sensible improvement.
- Seems to be least bad option.
- Makes the situation safer.
- Seems like small change for big impact on safety.
- Completely in favour.
- This option will be better.
- Want safest option. Best for those of us downstream.



- Seems there would be less works for the same effect.
- Appropriate levels proposed.
- Use of Catchpit looks to give sufficient capacity.
- Option M avoids raising of one of the dams
- Early, preventive intervention will reduce the drainage burden on the whole system. As Camden Council continue to increase residential numbers to the south of the Heath, the risks and associated costs of inaction become greater.
- Option M would give greater protection than Option P.
- I like the idea of having the path going by the Mixed Bathing Pond going over the dam and not having any wall.
- 1 metre will not appear significant in its context.
- This seems much more reasonable.
- I trust City of London engineers and surveyors
- I feel this option provides the greatest future security whilst also being the most aesthetically pleasing.
- Prefer a lower overall rise.
- Less impact on the Mixed Pond.

#### OTHER COMMENTS:

- Both options again look very good. I am sure the final result would be ok either way in the long term. Pro's and con's of the two options are evenly balanced. Equally OK with Option M or Option P. The plans are very well designed and I am happy with either option. Both options seem to cause little disruption
- There is no second choice it is either Option M or nothing.
- No opinion, whatever makes it safest.
- Any protection better than none.
- Both M and P have minimum disruption and adjustment. Well done
- This option is preferable to Option P but is still not desirable.
- With climate change the risk of serious damage to downstream communities appears to be increasing. I believe that such works can be carried out sympathetically and with appropriate landscaping may even be an aesthetic improvement.
- Raising the dam by 1 metre is acceptable if it is done sensitively.
- A reasonable scheme particularly the storage in the catch pit pond.
- Attenuation is not as good as the other option and this option results in greater tree loss on No2, therefore I give this a lower score. But I do prefer the lower dam on the Mixed Bathing Pond.

#### **Necessity for the Project Option M**

#### DISSATISFACTION EXPRESSED:

- The dams are unnecessary. There is no cogent, rational reason for them.
- The dams are inappropriate. Rules established for one part of the country being applied all over.
- If extreme storms will cause floods in the area downstream, it is not logical that building higher dams will make the slightest difference.
- Not convinced it is required. May not be justified. Unproven. Another survey is needed. Reasons given are insufficient. Based upon selective and inconclusive evidence. There is more evidence that it is unnecessary such as that compiled by the Heath & Hampstead Society.
- The risk has been over egged. The probability is very low. Alarmist scenarios presented. Risk of being hit by a falling tree is greater but we would not cut down the trees in response.



- The works are an over-reaction and an over the top response. The scale of the work is unnecessary. Over-engineered. There is no balance to any of the current proposals. The options proposed are not proportionate to the risk.
- Recent wet weather conditions have demonstrated no impact on the ponds or pond dams.
- There is no history of flooding or loss of life from flooding on the Heath from the ponds/dams.
- Will not prevent flooding in the downstream area, as past flooding is not due to the dams. Flooding was caused by bad drainage, which has since been rectified. This has been officially recorded. Flooding is a wider issue than damming ponds on the Heath. Water outflow is what needs to be improved. Remove all storm water connections to the sewer system and increase the storm water capacity.
- Planning for a 1 in 400,000 year event does not respect risk/reward principles. The 1:400,000 year flooding scenario is extreme, unrealistic and hypothetical. The professional guidance behind the calculation is in question within the engineering profession.
- Peer review of the modelling presented has suggested the software used is questionable. The data on which the modelling is based is unsound. Mistrust of the calculations.
- Misunderstanding of legal obligations. Reservoirs Act does not require works of this size. The ponds are not working reservoirs and so fall outside the legal requirement. Building dams is not a given legal requirement. Unnecessary according to expert legal authority (Lord Hooffmann). Based on narrow engineering judgement. Limit height of dams to absolute minimum to comply with legislation. Statutory law never requires the removal of all possible risk. The City of London has acted as both judge and jury in this matter. Too narrow an interpretation of the legislation. Lawyers for the City of London have been over-zealous.
- The City of London should seek a Judicial Review. Challenge the ruling. The legislation should be tested in court. Legal confirmation by the High Court is needed.
- The engineering profession has alternative view and we need more expert discussion. Peer review of the City's engineering advice suggests that the condition of the dams is good and they have greater resistance to overtopping than assessed.
- The City of London should get a second opinion from independent consultants, who should aim to properly assess the risk, and find solutions with the least impact on the environment.
- The plan has strong bias and conflict of interest. Too many of the people advising have (indirect) interests in seeing work of this nature going ahead.
- It's better to wait until serious flooding incident actually takes place before taking such drastic steps.
- The porous nature of the soils on the upper parts of the Heath means that there would not be rapid runoff on the occasion of extreme rainstorms.
- Agree with the arguments raised by the Dam Nonsense campaign.

#### SATISFACTION EXPRESSED:

- It's necessary and sensible.
- Trust in the City of London that it needs doing.
- Option M is the best of the necessary options.
- Taking no action would be unacceptable.
- Given recent weather, the works might offer protection to people living in the area.
- Do not want to rely on early warning systems because they don't stop flooding or sewers from surcharging into our streets and homes.
- This seems to be a rational response to the real risk.

#### OTHER COMMENTS:

- If we must, we must.
- Wonder why the Environment Agency would want to focus on such an unnecessary project where there is no need, whilst flooded areas are in great need of help.
- The Institute Civil Engineers guidance does not rationally apply to all sites. It cannot be applied here because the interest of safety can only be reasonably served if warning and evacuation measures, which must, by statute be carried out, will reduce the target loss of life even in the theoretical 1:400,000 year storm.
- Cost to the Heath and to its users outweighs the extremely remote possibility of the kind of climate event that would indicate any danger to life.

#### Information Giving and Consultation Option M

##### DISSATISFACTION EXPRESSED:

- You don't mention cutting down the trees for this option
- From the website I see that Option M also includes a third element which I don't fully understand, so I can't answer this question.
- Why isn't City of London listening to large numbers of users?
- You have not made clear whether any work in Catchpit area is included.
- Other option choices should be given as part of this consultation
- The City should be consulting properly at public meetings.
- The City seems to have made up its mind without exploring the alternatives.
- There is no information provided or consultation on the 5.6 metre Catchpit dam.
- The technical calculations and reasoning as to why dams of 1.5 metres plus high are required as the solution to the perceived scale of risk .
- The Heath display in Parliament Hill yard misrepresents the actual and visual, physical and environmental impact of the size of the proposed dams. Illustrations provided do not give accurate depiction.
- City of London has stated it does not wish to hold open public consultations now and in the future.
- I find the visual representations very misleading as they show any changes from hundreds of metres away.
- No information is given about the spillways at the Mixed Pond.
- This consultation should have been about whether either or no option was preferred. This choice has not been given.
- The information fails to make clear that a whole new dam will be created, rather than simply making existing dams safe.
- There is no clear idea of exactly what the visual impact will be and the resultant walking/feeling experience after having built these dams, it's almost impossible to give a meaningful/accurate response. At the moment, people are simply having to use their imaginations.
- It is impossible to gauge the level of protection required if the threat of flooding is not quantified by any risk assessment. The information given at the Heath exhibition appeared to be planning for an unspecified yet huge increase in flooding, over a period which encompassed climate changes for an unlimited future period. How can one respond to this?
- Not enough information given to make informed decision.

#### OTHER COMMENTS:

- I would like the City of London to advise Heath users what they believe to be the best option. I trust the City of London to make the best decision and then get on with it.
- Without knowledge of the hydrological survey and the climate studies it is not possible to comment rationally, it is an engineering question to choose a solution where safety is paramount.
- We don't know how local residents' views will be affected by works.
- Corporation seems to be protecting itself against something which has at the very most an extremely remote chance of occurring.
- The Catchpit earth dam is a little walked part of the heath, but a picture would be useful.
- Difficult to comment before knowing exactly what it will look like when finished.
- We feel we are not in a position to choose a scheme but would like whichever is the most effective against future floods

#### Implementation Option M

##### DISSATISFACTION EXPRESSED:

- Disrupting the natural habitat of many species while the work is carried out.
- Disruption caused by the building to the traffic and life generally.
- Not satisfied that the level of disturbance and disruption is necessary.
- The proposed construction work must involve some use of large earth-moving machinery as used on projects such as widening motorways.
- As users we want minimal disruptions, ability to swim in any of the unaffected ponds and improved swimming facilities at the end of the process.

##### OTHER COMMENTS:

- It is the impact in the intermediate time that concerns me. As long as old trees aren't damaged and birds and other animals are disturbed as least as possible

#### Amenity Option M

##### DISSATISFACTION EXPRESSED:

- Very disturbing to Heath users. Long time deprivation to Heath users.
- That months (maybe years) in the building of these dams would be extremely noisy and seriously destroy one's enjoyment of this treasured area.
- The public will not be able to access the Mixed Pond in the same way.
- Large scale dams would damage the aesthetic image of Kenwood and its amenities which is one of the last true gems within London.
- A 1 metre increase in the dam will "box in" the Mixed Pond. One of the joys of swimming in these natural waters are their open feeling, with views of the skies, passers by and the backs of the beautiful terraces below Hampstead Pond No.2.
- It will ruin a fantastic natural resource that is currently enjoyed by thousands every year. This wonderful resource should be maintained. These dams will ruin the pleasure people get from walking on the Heath, sitting in a natural environment and using the Ponds.
- The mixed bathing pond is a unique place to swim and will be blighted.
- Raising the height of the dam on the mixed bathing pond will significantly alter the character of this part of the Heath. The proximity of the water when crossing the path between these ponds is an attractive aspect of this part of the Heath, which will be lost under this proposal.
- I like the idea of a grass bank by the Mixed Bathing Pond. It will be an improvement on the current hard edge.

#### SATISFACTION EXPRESSED:

- It provides better screening for the water bathers from the paths. If included with new planting
- I think it would benefit the area.
- Cause less disruption to regular Heath users
- Better for mixed bathers.
- I think it is important to keep the dam height at the mixed pond as low as possible due to the fact that it is a swimming pond and having a greater drop into the pond could create problems if people try to swim from the causeway.
- Think the swimmers would have a preference for a 1m high raising.

#### Cost Option M

##### DISSATISFACTION EXPRESSED:

- Option M is a better option but not worth the expense. The gain is not worth the expense.
- Not satisfied that the level of expense is necessary to maintain safety.
- Does not offer useful solution for monies estimated.
- Why spend so many millions unnecessarily when so many other projects could be enhanced? E.g. Keats House, children, running track.
- A waste of money. Waste of resources.
- Other cheaper measures could be adopted that are less drastic including using the water further downstream and providing overflow arrangements.
- Great cost financially.
- I would rather that you spend your money controlling dogs on the heath, reducing the number and restricting the areas where they can run free.
- Misuse of £15 Million.
- Bad taste to spend £15 million on a risk that can be measured in 'thousands of years' when only £500,000 was allocated to the Somerset levels
- If the City has this kind of money available, it should spend just a fraction of it by improving policing on the Heath, in particular by clamping down on cyclists using non-designated paths and on dog-owners/walkers who allow their dogs to disturb people; something that is against the byelaws. They should be enforced, please.
- Tiny increase in safety for disproportionate cost.
- The money allocated should go to children who need food.

#### Information Requested Option M

- How much water are the two tanks going to hold for Option M compared with the volume held by the dams in Option P?
- Exactly what is the statutory requirement?
- Who requires the City to act and why?

#### Suggestions Option M

- Between Hampstead No. 1 and No. 2 pond there is some wall weakness near the SHP road end, which needs repair.
- The proposals for Catchpit are interesting but rather than a dry dam could it be a more permanent wetland habitat?
- The Mixed Bathing Pond is currently too shallow.

## Appendix 5: Hampstead Option P Results Summary

### Visual Impact Option P

DISSATISFACTION – was a result of:

- Detrimental effect on the view from the causeway path
- Impact on Men's Pond views South / North from Dog Pond
- Ruin aspect
- Option M preferable
- Visually dam too high – create a barrier
- Not sure about appearance of walls/don't want man-made walls
- Will ruin natural appearance of the heath
- Scale of change too big
- The overall appearance of the washway/dam between the mixed bathing pond No 2 is poor. Too harsh an edge
- Don't like wall on mixed pond dam or wall on No 2 dam
- Damages the view when swimming in mixed ponds
- It would obscure the view from Pond 2 considerably
- 3 metres will have a significant impact on the local landscape and views of the pond, with swimmers feeling as if they are in a goldfish bowl as they would be overlooked by people on the causeway between the ponds
- Very concerned about the resulting appearance of the Mixed Bathing Pond
- Dam height is too high, spoiling views from the swimming areas and also creating a dangerous drop into the pond from the causeway.
- Ugly, an eyesore, hideous

SATISFACTION – was a result of:

- Scheme appears to be well hidden
- Provides better screening for bathers from the paths - If included with new planting
- Dams more even (in height)
- More visually acceptable
- Don't feel that the increase in the Mixed dam will have a detrimental effect on the Heath and the elevated causeway will provide for a nicer view downstream
- I don't think raising the pathway at the mixed pond by 1 or even 2 metres would actually be a problem to the majority of swimmers and indeed could provide even better views for the walkers.

OTHER COMMENTS

- Difficult to visualise
- Any aesthetic impact will rapidly be forgotten
- The wall along the alignment of the present dam is not ideal but is to be preferred to Option M since the impact on the more visible Hampstead 2 pond will be minimised
- The Mixed Bathing Pond would benefit from dredging out its North end.

### Environmental Impact Option P

DISSATISFACTION – was a result of:

- Losing a tree
- Disrupting/killing wildlife
- Will permanently disfigure landscape

- Major impact on the amenity of the Heath.
- Almost total loss of trees and other vegetation - except grass- along the earth dams
- The plans are unsympathetic to the nature of the heath.
- Attack on a historic landscape

SATISFACTION – was a result of:

- Only losing one tree preferable to M
- Option can be accommodated within contours of landscape
- Conserve the Heath and environment
- I like the improvements to the habitat proposed for the Viaduct and the introduction of the floating islands to Pond 1 and 2.
- Keeps one tree

OTHER COMMENTS

- Trust that these dams will be landscaped and concealed as much as possible so as not to spoil the present setting

### Engineering Approach Option P

DISSATISFACTION – was a result of:

- Prefer option M
- Walls too high
- Don't like walls
- 2 metres is an unacceptable increase in the existing height of the dam
- The higher and more extensive the dams, the more fragile they will be. There are no large areas of water catchment above the dams as there are for large 'industrial' reservoirs.
- Dams should be the last option not the first – (there is) evidence to show that dams generally create more problems than they solve.
- These proposals are irrational. In one option the raising of the dams is minimal or not at all while in the second option a much larger set of works is proposed. Either work is needed or it is not. If Option M is a possibility why are you proposing much more aggressive work in option P. It is illogical.
- Changes the ponds' present primary role as recreational resources to create a massive storm water catchment facility with high embankments. This option is even worse than option M.
- Alternative measures seen as more appropriate/complementary:
  - o Sewer and drainage needs improving, not dams.
  - o Getting further engineers to assess the true situation, take into consideration civil defence measures that Camden Council presumably have in place. If anything, the sewer systems should be brought up to date
  - o Alternative measures such as improving the existing drainage systems, putting in place rainfall management measures such as swales and key-line cutting above the ponds, designating temporary overspill areas (perhaps controlled by sluice gates) and planting new areas of vegetation to help to retain the water.
  - o The ponds should be dredged to restore their base to the original level. This would lower the height the water comes up the dams and would thereby reduce water pressure on the dams. It would also increase the capacity of the ponds if the need arose.
  - o Consider the range of alternative mitigating factors such as early warning systems and required civil emergencies procedures?
  - o It would be possible and more environmentally reasonable to re-instate the last pond that used to be at Southend Green to make it an area to hold excess water.

- o Necessary to improve water out-flow from the Heath.
- o Would it be possible to divert some of the expected flooding via channels or overflow in the park?
- We should take advantage of constantly improving technology and put in place automatically operating sluice gates which can operate more effectively than the ancient technology of mud banks.

SATISFACTION – was a result of:

- Create walls which provide structural strength
- Walls ok as long as thoughtfully designed
- Provides most protection – safest long term
- This Option gives a much better level of protection. I gather that Hampstead No 2's dam would benefit from some crest work and so raising it by 50 centimetres shouldn't be a problem.
- Good scheme in terms of water storage with more water in the mixed bathing pond so better for swimming and more storage in Hampstead No. 2 pond with the loss of only 1 plane tree.

OTHER COMMENTS

- Prefer embankment and natural dams
- Would like to see alternative methods explored/offered.
- please look at alternatives that will not raise dam height
- In the case of a flood - stated by engineering scientists - it would be the drainage where work is required,
- This creates a very dangerous H&S problem because if anyone falls into a pond, or is swimming, and is in the process of drowning, nobody would be able to see it because of the dams and the City would be at great risk of being sued.
- Please reconsider these proposals in the light of common sense and of the alternative engineering scenarios which I am sure you will be presented with in the course of this consultation.
- I understand the need for some kind of 'defence' against possible flooding but would like to know other options. Have we talked to the Dutch for example?
- I believe that works to protect communities downstream should be carried out to give as much protection as possible from flooding and surcharging, such works can be carried out sympathetically and with appropriate landscaping may even be an aesthetic improvement. I see it as crucial that the dams should hold back rainfall and release it slowly to give drains and sewers time to cope.
- If it has to be raised and this was the considered opinion of experts I would support
- Camden Council and the Corporation of London ought to oversee and fund the update of the drains and sewers systems as a priority
- This solution feels good for the contractors but not good for the Heath or its many users.

OTHER PREFERENCES

- Would prefer the works to provide the maximum flood storage capacity
- Would limit height of dams to absolute minimum to comply with legislation
- Repair and reinforcing at existing heights would be ok
- Would have hoped for more visionary approach - earth dam? A timber walkway above a more fixed/engineered dam?
- Should be some drainage improvement to prevent this occurrence (1975) Put the money to improve facilities instead

- The Catch Pit is also being dammed up so why not increase that capacity? Allow spillage dam to No 1 pond and contain it there as there is potential for high capacity there by damming up N and W sides of No 1 Pond
- Other measures could be adopted that are less drastic including using the water further downstream and providing overflow arrangements.
- The Ponds need to be permitted to allow their natural flow and seepage systems of flow, and that any interference with these are unnecessary and untested.
- Would like to be sure that the maximum amount of rain water can be contained to prevent flooding below.
- Would like them to be bigger/deeper

### **Necessity for the Project Option P**

*The consultation material provided set out that City of London would not be able to act on comments that challenged the need for the work to be done which was outside the remit of the consultation. Nonetheless a large number of comments received were related to this theme. These comments questioned the necessity for the project and were one of the key reasons given for dissatisfaction with the options.*

DISSATISFACTION – was a result of:

- Generally considered unnecessary or unjustified:
- Newly introduced assumptions, judgement of risk, interpretations appear dubious
- (Local) Flooding never been caused by ponds:
- Unaffected by recent heavy rains
- Not a legal requirement
- Computer modelling full of flaws
- Over reaction to unproven risk
- In contravention of 1871 Hampstead Heath Act
- Without any evidence of greater safety.
- The City of London - have not stated or clearly communicated the technical calculations and reasoning as to why Dams of 1.5M+ high are required as the solution to the perceived scale of risk
- Risk is minimal and statistics flawed
- The professional guidance behind these extreme calculations is questioned by the engineering profession.
- Prefer option M
- Not convinced of the necessity to protect against a 1 in 400,000 year storm
- Don't see the need for any works beyond maintenance.
- Previous flooding incidents were caused by sewer problems and were not due to the ponds overflowing.
- Scale is over reaction to minimal risk

SATISFACTION – was a result of:

- Accept the need, sensible in terms of adapting to climate change
- Necessary to prevent future flooding
- If the work has to be done, it should be done thoroughly
- The higher the dam, the more effective
- Option M seems rational response to risk



#### OTHER COMMENTS

- More water stored safely. As long as there are walkways on top
- Legal interpretation should be judged in a court

#### Information Giving and Consultation Option P

DISSATISFACTION – was a result of:

- Information confusing and misleading
- Illustrations provided do not accurately depict the reality of what they would look like.
- Grossly misrepresented the actual and visual/environmental impact of the size of the proposed Dams
- COL have chosen to consult on these two dams but given not the slightest indication of the visual damage that will be caused by the spillways. This suggests to me that there is something to hide and that full disclosure of the plans would cause a public riot.
- A full public inquiry should be conducted instead of forcing through this work with a tokenistic consultative process such as this.

#### OTHER COMMENTS

- The figure of 2 m above does not correspond to the text under picture 5 (1m) on the reverse side of the last page of your handout document
- There are different ways of managing water than just building up huge dams. Why are we not being given other choices as part of this consultation?
- The City should be consulting properly at public meetings
- As a consultation this is not a very balanced approach.
- Am not understanding why there is no info on a new 5.6 metre high earth dam to be built above the Mixed Bathing Pond in this survey. The proposed works are not even fully addressed here
- CoL has based its response on one survey only, another is needed

#### Implementation Option P

DISSATISFACTION – was a result of:

- Disruption to heath users
- None are desirable - as users we want minimal disruptions, ability to swim in any of the unaffected ponds and improved swimming facilities at the end of the process
- Disrupting the natural habitat of many species while the work is carried out

#### Amenity Option P

DISSATISFACTION – was a result of:

- Ruin bathing in the pond
- Dam height is too high, also creating a dangerous drop into the pond from the causeway
- This will completely change the access (and views), which is not desirable.

SATISFACTION – was a result of:

- like the increased area for the dam for sunbathing

#### OTHER COMMENTS

- Concentrate on other ponds that won't affect swimmers
- Prefer to concentrate the work at Model Boating Pond: Think the swimmers would prefer for a 1m high raising.

### **Cost Option P**

DISSATISFACTION – was a result of:

- Not worth extra cost (& and effort) considering risk
- Doesn't offer useful solution for monies estimated
- Unnecessary work at great expense
- Funds could more usefully be spent elsewhere

### **Information Requested Option P**

- Why both dams raised compared to M?
- Who will be making money out of these proposals?
- I would like more information on the possibility of early warning systems to predict storms and ways of draining water from the system before such a storm. I think something like this could prevent loss of life not just reduce it. I am in favour of making the heath as safe as possible but do not think this is the right way to go about it. I find the visual representations very misleading as they show any changes from hundreds of metres away.
- We are concerned that the proposals for containing surface water are not sufficient to prevent our property being flooded and would like a better understanding of how this will be effected.

### **Suggestions Option P**

- Include new planting at the same time.

## Appendix 6: Questionnaire Other Comments Results Summary

### Visual Impact Other Comments

#### CONCERNS EXPRESSED:

- Concern was expressed about the permanent and irrevocable visual impact of the project, that it would spoil the Heath's character and the dams would make it look artificial and like a municipal waterworks.
- The visual environment of the ponds needs to be protected for posterity and future generations.
- The catch pit dam is considered too large and obtrusive.
- That the beauty of the Heath's landscape would be damaged without true cause.
- Protect the views of the Kenwood Ladies Bathing Pond.
- The works appear excessive and extreme. The present options are too big and too much of an intrusion into the landscape.
- Aim to have lower wall increases on the Highgate ponds dams.
- Do not wish to have to stand on top of a 6ft bank to look at the Model Boating Pond.
- The current view of the Highgate No. 1 Pond is like being in the countryside at the moment, looking at the birds through the reeds: want this retained.
- Both options for Highgate will change the beautiful current view between the Model Boating Pond and the Men's Bathing Pond completely, which is unbearable.
- Reduce the height of the walls. Would like to have banks instead of the walls.
- The use of a wall (regardless of height) will obstruct the view especially for children.
- The proposals will result in concrete ponds.

#### APPROVALS EXPRESSED:

- That the project looked non-invasive.
- That the height of the dam was not an issue since the ponds were man made.
- The impact of the work will soon be unnoticeable and people will forget how the area looked before.
- None of the options seriously upset the look of the Heath.
- This project has carefully protected most views.
- The project has in some cases (e.g. walk along the summit of Model Boating Pond and Men's Bathing Pond dams), improved views.
- Cannot understand fuss being made about small amount of change to the appearance of paths (dams) creation of wildflower meadows will change the look more.
- The sensitivity of the project will keep the Heath beautiful.
- Having witnessed similar flood prevention works in Yorkshire, consider that the work will be carried out sympathetically and quickly blend in.
- The proposed landscaping will give a more natural look than the existing structures.
- Preservation of the landscape is being put at the top of the agenda by City of London.
- The trees around the ponds should be thinned or removed where appropriate to improve views through to the water.
- Confident that work will be carried out with sensitivity to the environment and aesthetics

#### OTHER COMMENTS:

- The work needs to be landscaped properly and planted well afterwards. This must be carried out as planned and not modified to save money.
- Keep impact to a minimum, especially the heights of the dams.
- Caution against too great an emphasis on the benefits of 'landscaping'. The Heath is not a park and should remain wild and unmanaged in spirit.

- My thought is that dramatically raised dams with grassy verges might leave the landscape like telly-tubby land! Perhaps a wall adding to the height of a dam will look less artificial than creating that height with grassy embankments. I may however be wrong.

### Environmental Impact Other Comments

#### CONCERNS EXPRESSED:

- Disruption to wildlife and the natural environment disturbed.
- The time it will take for re-growth on the embankments to take place.
- Concern that the new wildlife-friendly west banks of the Model Boating Pond will be fenced off (as in other places on the Heath) which is disliked.
- All the options affect the topography of the Heath.
- Concern that the Vale of Heath will be impacted by the project.
- Negative impact the works may have on the ponds' unique ecology and hydrology.
- The works are contrary to the legal duties of the City of London set out in the 1871 Hampstead Heath Act. The proposals do not sufficiently take into account the protection of the Heath environment.
- The works will damage the environment.
- The Heath should be kept in a natural state.
- Less invasive options should be considered.
- The approach of undertaking landscaping following the dam works is insufficient to address the environmental impact that will be made.

#### APPROVAL EXPRESSED:

- Pleased to see that the plans include a commitment to protecting the natural environment.
- The overall objectives of the project are well balanced against the minimisation of environmental impact.
- Works have been planned with careful consideration of potential impact on Heath. Confident that the work will be done with care and sensitivity.
- Many considerations have been given to future habitats. Like the idea of wetland area and wooded island on the Model Boating Pond: This would enhance the habitats frogs and toads and for bird life and nesting respectively.
- It's positive that there will be improvements in water quality and wildlife. Like wildlife friendly changes. Ultimately wildlife will benefit.
- Confidence that the project will retain the integrity and value of the Heath.
- The changes are sympathetic.
- The trees around the ponds should be thinned or removed where appropriate to improve views through to the water.

#### OTHER COMMENTS:

- The most preferable options would be where some ponds could remain untouched altogether for the benefit of birds and wildlife.
- The work should aim to have minimum impact on wildlife, which should be protected.
- Potential damage to trees should be taken account of and they should be protected as much as possible.
- Trees are important but the loss of 1 or 2 trees in the overall scheme is regrettable but acceptable. In a very short time the impact (which will only be really significant if actually bathing in Mixed Pond) will be minimal.
- EIA needs to include species impacted and how to reduce impact, e.g. newt, kingfisher etc.
- Preserve, improve and add to habitats where possible; embed this in the plans.

## Engineering Approach Other Comments

### CONCERNS EXPRESSED:

- Changes are excessive and should be scaled down. Some raising of the dams is acceptable: modify the proposals and everyone will be happy.
- A review should be undertaken to assess whether only minimal works are needed in view of the level of risk.
- The range of options offered in order to address the situation is too limited. Alternative suggestions (some to be used in combination) for preventative measures, which are considered to be more realistic and lower impact, are as follows:
  - Dam strengthening at their present heights (not raising) without making the works have a visible difference.
  - Widen, improve and clear existing overflows from pond to pond to avoid erosion. Spillway and subsurface drainage conduit construction.
  - There is an existing wet depression (good for overflow) in the southwest corner of the Model Boating Pond. It appears that you are going to fill this in a put the dam over it. Why not use this hollow to install underground tanks?
  - Create more wetland area to catch water, which may reduce dam height.
  - Managed option such as lowering water levels in time of high rainfall.
  - Weather forecasting, telemetric warnings, evacuation under Civil Contingencies Act 2004
  - Action involving the emergency services or mechanical or electrical equipment
  - Hampstead Heath is a source of water that forms several rivers. It should be possible to harness it usefully and beautifully.
  - Dredging the ponds and management of leaf litter.
  - Use of sluice gates
  - Use complimentary contemporary technology such as early warning systems and automatic water release mechanisms.
  - Make the ponds deeper rather than wider.
  - The compaction of ground on the Heath needs to be addressed. The Heath should undergo a rotation of mole ploughing to break up the soil.
  - Use the levelling valves: monitor these and adjust accordingly if the water level rises.
  - Plant more trees [http://www.ceh.ac.uk/sci\\_programmes/pontbren.html](http://www.ceh.ac.uk/sci_programmes/pontbren.html)
- High embankments around the ponds especially the boating pond, represents difficulties for parents with very young children by increasing hazard if child falls in. Concerned there will be an issue with kids rolling or running down the 2m bank to the Model Boating Pond.
- Public safety needs to be considered as there will be higher dams on some of the ponds and different edge profiles. This could lead to more dangerous access routes around the ponds with a risk of falling in or attracting unauthorised swimming.
- The project is too engineering led and needs a landscape architect sponsor who has long-term view on the landscape, its aesthetics and how it will be managed in future (take learning from the Olympic park team leadership).
- Objection to the 5.6m high earth Catchpit dam above the Mixed Bathing Pond and to the excavation of the sports field to provide earth for this dam; the raising of the dam at Highgate No. 1 Pond and the giant spillways.
- The City of London should seek a second opinion from some other independent engineers, including international experience.
- In a severe storm broken branches and other debris is likely to be washed towards the dams, leading to the boxed spillways becoming blocked. Provision must be made for trained staff to be alerted to clear obstructions; suitable tackle, winches, lights must be kept in readiness nearby.

- Object to a new walkway across the new planned dam at the Catchpit: Every effort should be made to retain the total wildness of this wooded valley area with the new structure hidden from view; do not turning the area into a tidy and accessible landscaped valley with easy access.
- The work should be coordinated with Thames Water and Camden Council to avoid increasing the likelihood of flooding in Oak Village, Rylands, Fletcher and Brookfield Mansions from surface water discharge.
- The plans should be reviewed given press coverage about a conflict of interest involving the construction company.
- Would rather live with the risk of flooding than accept any impact on the Heath.
- Long-term loss of trees and other vegetation except grass along the earth dams.
- Concrete dams are ineffective against flooding.
- The proposed grassy footpath would quickly become a quagmire so any footpaths are definitely best kept as gravel paths.
- The main beneficiary of the works appears to be Thames Water plc, which will be provided with a facility to store excess rainwater once the new dams are completed.
- Concerned about the giant spillways.
- The heightening of the dams is not enough in itself to remove the risk of flooding. Would like further measures to be taken to reduce the risk of flooding of the residential areas below the ponds.
- Any water discharged through this approach needs to be directed to the Thames Water's Flood Alleviation Tunnels.
- In order for the approach to be properly effective and provide protection Thames Water also needs too improve the sewer system/storm water system in the downstream area.
- Raising the height of the dams is being done as a quick and cheap fix rather than repairing them properly.
- The treatment planned for the playing field, which is to be excavated to provide earth for these projects.
- The Ponds need to be permitted to allow their natural flow and seepage systems to continue. Any interference with these is untested.
- A dam may well make the situation worse by forcing water down new courses and causing floods.
- Disagreement with the concept that in the event of the dams being over topped, water moving around trees would wash away the earth dam more quickly. Consider it more likely that the current web of tree and other roots would provide extra stability to the dams. Removing trees and bushes would weaken the earth structures.
- Raising the dam at Highgate No. 1 pond will only protect Brookfield Mansions car park. Water will flow round the side of the lake onto the path, which is currently lower than the existing dam.
- Failure to use the scour pipe to reduce the water levels in Highgate No. 1 will only delay the water entering the sewage system by a few moments.
- I would like to query whether the spillover from Highgate no. 1 pond will correctly enter the Thames Water's Flood Alleviation Tunnels at Swain's Lane

#### APPROVAL EXPRESSED:

- Plans look well thought out with good consideration given to the various options. The expertise employed is impressive. They are well presented and thoroughly detailed. Excellent work.
- Support the work being done to achieve maximum protection. It's sensible to go for the options that give the maximum protection at this stage rather than possibly having to upgrade the dams again. The works are in proportion to the level of risk.
- I am happy to leave it to the experts to decide the best in terms of cost and effectiveness.
- Schemes represent reasonable approach given rise in rainfall.

- This project is as constructive, well thought through and as thorough as it could be.
- Pleased to be able to continue to enjoy use of both the model boating pond and the men's bathing pond for their intended purposes.
- Pleased that the capacity of the ponds is being increased.
- The enhancements outweigh any problems.
- Instead of a high dam in the Catchment Area I would suggest a smaller one over the existing catchment pit, to create some more capacity above Lime Avenue by digging out 0.5-1metres and increase the Viaduct dam by raising the path or adding a retaining wall.

#### OTHER PREFERENCES:

- Preference for natural methods such as planting to address the problem rather than artificial installations.
- For the option chosen to be as natural as possible and be least disruptive to the Heath.
- The advisability was endorsed of taking maximum precautions now, with the example cited of the Thames Barrier recently being challenged.
- The defining feature of any model boating pond is that it be accessible from all banks. Therefore the footpath to the proposed island is of vital importance.
- In order to screen views of the proposed wall for the Men's Bathing Pond when looking south I think an area of soil bank should be extended out into the Men's Pond so as to establish vegetation to screen the wall.
- Prefer curved dam to Catchpit.

#### OTHER COMMENTS:

- It is clear from the website reports that Highgate and Hampstead Chains are in very different states. You propose to improve Highgate side from 1:100yr to 1:1000yr. That's very worthwhile; Options 4 and 6 are finely balanced so it's sensible to ask people which they prefer. The Hampstead side is already better than 1:1000 so there's no question. You want the less intrusive (no doubt cheaper) scheme.
- Options so similar, why bother asking, as everyone will go for least intrusive.
- Confidence that many improvements will be gained from the project.
- I do not feel skilled enough to decide on how the high dams should be raised, but as the project is well thought out, am comfortable to go with the decision made.
- Additional works are needed in cooperation with London Borough of Camden and Thames Water. Would like City of London to encourage Camden Council and Thames Water to join with them in helping to mitigate risks by improving drains and sewers that fall within their respective responsibilities.
- Trust in the City of London to take the right decision.
- These ponds are part of a river, which is part of the whole of London waterways. Their management should be included in London's water management policy. London's rainwater could be captured and used; there could be permeable pavements, and numerous areas of water retaining vegetation (water gardens) could be planted. (Some cities in the US such as Portland Oregon have successfully carried this out).
- The City of London should encourage Camden Council and Thames Water to share in their forethought and preventative work and carry out any work that could reduce the risk of flooding further.
- Confidence expressed that the City of London will make a suitable decision.
- It is important to get the siting of the dog access right i.e. so they will be used.
- I would very much like to see the rainfall figures this winter inputted into the Atkins computer model to see if the models response is in any way in line with the actual response of the ponds system. I would like to see correlation of rainfall data with the pond level data provided by the sensors. I recognise that an extreme, summer rainfall event would be of a different nature - but



we have a real system observation of which will valuably complement any information that a computer model can generate.

- I would expect the resulting impact of any of the proposed options on the connected sewerage systems will have been analysed to ensure that the forecast output flows in a PMF flood are manageable by the sewerage systems. I would be grateful if you would make this analysis public.

### **Necessity for the Project Other Comments**

#### **CONCERNS EXPRESSED:**

- That the project is unnecessary. It is not rationale or sensible or a requirement.
- The case for the project is unproven and not supported by any current documentation. Research has been insufficient.
- It is difficult to see that there is any problem with the dams as they are. Leave the Heath alone.
- That the project was an over-reaction and an excessive, out of proportion response, especially the idea that all flooding risk should be eliminated. The risk is very small and a worst-case scenario. The risk assessment should be reviewed. The risk is so low that the project is not worth doing.
- The recent record-breaking weather conditions have demonstrated that there is no need for the project as the dams have stood up to the challenge.
- There is no historic precedent of dam breach or uncontrolled escape of water. There has never been flood damage on the Heath.
- Flooding in the area in the past has caused by inadequate drainage or sewerage, not the ponds. With the advent of the North London relief sewer, this problem has been addressed. The sewers and drainage in the area need to be properly maintained and upgraded where necessary. Camden Council's maintenance contract in this regard requires a review.
- The work is not required by the Reservoirs Act 1975. The project is a result of a misunderstanding or an over-zealous application of the law, which does not indicate work on the scale of the ponds project. Only the minimum requirement should be effected.
- The project should be subject to a judicial review, which the City of London should pursue.
- The risk and the modelling that underpin it are unproven. The data on which the modelling is based and the professional guidance behind the modelling is unsound or too selective. The modelling should be reviewed in case of error.
- An additional survey should be made in advance of any further action.
- The design standard is too extreme and should cater for 100s rather than 1000s of years.
- The work goes against meteorological predictions.
- The inspection reports give no indication that the work is required.
- The need for the project has been challenged within the engineering profession.
- City of London should seek clarification from the courts on the legal basis for project and for the requirement for the new dam heights that it sets out. There has been another instance where legal advice provided to the City of London has been challenged e.g. the requirement for lifeguards.
- There is no point in doing the works, as they will not prevent flooding in the downstream area altogether and in an extreme weather event of the magnitude predicted, flooding would occur in the downstream area anyway along with the rest of the Thames basin.
- The proposals are influenced by vested interests on the part of the planners. There is a conflict of interest since the engineer who wrote the legislation and recommended the work be done are the same person.
- Suspicion that the City of London wants to get rid of all swimming in the ponds on the Heath and this is how they plan to achieve it.
- The city of London should seek an engineering adjudication.
- More time should be taken to reflect on whether the project is necessary before taking action.



- It's unclear why the safety of the dams has suddenly become an issue.
- Just because flood planning and defences are now at the top of the public and political agenda, does not mean that you 'have' to spend taxpayer funds on flood defences where they are simply not needed.
- Far more people would be affected by this project as Heath users and in terms the impact on the Heath than would potentially be protected from flooding risk.
- Early warning systems don't stop flooding from affecting people and property.
- We need much better quality of information as to whether the current situation warrants such work. For such large-scale work and disruption I would expect a better quality of evidence and also better evidence that there has been a proper procedure.

#### APPROVAL EXPRESSED:

- The City of London should go ahead as the Heath as precious and in need of protection. Remedial work on the back of any flooding incident may not be able to preserve the Heath's environment in the same way as this project.
- That the project is a good idea in view of climate change.
- That since the Heath is in an urban area and is busy it is sensible that management is needed.
- Support for any protection from flooding that the project can provide. The project is adequate and timely to protect communities downstream. The safety of people and property considerations are the priority.
- The City of London is acting on its public and statutory duty of care to make sure that the ponds are adapted to keep them safe in a changing climate. It also has a moral obligation to do this.
- Action needs to be taken; doing nothing is not an option and unacceptable, the work is essential to reduce the risk. Pleased that the City of London is taking it seriously, is thinking ahead, being proactive and prepared to invest.
- Appreciation or understanding of the need to raise the heights of the dams.
- The work should go ahead as soon as possible. The work is long overdue.
- The City of London are supported and trusted to go ahead with the project.
- Recent flooding demonstrates how quickly flood levels can rise in extreme conditions.
- Local residents will be affected. Their insurance policies may be affected if works are not carried out.
- Awareness that the potential for the dams to overtop is real.
- The City of London has tried hard to find a realistic compromise.

#### OTHER COMMENTS:

- Although personal preference would be to do as little work as possible, still appreciate the thought and effort that has been put into the project and doing the right thing.
- The ponds have been managed by man for centuries and would continue to be so.
- The project is not designed to benefit welfare of animals, people or nature of Heath; it is about Health & Safety.
- The project is a unique opportunity to leave something better for next generation to enjoy.
- Early warning systems should not be relied upon because they do not stop flooding.
- Support for proposals that reduce the risk of future flooding even if they do not eliminate it completely.
- There should be more proactive liaison with Thames Water.
- Banks should be raised as high as possible.
- Managed green spaces are always evolving and that is part of good management.
- The City of London is proposing these works as a remote landlord, which does not understand the Heath or risk management. The City of London should consider itself the servant of the community not its master.

- The City of London should take heed of the Heath & Hampstead Society views and seek legal clarification alongside them.
- Have the huge luxury houses built in the Mill Lane area had an impact i.e. have the underground car parks and swimming pools disturbed the water table?
- Suspicion that there is a connection between the survey and the work envisaged i.e. that there is a vested interest /will be financial benefit. The advisors who have been used to devise these schemes are companies that are predisposed to recommending extravagant activities of this type. Their independence and impartiality is not to be taken at face value.

### Information Giving and Consultation Other Comments

#### CONCERNS EXPRESSED:

- It is not possible for the average person to assess or comment on how high the dams need to be raised and therefore difficult to comment on the options.
- Better communication is needed that the works are a legal requirement.
- The consultation is flawed because only two alternatives presented, with no opportunity to look at other options, including, 'do nothing'.
- The consultation does not allow for rejection of the plans or a challenge to the assumption that the work is necessary. The process does not allow for a proper debate, so have no confidence in it. The premise of the consultation, that the works are a requirement, is not accepted.
- The information indicates the proposed heights of dams but not the extent at either end, especially of the Model Boating Pond dam.
- The engineers and designers of these plans should know more than the public and therefore should recommend the most cost effective, environmentally friendly solution.
- The project is difficult to understand even after visiting the display.
- The before and after mock up pictures showing the key changes are not a true representation. They are shown from too far away and fail to show the proposed changes in a realistic way. Digital images and models that convey the full scale of the proposed work should be used.
- Display boards don't show a clear 'starting point'.
- How did the situation start? No mention of professional opinion of panel engineer.
- Consultation is too limited in scope, as it does not cover the proposed 5.6m dam at the Catchpit or the 1.25m raise at Highgate No. 1 pond or the giant 60 metre spillways. Cannot understand why they are not included in the consultation and do not consider it valid without them.
- It is not made clear that the Model Boating Pond will double in size.
- The communication has understated the scale of the works.
- Expected there to be public meetings as part of the consultation.
- The consultation would have been scheduled better in the summer when more/ a wider range of people are using the Heath.
- Exhibition is very poor. Too much information on each board. Takes too long to work out what the issue is and what is up for comment.
- Difficult to visualise the changes in height. A 2metre embankment does not sound very high but is above the height of a 6ft man standing on the current bank. Heights should be stated in feet as well as metres to help those not brought up on metric measurements.
- Consultation should include how local roads and access ways onto the Heath can accommodate the traffic that will be required to carry out the works.
- Disappointed that no information has been provided on the impact on Heath swimmers.
- The spillways haven't been shown clearly enough and not there is not enough information about them.
- I believe that the timing of this consultation has been intended to avoid input from most of the swimmers at the ponds. There are some winter swimmers but most people swim in warmer

weather. I would like to see this consultation reopened and extended, at least through the month of May.

- Even with the help of the information sheet it is very unclear what the crux of the issues between Hampstead chain options M and P is: had to seek explanation from staff at the display, therefore think the results of the survey will be affected.
- The issue should be decided upon by those who are users of the various ponds, by forming a user committee.
- The consultation is a sham since the works will go ahead no matter what the outcome of it is.
- The real reason for the dam works has not been shared.
- The consultation is invalid because the information provided does not specify how long will each of the ponds be closed for and whether additional charges will be made to users. Plans should now be at a stage where this is known and therefore this information should have been made public.
- There has not been any opportunity to fully engage with the City of London on this project and would appreciate some debate.
- It is evident from the major publicity campaign launched by the City of London that the Corporation has made up its mind on this project and is only attempting to show willing by 'trying' to gauge public opinion.
- In presenting the case for these works the photos/mock-ups do not get across the scale of the works and are inadequate. 3D models should have been provided.
- You're presenting me with no choice at all, but dressing it up as if I indeed do have a choice.
- There has been no real dialogue on the City's part with the local inhabitants who use the facilities on a daily basis.
- The City of London has made so little effort to meet with concerned residents and users of the Heath.
- The consultation has been done over the winter, when far fewer users of the Heath are around.
- The video seems misleading.
- There has been a lack of advance publicity about public consultation meetings and other channels.
- The nostalgic pictures used in the information materials are presenting the project as a conservation project, when it is in fact transformative.
- This survey should be disregarded until the legal opinion is settled.
- I had to scroll through a lot of pages of complex information before I found the comparisons between the projects - the pros and cons of each - which I used to make my choices.

#### APPROVAL EXPRESSED:

- Appreciate the consultation. The City of London has gone to great lengths to explain the need for this work. Communication has been good. The consultation has been very open.
- Impressed with the public consultation materials. The information provided is clear, comprehensive, well-presented and good quality.
- Very good Heath displays and predicted pictures of impact, very helpful and informative. Provision of helpful staff at the displays was welcome. Enjoyed having the proposals explained.
- Appreciate the notice boards.
- Impressed that people's views are being taken into consideration.
- All sides need to be consulted.
- The guided walk was very informative.
- The City of London has worked hard on this consultation.
- The consultation has been very open.
- I commend you on the way you have given walkers ample opportunity to have their say (detailed signs on the heath alerting us to the plans).

#### OTHER COMMENTS:

- The options proposals are very similar.
- Whilst I understand why the City of London may consult the community, few people within the community are well placed to make sound judgements based upon the engineering considerations, which are what really matter. The other concepts such as aesthetics are subjective.
- Consultation hints at a failure to trust the consulting engineers (Atkins, who are very good), which is prevalent within the public sector.
- Thanks for consulting on this matter, the advance information and the materials provided.
- There needs to be a full discussion and agreement with those who use the Heath and those living close by.
- It's a lot of information to take on board.
- Residents' views should play a major part in decision-making.
- It is important that everyone gives an opinion regardless of postcode.
- The initial consultation in August 2013 was at best inept in its timing and may have led to suggestions of bad faith.
- Extensive engagement was carried out and I was one of the people consulted. None of my opinions, and those of my colleague, have been taken into consideration. It's pointless conducting engagement if you just ignore what people say and simply carry on with what you wanted to do in the first place.
- I am a local resident and user of Hampstead heath and the bathing ponds and received no information or consultation letter about these extensive works.
- Earlier in the piece when consulting the various interest groups, the attitude of the engineers/project managers came over as patronising & bulldozing.
- Thank you for putting so much effort into this.
- I am concerned about the amount of misleading and negative information that has been put in the press and would like to see the City making its case more forcefully.
- The information provided is comprehensive but as someone who walks on the Heath, rather than an expert in flood control, it is hard to express a preference for one option over another.

#### Implementation Other Comments

#### CONCERNS EXPRESSED:

- That the Heath would be disrupted and made a mess by the construction, including access to it for a long period e.g. 18 months.
- Concerned about disturbance during the works of the Heath's peaceful environment for 18 months.
- The works would upset walkers, wildlife and neighbours and spoil other parts of the Heath over a long period.
- Possible contamination on the Heath resulting from the construction works planned on the dams.
- Works will affect the enjoyment of visitors to the Heath.
- The works would involve great damage to the Heath by the movements of large trucks, heavy mechanical plant and excavating machinery during the course of construction.

#### APPROVAL EXPRESSED:

- Necessary disruption while the works are happening is acceptable.

#### OTHER COMMENTS:

- Keep disruption to a minimum.
- Avoid disruption to wildlife. While doing significant works care needs to be taken to minimise impact of vehicular movement regarding wildlife routes.
- Phase the work. Only remove access across dams one at a time. Build new footpaths before removing old. The aim should be maintain the Heath as it is as far as possible.
- Avoid use of excessive temporary buildings in the Kenwood area.
- Co-ordinate the pond project works with any works relating to the High Speed 2 rail link, as the latter will also involve building lorries coming into the area.
- Care needs to be taken to minimise impact of vehicular movement regarding pedestrian safety
- Consider carefully what times of day the work should be carried out to avoid disrupting the peace of the landscape. Avoid carrying out work at weekends or evenings and in the summer. Construction should be limited to 5 days a week
- Maximise the availability of the ponds to remain as far as possible during the work and do not shut them for any length of time:
  - Ensure that the plans and their implementation allow all (swimmers, fishermen, dogs, etc) Heath users continuous access to the ponds.
  - Would like pond kept open for swimming while work being done. Would like the work carried out over winter to prevent closure of the swimming ponds in particular in spring and summer.
  - Maintain access for runners and walkers throughout.
- Hope that building work will take place not in the daytime when people are enjoying the Heath.
- Seems most impact will be during work, not by actual work.

#### Amenity Other Comments

#### CONCERNS EXPRESSED:

- Consideration has not been given to the public amenity areas in between the ponds.
- Any negative impact on the ponds being of concern to local residents because enjoyment of them is a key reason for living in the local area.
- The impact on the Heath's appearance from the works will impact on the Heath's ability to remove the stresses of city life and contribute to people's well being; which is the reason many people visit.
- The project will be distressing to people who live around the Heath and make regular use of it.
- The Heath is a much loved and valuable asset to Hampstead as a tourist spot famous across the world. It is of financial and cultural benefit to London and the project compromises this.

#### APPROVAL EXPRESSED:

- Pleased to see that all ponds and related activities will be retained.
- The proposed changes to the banks of these ponds seem to add to Heath usability and experience.
- Rebuilding the ladies facilities is a good idea.
- Ultimately people will benefit.
- Works have been planned with careful consideration of the future enjoyment all users.
- Walkways to be able to view the ponds would be good

#### OTHER COMMENTS:

- The existing dog swimming area in Highgate No. 1 needs to be retained.
- Concerned that building work on the Heath may lead to residential building
- Concentrate the works on the hidden Catch pit area and the north and west of the Stock Pond. This will enable new public zones behind the houses.
- I think it is essential that there is access (as is proposed) to the island created in Model Boating Pond.

#### Cost Other Comments

#### CONCERNS EXPRESSED AND ISSUES RAISED:

- That the cost of the project was out of proportion to the risk presented by the modelling.
- The money should be spent more constructively.
- The money should be spent on other actions such as sewerage improvement.
- The dams are a waste of money.
- Better to spend money on flood defences elsewhere in country.
- It is a huge amount of money to be spent in a time of austerity and when the country has financial problems.
- Spend the money on worthwhile projects such as community improvements or helping underprivileged people.
- Public money should be spent more sensibly.
- Many Londoners are in need of housing and the living wage. Spend the money on housing provision.
- There is a moral obligation not to misuse £15 million.
- Funds spent for this flood defence, could be directed to an area that actually needs their flood defences improving.
- Spend the money on protecting other natural areas in London.
- Apply the funds to making pedestrian and cycle access to Hampstead Heath safer.
- Spend the budget on something worthwhile e.g. it will only cost c. £40k to put proper showers in at the running track, but this has not been done due to lack of funds.
- Resources could be far better used in managing the growth of wild trees and bushes that are turning the Heath into a jungle, particularly over West Heath.
- Money would be much better spent on looking at ways to improve the water retention and storage on the heath for those years where there drought conditions.
- Money would be better spent on more effective drainage further down the river system.
- The money should be handed back to tax payers.
- Put the money instead into improving the landscape and dredging of the ponds.
- The money would be better spent in providing cyclists with shared access with walkers to all parts of the heath.
- Clearing the storm drains downstream of the Heath would be a more cost effective solution
- Should be 100% funded by the EU, as the only reason for the works is to meet their regulation

#### APPROVAL EXPRESSED:

- Impressed that costs will be met by the City of London

#### OTHER COMMENTS:

- The greatest protection from flooding from the works will offer the greatest value for money.

## General Comments – Other Comments

- Rangers do a good job
- Appreciate dog friendliness
- Thank you for looking after the Heath.

## Information Requested - Other Comments

- Further details of the legal requirement to undertake the works.
- With there be some safe havens left for birds and wildlife while the work is ongoing?
- There is no information on the type of construction of these dams. Will there be extensive piling and concrete structures?
- Would like the new proposed path and pond edge (Model Boating Pond) to be very clearly marked on the land for all to see now as complaints will be far worse when it is too late.
- How much power noise would the works consume / make?
- When is the work scheduled to take place?
- How did the situation start?
- Would happen to surface water discharged from the ponds and linked to that what the links are to Thames Water's drains and their capacity, as it relates to residential property boarding Highgate No. 1 Pond.
- Will paths be resurfaced?
- Will dog access improved?
- What will happen to the wildlife while the construction is going on?
- Who do the 'stakeholders' represent? Are they representative of the full community and residents likely to be most affected?
- People need reassurance about the level of disruption the works and transport of materials will cause.
- Does the plan to increase holding capacity in the ponds mean that greater volumes of water would flood in the event of dam failure?
- Why are some of the large-scale proposals e.g. the dam at the Catchpit, not included in the consultation?
- I have a commemorative bench round the Boating Pond and want to know what will happen to it if the pond level is raised. [*Consultation Ref. O292*]
- Would like to see a time scale provided for the works.
- Who has responsibility for protecting Brookfield Mansions from potential flooding by surface water?
- Will Highgate No. 1 Pond have a sloping dam?
- Would like details provided on the impact on Heath swimmers.
- Updated flood maps for the surrounding areas would be useful.
- A statement of how the risk assessment relates to the options would be useful (together with any other information relevant to these options).
- Why does the work need to be done?
- None of the proposals attempt to show any access and new paths/ramps. How will the existing routes be affected? What will be the access for disabled, old or impaired? How will this be improved and catered for?



## Suggestions - Other Comments

- Any new works should be unobtrusive and screened with vegetation or covered with a climber such as ivy.
- Use the project as a positive opportunity while building to create more places for wildlife, i.e. more habitats, reed bed, kingfisher/Sand martin nesting sites; encouraging amphibians etc.
- Can you make the bubbling machine permanent in the viaduct pond?
- The gas board left a horrible wet mess beside the path near the Men's Bathing Pond. This needs draining and improving. It is an eyesore. It leaks water on to the tarmac path, which freezes and is hazardous.
- Swap Mixed and Men's Ponds around.
- The men's pond and surrounds need revision. There is rough path that runs through the site. It splits the overflow/sun bathers and a space from the actual pond. This means bathers risk cuts from the rough street and have to sun bathe / rest in public gaze. Treat it as per the women's pond as per screening and public space. Move the footpath to the edge.
- Would like changing rooms replaced after the work is done.
- All the swimming ponds should be mixed it's the 21st Century
- Could the number of cycle paths on the Heath be increased to allow its crossing by bike from NW to SE and NE to SW?
- Look at opportunities for a north-south cycle route on the Heath.
- Some improvements to the gents by the tennis courts would be welcomed.
- General ground drainage issues are spoiling the recreational opportunity in a number of spots around the Heath, which have become impassable to all but people wearing Wellington boots. Use of wood chippings could improve these problem areas.
- Install underground drainage where grass boggy and plant trees to absorb it. Could widen ditches on slope.
- The surface drainage adjoining the Men's Bathing Pond needs to be sorted.
- Take advantage of the building to make improvements to facilities i.e. changing rooms.
- Would like to see more wildlife on ponds. Introduce reed beds and floating habitat for birds so they are not disturbed.
- Would like the swan in Vale of Health pond to have a mate again.
- The works should be used as an opportunity to increase habitats.
- Embed biodiversity & wildlife within new plans.
- Like the idea of honesty boxes by ponds; maintain them.
- Improve cycle paths and create lanes.
- Maintain and support adventure playground.
- Take opportunity to create more tree cover near Men's Bathing Pond
- Dog 'showers' would be appreciated
- More terrace/grass areas close to the Mixed Pond. Smaller changing area for swimmers: Could be mixed male/female with un-roofed cubicles: single couple & family sized. Doors swing open when not locked from inside. Space saved goes to better terrace/grass areas.
- Coin-op secure lockers for swimmers
- Would like planning for improved surface drainage integrated into the ponds project.
- Would be good to have more consideration and information about planning gain from the project (over and above the improvement at Model Boating Pond).
- A sanctuary for recovering animals would be welcome supplement to games/football provision and inviting prospect for less sporty children.
- There is a section opposite the Men's Bathing Pond that needs attentions since every winter it becomes a quagmire and is an eyesore.
- Can you undertake some clearing of the ponds whilst work is being carried out?



- More visible information on the changing hygiene levels of the Mixed Pond is needed.
- Women's changing building to have much more user-friendly, lower walls so that it is possible to change in the sunshine (should there be any) for most of the year. This is currently only possible in mid summer.
- Management of any new habitats/structures needs to be as good as the design.
- Continue visual display and information throughout works.
- Do not alter the facilities at the Ponds. Leave the swimming area untouched. Please do not use the dam project as an excuse to ruin the facilities at the Men's and Mixed Ponds. Leave the facilities as they are, rural, rustic and outdoor. No hot showers.
- Can you heat the Lido instead?
- Add raised board over muddy / boggy hot spots
- As part of good management, surrounding fields should have an annual spiking to allow soil to drain.
- Links between ponds should have visible flowing water.
- Water Board, Thames Water should greatly increase the capacity of the sewers flanking the lower part of the Heath e.g. 2004 cellars in Tanza Road flooded with sewage due to back pressure.

## Appendix 7: Heath Displays Comments Results Summary

### Visual Impact Heath Displays

#### CONCERNS EXPRESSED:

- Worried that the works will change the way that the Heath looks and asking that these visual changes are minimised.
- Concerned about how the model boating pond will look, including views on to it and that its banks will be too steep.
- The embankments will spoil the views.
- That you will have to get up on to the embankments to see the views.
- The dams are too high.
- The embankment on the boating pond is too high.
- That the embankments will look unnatural.
- The men's pond will look municipal.
- That while the works are going on it will look unsightly.
- That the surroundings of the men's pond would look unnatural.
- That people would be able to see into the men's pond.

#### SATISFACTION EXPRESSED:

- The works are an improvement on the current look of the ponds, particularly the model boating pond.
- The visual impact was much less than the media hype had led them to believe.
- It doesn't look excessive.
- The Heath is constantly changing anyway.
- Looking forward to the new embankments.
- If the works are made to look good afterwards, then it is fine.
- Particularly like the new Island on the Model Boating Pond.

#### OTHER COMMENTS:

- Build the dams as high as possible
- Protect the lovely clearing in catchment 1.
- Make sure the finished scheme enhances the Heath

### Environmental Impact Heath Displays

#### CONCERNS EXPRESSED:

- It is going to ruin the landscape of the Heath.
- Minimising the impact that the works will have on wildlife, both during the works, through disturbance and where the pond life will go, and afterwards.
- Does not want the vegetation around the mixed bathing pond removed.
- That the reed bed in the Model Boating Pond would be removed.
- Worried that too many trees are being removed.
- What the impact will be on trees in the catchment area.

#### SATISFACTION EXPRESSED:

- Keen that the works increase the wildlife habitats, such as wetlands.
- Happy that the works will improve the area for wildlife.
- Trees will grow back.
- The landscaping of the boating pond would be an improvement.

#### OTHER COMMENTS:

- Hopes the works are going to be landscape sensitive.
- Would like a consultation on the environmental impact after the works are complete.
- Would like to know how habitats are being improved through the works.
- The difference between the options seems mainly how many trees you will save.
- Would like more information on which options have the least impact on wildlife.
- Do not allow access to the new island in the Model Boating Pond, leave it for the birds.
- Suggest using horses to do the tree clearance.
- The Marylebone Birders support the project.
- Fences change the flow of a landscape, they can create a tunnel effect.
- Bill Oddie is NEVER wrong

#### Engineering Approach Heath Displays

#### CONCERNS EXPRESSED:

- That the works are not enough to protect against all eventualities.
- Should increase the dam on Highgate 1 more and make it wider.
- Overkill/too extreme
- Don't agree with extent of works, need to sort drains out first
- Dam between boating and men's pond too high, doesn't want either option
- Concerned about blocking outflow of Highgate 1 and potential flooding.

#### SATISFACTION EXPRESSED:

- The island sounds lovely, an improvement
- Both options good.
- Glad the model boating pond is being targeted, it is a very unnatural pond'
- Really like changes to model boating pond
- Trust City to make right choice
- Likes the work proposed to soften the boating pond 7,
- Don't really see what all the fuss is about. Looks like it's been dealt with sensibly
- All looks fine

#### OTHER PREFERENCES:

- There are other lower impact options, which would suffice, such as dredging the ponds, digging them deeper, sorting out the drains and sewers, letting the water escape faster, putting in longer pipes
- Access for prams to boating pond, pegs closer and more.
- Prefer option of straight dam.
- (Local swimmer) potential for water quality improvements?
- Would prefer loss of trees and no wall on mixed causeway
- Why are the walls being built on the dams? Why not just increase the height by building up existing dam profile with earth?
- Might go for lower banks - what's the city's preferred option?

#### OTHER COMMENTS:

- The plans are better than before
- Why all this primitive work? Why not use more modern technologies?
- What about water management/drainage downstream? Thought cost £40m
- How will raising on only one side prevent flooding? Against

- Options very similar, hard to decide
- Is it time that the same engineer whose advice is guiding the project is employed by architects/planners?'
- Pointless
- Opportunity to make improvements
- Why the work? Is there a connection with flats - drying out the basements in the rise?
- If there are 2 pipes per ponds just make 4 pipes per pond
- All about striking the right balance between those who want to protect and those who live downstream.

### Necessity for the Project Heath Displays

#### CONCERNS EXPRESSED:

- No effects from recent extreme rainfall
- The risk is too small to justify the works
- Nobody has died from flooding around Hampstead, so it is unnecessary.
- The risk has not been proven
- Planning for a 10,000 year event would be sufficient
- The assumptions are that are being used to calculate the risk.
- There is not enough evidence of recent flooding; the ponds have not flooded for 300 years, so there is no need for the works; the flooding in the 70s was due to drainage and sewer issues, not the ponds flooding.
- The ponds have been around for centuries and the dams have not eroded, apart from on minor ponds.
- The scale of the works is out of proportion with the risk
- Engineers have over planned the works
- Not convinced that there is a need for the works
- The legal case for the works is not proven, the ponds are not covered by the Reservoirs Act, it is being interpreted wrong
- The legislation is too extreme
- City of London should be challenging the legal need for these works themselves
- The work is only being undertaken because the laws have changed
- That there are vested interests pushing the project through, including people exaggerating the risk in order to keep themselves in a job
- It is part of an insurance scam
- If there was an extreme flood then the measures proposed would be useless anyway

#### SATISFACTION EXPRESSED:

- Understand the need for the project and feel that if necessary then should go ahead.
- Appreciate the need to reduce flood risk, particularly local residents.
- Remember incidents of flooding in the past.
- Accept that it is a legal requirement.
- Glad that Climate Change is being taken seriously.
- Increasing number of extreme weather events, including January storms.
- Happy with whatever keeps the Heath healthy.
- Thinks it is sensible to plan for the worst case scenario
- Good forward planning, glad that City of London is being proactive and not waiting for a disaster to happen before acting.
- Supports all safety work
- Accepts that EU legislation will add urgency to the project

#### OTHER COMMENTS:

- Should be doing maintenance work, but not preparing for extreme weather events.
- Wonders whether there would be the same obligation if the ponds were natural.
- It depends on what the worst case scenario is.
- Wonders why the rainfall records for Hampstead for the last 100 years are not relevant.

#### Information Giving and Consultation Heath Displays

##### CONCERNS EXPRESSED:

- Thinks photos are unclear & misleading. Will look on website
- Was there only one form of consultation?
- Boards are not clear,
- Information quite biased and confusing
- Survey doesn't cover ecology.
- Drawings insufficient for decision.
- Options almost identical - not a consultation
- Images misleading and do not show the sides (wetland on model boating pond) Grey dam on model boating pond profile almost invisible.
- Concerns about inability to have input any more on the need for work to be done

##### SATISFACTION EXPRESSED:

- Was concerned with boating pond had heard rumours of 3m high dam, reassured after seeing info
- Really appreciate the way the city is informing people so accurately on the plans
- Display very helpful
- The exhibition is very clear - city has done a good job explaining it all
- Interesting display, works well
- Doesn't sound too drastic. Like democratic approach of COL
- Excellent you're open to discussion

##### OTHER COMMENTS:

- A diagram of the potential flood area would be useful
- Really interesting project. Appreciate the way the city is dealing with it all
- Are you still discussing this?
- Can't really see what it's going to look like from pictures on display. If had presentation with high tech to show probably wouldn't have people against project
- H&H members mostly from NW3 and have a blinkered view
- Didn't realise that footpaths are actually dams
- Want image of affected views on boating pond
- Would like model of how heath will change
- Happy with info, tweeted friends to read and do survey.
- Stakeholders (COL, architects etc.) should have talks where people can ask questions directly.
- A walk would be better than a display
- Need detailed plans
- Should mention global warming in display.
- Need more detail on process not just final.
- Need photos of stock pond and boating pond overflowing in May 2010 and 75 floods
- 3d visualisation on web of changes and drainage - history
- Will there be a public forum or talk sometime in the future?

- Map of flood area would be useful
- Should include more info about why doing project - Climate change meaning more big storm events in future
- Where do I find out more?

### **Implementation Heath Displays**

#### CONCERNS EXPRESSED:

- Concerned about disturbance and extent of change
- Concerned with how long might take,
- Concerned about use of ponds during works
- About changes/access to ladies pond.

#### SATISFACTION EXPRESSED:

- Good to see minimal disruption

#### OTHER COMMENTS:

- Rather sooner than later

### **Amenity Heath Displays**

#### CONCERNS EXPRESSED:

- General disruption during works
- Long term impact on heath appearance
- Concerned about fishing
- Worried about access for kids and pushchairs to boating pond

#### OTHER COMMENTS:

- City has managed the heath beautifully
- Please do not change/ replace the facilities on the swimming ponds. We like them rustic

### **Cost Heath Displays**

#### CONCERNS EXPRESSED:

- Should give the money to hospitals
- No need to spend money on changing heath
- Money better spent on tennis courts and other heath facilities
- Dams are too high,
- Conspiracy by contractors to make money from COL
- Is there money for this?
- Waste of money
- Satisfaction expressed:
- How much will it cost? Who's paying?

### **Information Requested Heath Displays**

- Info on dam height unclear. What is the wall and dam on top
- How grade down at ends? Why is not the whole system down (Fleet street etc.) considered first?
- What happens at ends of structures?

- Will there be improvements to water quality, such as the blue green algae? When would EA step in?
- Concerned about ladies pond - 'will I still be able to sun?
- What happens if new dams break? Needs reassurance.
- What are the other materials apart from concrete and timber in walls?
- How will fishermen access ponds?
- Will you manage trees on/around dams to limit root damage?
- Concerned about impact on men's pond. Will it be dredged?
- Why not control water level with sluices and forecasting? Where are the outflows and how many are these? Bd 7 - model boating pond - volume in m3 flowing through? 07768422304
- What is the biggest change? Interested in positive improvements
- Query re fleet pipe as it crosses railway by footbridge and Acland Burghley School - is it ever maintained?
- Will ponds close?
- How much water will be released through the fleet tunnel?
- Is there a possibility of access for families for sun bathing in the future?
- What is the start and duration of works? Levels of disturbance & openness of ponds?
- Dates of work and process? Will mixed pond close?
- What about the gas pipes?
- Wanted specific info on the areas most at risks from flooding - what would happen if the ponds dams failed now?
- Where will the water be transferred to when the dredging is done?
- Where is soil coming from? Where is field m?
- When were dams last compromised? Can ponds be dug deeper instead?
- Can dogs still swim in the pond while work is being carried out?
- Ecology info? What will happen to the fish during the works? How will habitats be improved?
- Will people be able to see into mens pond?
- Info isn't detailed enough, where will the diggers be? Disruption?

### Suggestions from Heath Displays

- Have sluices been considered? Or drainage down the line?
- Do dams have to be this high? Why not use more areas as floodplains and overflow
- Hampstead and Highgate ridge - 9m down, what is capacity?
- Look up what they are doing at Tamera in Portugal - habitat restoration, regeneration of underground water springs
- Could cycling routes be included/added/improved in the works?
- Why can't the overflows be made bigger? Opposed
- www.huf\_haus.com please consider these buildings for the new ladies bathing pond
- Have a board explaining how water would be slowly released on the heath and explaining the technicality.
- Will the changing room facilities be improved?
- Cycle route to gospel oaks train station please.
- Avenue at South End Green should become a pond again. Neutral
- In a few years no-one will know the difference. Creating floodplains is the way forward
- Dog shower would be good if are re-doing facilities
- What about water management/drainage downstream?

## **Appendix 8: Requests for Information and Questions Summary**

*As part of the questionnaire, respondents were asked (other than what was on the City of London website or the summary leaflets) whether there was any other information they would like to be provided to help inform their understanding of what was happening or why. The following forms a summary of the requests for information made and questions raised, organised under relevant topic headings. There were many identical or very similar questions. Note that some of the following information requests / questions may fall outside of the remit of the City of London.*

### **Advice and Challenges**

- How long has Atkins been working with the City of London?
- Have a range of engineering firms been consulted?
- What consultation has taken place with other countries / cities that share this problem?
- Have the proposals been peer reviewed by the engineering profession?
- Have the proposals or any other mitigation measures been discussed with London Borough of Camden, Thames Water Authority and Environment Agency?
- Details of the challenges made to the Atkins' DFA by members of the Ponds Project Stakeholder Group, and others, to be available on the City of London website.
- The City should engage with and make available the studies that show that the proposed works would be excessive and ineffective.

### **Alternative Measures to Address Dam Safety**

- What other alternatives, including those of lower impact, to the designs proposed have been explored? Are there any other options or actions that could prevent flooding and what have been reviewed and why have they been rejected? What reports on these are available?
- Why can't the existing dams be made safe without the need for the engineering approach proposed? Is there any possibility that the work could be replaced with reinforcement and maintenance?
- The effects of standard mitigation techniques, so that the effect of the current dam proposals is isolated clearly for comparative purposes.
- Why can use not be made of the City of London's monitoring equipment to measure the water level in all the ponds?
- What assessment of technological advances was made as part of the risk assessment?
- Why do the designs for the works not include meteorological forecasts, early warning systems, evacuation procedures required under civil emergencies legislation?
- Why do the designs for the works not include preventative/mitigating action involving the emergency services or mechanical or electrical equipment?
- What would happen if no action was taken and no work done on the ponds?
- What more cost-effective approaches were considered?
- How would pumps be able to help?
- Has diversion of the potential floodwater been considered?
- Has the use of spillways beside the ponds been considered?
- What options are there for downstream change of uses i.e. bigger floodplain?
- Is opening up the Fleet and tributaries, as has been done with the Quaggy in Lewisham an option?
- Why are underground pipes to take away the excess pond water not being proposed or the creation of an underground water storage facility for peak loads?
- Why is the City of London is being encouraged to adopt such an old fashioned approach to water management: Have lighter touch alternatives been considered?



### **Contracts and Governance**

- Transparent accounting of the consultants used and who benefits financially from the work to carry out the Ponds Project.
- Are there conflicts of interest with respect to the providers of the works also being on various Committees that agree to the works; or the advising engineer responsible being employed by the probable contractor?
- What is the contracting process for the work and what additional engineers have been invited to tender?
- Has there been any lobbying by construction firms likely to be asked to tender for this work?

### **Decision Making**

- Communication of the chosen option.
- Details of who makes the final decision and what that decision is based on.

### **Drainage**

- What is the state of the sewers and drainage facilities? Why isn't the adequacy of the drains and sewers being addressed?
- Should the sewers not be the main focus of attention in the case of flooding and therefore the focus of a study for improvements?
- Why do the current plans not take into account liaison with Thames Water to improve the drains?
- How are Camden Council, Thames Water and the City of London co-ordinating efforts against flooding?
- Would new underground surface water drains connecting to existing systems be an alternative?
- Why can't a better system of releasing water early be considered?
- How the drainage through the Highgate pond system relates to the proposed large-scale Fleet storm/sewer improvement planned for the City.
- How will the proposals for containing surface water be made sufficient to prevent Brookfield Mansions (downstream of Highgate Pond No. 1) being flooded?
- Drainage and flood overflow channels in the vicinity of Gospel Oak
- The size and location of Thames Water main drains and storm relief sewers
- Details about the Flood Alleviation Tunnels.
- What is the structure and depth of the York Rise conduit of the River Fleet?
- A report from Camden or Thames Water on the effectiveness of their drainage system to cope with a one in 100,000 year event.
- How the resulting impact of any of the proposed options on the connected sewerage systems have been analysed to ensure that the forecast output flows in a PMF flood are manageable by the sewerage systems.

### **Engineering**

- The design criteria and scope set by the City of London to Atkins
- More details about the Kenwood Ladies Bathing Pond.
- New proposals for paths and affected routes. Gradients of new paths.
- More details of the dam NW of Mixed Bathing Pond: How many trees will be lost, how will it be constructed?
- Options M and P seem to significantly differ in the proposed amount of work, what level of work is actually needed?
- Why is such the colossal Catchpit dam necessary? Is this also being planned on the basis of a 1 in 400,000 year storm passing directly over the Heath?

- Catchpit area: By raising chain dam higher still would this eliminate the need for any changes to the causeway lower down?
- Would there be an issue with kids rolling or running down the 2metre bank to the Model Boating Pond?
- There should be an explanation of the concept of progressive collapse, where failure upstream would progress downstream to result in a sudden mass of water surging down the valley, filling the railway cuttings further down the valley with significant danger to life and disruption to London as a whole.
- How would the water flooding down the hill get over the railway line?
- It is not clear why the dam works would protect areas downstream of the Heath from flooding. Flooding can be caused and exacerbated by many other factors such as drains and sewers being overwhelmed, and the effect of hard standing where gardens used to be.
- Will the proposed raising of the dams actually stop all flood risk?
- More acknowledgement that the proposals are about massively increasing the temporary water storage capacity of the Heath by raising dams rather than just strengthening dams for safety.
- How will the storage approach be used?
- Does the approach mean more water than before to flood should dams fail?
- Explanation of whether increased storage capacity can/not be applied more to men's bathing pond than Boating Pond. Tree island proposal is ingenious, but is it necessary if Men's Bathing Pond capacity enlarged?
- What material is being used to raise the dam heights: earth or brick or concrete?
- Samples of walls if included in design.
- Will there be extensive piling and concrete structures?
- Why the two temporary water storage areas that were originally considered, prior to the current options, were discarded.

#### **Environment**

- Details on the new wildlife that will be planted on the banks.
- How careful the workers would be in dredging, emptying ponds and making sure that fish amphibians water invertebrates, nesting birds were all safe and could survive.
- Ecological impact during the works and possible enhancements post works.
- How wildlife (in particular birds) will be preserved
- What Prince Charles The Prince of Wales thinks about the threat to the wildlife and flora on the Heath.

#### **Funding and Cost**

- Why has the City of London prioritised funding for the Ponds Project in the face of so many other pressing needs?
- Why have proposals to maintain the existing dams, presumably requiring a lower level of funding but still an increase of it over current levels, not been offered as an alternative?
- Approximate cost of the works and how this was arrived at.
- Where is the money to fund the project coming from?
- How much funding is Thames Water contributing to these works given that the reservoir capacity of the Heath ponds will be greatly increased to their benefit?
- How much will contractors be paid?
- Why this is considered to be the most cost effective solution?

### **Flooding / Hydrology**

- What is the history or evidence of flooding from the ponds or dam failure causing problems in this area in the past and in the recent winter wet weather conditions?
- What is the relationship between the flooding as a result of the recent weather and the prognosticated flooding as the result of a potential breaking of the dam?
- Previous flooding not connected with the ponds.
- To what extent would the 1975 floods have been affected if the proposed works had been implemented at the time?
- Updated flood maps.
- Water levels of the ponds.
- What is the largest possible flood that could occur?
- What are the possible depths of flooding that could occur and affecting which areas?

### **Implementation**

- Progress reports once the work has started.
- A programme of work and a schedule or timetable for the works (so users know when to avoid and can visit around them)
- Duration of works including estimated date of completion.
- Where can we use remote control boats or take dogs swimming during works?
- Will the use of the men's and ladies ponds be shared for a period of time?
- Disruption to local roads during work
- Pond closures, especially with regard to swimming and other restriction of access to the Heath including time periods
- What will happen to the property prices in the area during this period? Are we to be compensated if our value goes down due to the noise and other inconveniences caused by this major public works project?

### **Information Giving and Consultation**

- The public should continue to be kept informed and consulted.
- Additional guided walks.
- Another You Tube video to see how the project progresses.
- The summary report.
- More information up around the Heath.
- A clearer website.
- Which is the definitive final information in the various reports?
- More public meetings and wider awareness for residents and concerned groups to meet with City officials before final decisions are taken.
- A public enquiry.
- Space to provide alternative views, including by groups and experts who question the entire scheme alongside that provided by the City of London.
- Why hasn't the City of London taken notice of local opposition to the proposals?
- A response to the powerful arguments of the Dam Nonsense campaign / Heath and Hampstead Society that the work is not necessary.
- Why have so many community organisations objected to the works?
- Why was there no consultation on the 5metre Catchpit dam behind the Mixed Bathing Pond?
- Why is the consultation process been based on the assumption that there is no alternative to the works?

## **Insurance**

- Observations of insurance companies' position on cover against flood in Gospel Oak.

## **Legal**

- What legislation is driving this, why now? What is the legal necessity underpinning the works?
- The legal opinion that requires the City of London to carry out the works and says that these cannot be met by any other means and who gave it.
- The legal option that advised the Dam Nonsense campaign that says that the City of London is not required to carry out the works.
- Does the City of London believe that it should comply further with the Environment Agency's statement about storing as much floodwater on site as possible?
- Why has the City of London not joined with the Heath & Hampstead Society in seeking a judicial ruling on interpreting the requirements of the Reservoirs Act and having regard to the Hampstead Heath Act.
- How these proposals are not in contravention of the Hampstead Heath Act of 1871.
- I would like the case for enlarging the dams to be tested in court before any work is done.
- The driver for these works being EU regulation rather than risk.

## **Meteorology**

- An alternative way of understanding the size and shape of a rainstorm event that would first come over the top or out of the side of Highgate No 1 pond - other than Standard of Protection.
- A sample of 'realistic' storm events, measured in millimetres and hours for how a given, realistic set of ground conditions at the time would work.
- Meteorological forecasts
- Why despite the recent record rainfall have plans not been re-assessed?

## **Modelling**

- Details of the original report warning of a 1:400,000 year event storm and who compiled this report.
- Full publication of all details of the modelling, including all the assumptions and data sets.
- Has the accuracy of the modelling information been supported by other engineers?
- Why is the project based on a 1 in 400,000 year worst case flood scenario.
- How has the potential loss of life due to a 1 in 400,000 year event has been evaluated in that assessment?
- Statistical calculations of 400,000 year estimated: Why not one in 100,000 years? One in 500,000 years?
- Is the possibility of the Heath dams failing a 1 in 10,000 or 1 in 400,000?
- More information about what is meant by a Possible Maximum Flood: How is this determined and the what is probability of it occurring?

## **Planning Controls**

- Have the new buildings on Mill Lane had any effect on the water table?
- What is the position on planning control of paving over gardens, hard-standings, loss of percolated surfaces, garden space, deep basement prohibitions?

## **Project Team**

- How many of the officials and consultants live within a 1 mile radius of the Heath?
- Who originated the plan?

## **Rationale**

- Why are the existing dams and other systems no longer adequate? What evidence is there that present dams are unsafe?
- What are the assumptions, case or evidence for why this work is needed?
- A more balanced view showing the case against.
- A much better explanation of how to answer (and eliminate) the ridicule of people saying you're designing the dams to cope with a 1 in 400,000 year event.
- No detail has been provided on precisely why the works need to be so extensive.
- Why was the report on the last extreme flooding event in Camden (see the Camden Borough 2003 report entitled "Floods in Camden, Report of the Floods Scrutiny Panel, London Borough of Camden, June 2003), which in no way implicated the ponds in that flooding event, taken into account by the Corporation of London or its engineering adviser. At that time, many roads adjacent to the ponds were flooded due to backing up of the sewers
- How can this work be justified on the basis on disaster mitigation in the event of extreme flooding when extreme storms will still cause floods in the area downstream after the work is complete?
- Heavy rainfall and inadequate drainage has been the cause of local flooding so why are these works necessary?
- Who will actually benefit if this project goes ahead?

## **Risk Assessment**

- Copy of summary of Engineer's Report that justifies the works and the parameters that they work to.
- The Corporation's engineer's response to the other engineer's criticism of the evaluation of the need to make these changes (as referred to in the letters section of the Camden New Journal as at 9 February 2014).
- Considering how much land (e.g., Dukes Field) lies downstream between Highgate Ponds and domestic housing. What are the real risks of an immediate and previously undetected, breach?
- What is the probability of the dams failing?
- How reliable are all the recommendations? Is the technical evidence really sound and indisputable?
- Has the need for the work been assessed by other agencies?
- Why is the City working to such a remote probability in respect of the works proposed?
- Why does anything on this scale needs to be done: what you perceive the risks to be and why? What is the scientific case for intervention?
- What is the historic analysis of risks?
- How likely is it that someone will die as a result? How likely is it that damage of over, say £100million will be caused?
- Is this just a bureaucratic response to legislation intended for more serious life threatening situations?
- Why do similar threats of flooding do not exist elsewhere in London where there is no dam in the event of maximum precipitation.
- Why is this risk being addressed, whereas other much more imminent risks are not: Risk of the Thames flooding and obstructing the footpath near the Customs House; risk to cyclists from traffic (there's always more the City could do)?
- A risk / loss analysis: What is estimated cost of projected works versus estimated liability risks?

## **Safety**

- What emergency planning proposals has the City of London initiated in partnership with local authorities, emergency services and other bodies and what ongoing mechanisms that have been set up to maintain and develop these partnerships to mitigate the harm element of the risks under discussion.

## **Visual Representations of the Proposals**

- To scale physical models of the proposals with spillways shown clearly and showing where the water will run if the ponds overflow.
- The new boundary of the Model Boating Pond to be clearly indicated on the ground with posts for a week or two.
- Size and location of the main drains and storm relief sewer to be linked to the project maps.
- 3D models of what the options look like
- 3D video presentation.
- Computer mock ups of the spillways
- More accurate artists' impressions than those currently available.
- Diagrams showing proposed height of the Model Boating Pond Dam e.g. artists impression.
- Graphics on how things will look after the work showing the size of the changes planned.
- Show how the dams would look if one was standing by them on the path as well as seen from across the pond to show the true visual impact. Perhaps a digital "walkthrough" of the options showing their visual impact from a pedestrian's point of view as they move along nearby paths?
- Aerial view of proposed new path by Highgate Pond Chain with artist impressions of new views.
- Visual image of proposed changes to vista from east of Boating Pond.
- 3D modelling of inside the Hampstead & Highgate Ridge showing understanding of the water table, water storage, estimates of change over time, outfall predictions.

## **Water Management**

- Anti compaction measures implemented over the Heath's surface and contribution to run off.
- The historical context of water management including measures implemented over the past 1000 years including the Saxon ditch heritage.
- London's water management policy for the next 50 years.
- Position downstream from Gospel Oak, implementations of measures further down Fleet Valley, Kings Cross, Farringdon.

## Appendix 9: Postcodes Responses Detail

Note: The number of instances of each postcode is 1 unless otherwise shown.

E	No.	H	No.	N	No.	NW	No.	SE	No.	W	No.	Other
E2 4		HA1 1		N1	2	NW1	25	SE1		W1	2	AL2 2PQ
E2 8	2	HA5		N1 2		NW1 0	3	SE1 2		W2 1		BL2 6PN
E2 9		HA8		N1 4	3	NW1 1	6	SE5 7		W2 3		CV3 6
E4		Ha8 8		N1 7		NW1 7		SE8		W6 9		HP23
E4 6		HA9 7		N2	2	NW1 8	4	SE10		W11 2		IG6 1
E4 9				N2 0	7	NW1 9	9	SE11				KT2 6
E5 8				N2 055		Nw2	3	Sw12	2	WC1N	2	M6 8
E8				N2 9	6	NW2 1	3	Se13		WC1X		TW9 4DA
E8 1	2			N3		NW2 2	8	SE16	2			UB8 2
E10				N3 1	3	NW2 4	3	SE19 1				WD19
E10 5				N3 2	2	Nw2 5						YO24 1LG
E11				N3 3		NW2 6						
E11 4				N4	3	NW3	27					
E12 5	2			N4 2		NW3 1	98					
e17 3				N4 3	2	NW3 2	121					
E17 8				N5 1	4	NW3 3	6					
e18				N6	8	NW3 4	18					
				N6 2		NW3 5	23					
EC1				N6 4	15	NW3 6	19					
EC2				N6 5	25	NW3 7	15					
EC2 Y	3			N6 6	47	NW4 3TR						
				N7	5	NW4 4	2					
EN4 4				N7 0	19	NW5	9					
EN4 9				N7 6	2	NW5 1	124					
en4 0				N7 9	3	NW5 2	22					
EN5 6				N7 U		NW5 3	8					
EN5 I				N8		NW5 4	39					
EN6 Q				N8 8	4	nw6	3					
				N8 9ET	4	NW6 1	10					
				N9		NW6 2	2					
				N9 0		NW6 3	2					
				N10 1	2	NW6 4	3					
				N10 2		NW6 5						
				N10 3	7	NW6 6	6					
				N10 H		NW6 7	3					
				N10 2		NW8 0	3					
				N11		NW9 5						
				N11 2	2	NW9 8						
				N12	3	NW10						
				N12		NW11	41					

E	No.	H	No.	N	No.	NW	No.	SE	No.	W	No.	Other
				N12 8		NW12						
				N13 4	3							
				N14 6			645					
				N15			10					
				N15 6								
				n16 5								
				n16 7								
				n16 8								
				N16 9								
				N17 6	2							
				N17 8								
				N17 A								
				N19	7							
				N19 3	9							
				N19 4								
				N19 4								
				N19 4BZ								
				N19 4DB								
				N19 4DG								
				N19 4PS								
				N19 4QQ								
				N19 5	20							
				N20 0								
				N22 7								
				N29	3							



## Appendix 10: Other Ethnic Backgrounds and Groups Detail

Ethnic Background or Group	Total
American	6
<b>American with UK passport</b>	1
American/Irish/German	1
Anglo-French (born off East Heath Road)	1
Australian	4
Born in South Africa	1
British - Mixed English, Scottish, German, Italian	1
Canadian	1
Central European	1
Channel islander	1
Continental	1
Dutch	2
East European	4
English French	1
European	13
French	5
French & American	1
French & Indian	1
German	2
Greek	1
Greek/Dutch	1
Italian	5
Japanese	4
Jewish	1
Jewish Ashkenazi but I consider myself English.	1
Malaysian	1
Mediterranean	1
Mexican	1
Mixed	1
Mixed British Central European	1
My mother was Scottish and my father an Askenazi Jew.	1
New Zealand	3
Norwegian	1
Parents' origins in Germany & Austria	1
Polish	2
Polish-American background	1
Russian	1
South Africa	1
South American	2
Swedish	1
Swiss	1
Viking	1
Western European	1