

Summary table of PPSG feedback from Seminars on 13 April, 10 May, 15 May and 9 June 2014 and how this has been/will be addressed

	YOU SAID	WE DID	FUTURE WORK
<b>1.0</b>	<b>GENERAL POINTS</b>		
1.1	Contours must be consistent on all maps.	All contours are at 0.25m on engineering drawings (currently 1m intervals on existing site plans and Environmental Masterplans). Proposed contours have been differentiated from existing on the Environmental Masterplans.	
1.2	Contour information of Brookfield and West Hill Court requested.	A survey has taken place. City received draft results on 9 May.	Contours will be generated and shown on drawings once scope agreed by CoL. The results will feed into detailed design.
1.3	Plans are difficult to read when ponds are spread over several pages.	Each pond has now been reformatted to appear on one sheet for PPSG consultation – benefit printing at A3 sheet.	
1.4	PPSG request to see engineering drawings	Engineering drawings were made available for review on May 10.	Cross sections will be made available on 26 <sup>th</sup> June. Further Engineering details will made be available during detail design.
1.5	Request for a cross section of entire chain to scale.	Noted.	Atkins is preparing cross sections to submit with the planning application – these will be submitted with the planning documents.
1.6	Show water level heights on drawings.	Top water level heights have been shown on drawings.	
1.7	Contours need to be more visible (ok on our prints not on Stakeholder copies).	Thickness / darkness of contours and levels have been adjusted on the Environmental Masterplans.	
1.8	Cross sections – different scales on sketch development sections.	Accepted. Existing and proposed cross sections have been prepared at same scale to enable comparison.	
1.9	Design Development Document requested for Lower Ponds	Atkins have issued.	
1.10	Can a catchment be proposed for each pond	Noted.	Atkins to review
1.11	Footpath finishes to retain Heath character	Accepted. Atkins have considered in relation to usage and	

Summary table of PPSG feedback from Seminars on 13 April, 10 May, 15 May and 9 June 2014 and how this has been/will be addressed

	avoiding black asphalt and 'civic' appearance where possible.	location.	
1.12	Electronic version of Materials Palette requested.	Atkins have issued.	
1.13	Abbreviations should be clarified on drawings g TWL, EGL and AOD.	Accepted.	
<b>2.0</b>	<b>DETAILED INFORMATION</b>		
2.1	Tree removal information must be given in more detail for clarification.	A table listing tree loss at each pond distributed – 9 May	Version of tree protection plans issued 15 May with information on trees on the dams, with trees to be removed marked with red crosses and listed in tables. Tree walk with PPSG took place on June 9.
2.2	Spillway dimensions must be made available.	A table with this information was distributed – 7 May.	
2.3	In addition to detail comments identified by pond below by H&HS in relation to the palette H&HS have also suggested: No black asphalt should be used anywhere as a finished surface, path edges should not be defined and should be hidden by encroaching grass, additional fencing should be kept to a minimum, adopting a minimalist approach ' <i>if it is not essential don't do it</i> '.	Noted. Atkins are considering as part of the design development.	
2.4	Highgate CAAC concur with H&HS above and have advised ' <i>the project affects ALL users of the Heath and ALL local residents we feel strongly that the opinion of one particular group should have no more weight than that of any other and that the best solution is for the majority view to prevail</i> '.	Noted. Atkins are considering as part of the design development.	
<b>3.0</b>	<b>HAMPSTEAD CHAIN</b>		
<b>3.1</b>	<b>VALE OF HEALTH</b>		

**Summary table of PPSG feedback from Seminars on 13 April, 10 May, 15 May and 9 June 2014 and how this has been/will be addressed**

3.1.1	Spillway would be better in a straight diagonal line rather than a sweeping curve. Vale of Health Society keen to see spillway starting at existing low point of dog washing area to run at a slight angle across the path and then as close to the redwood as is possible without risking the health tree.	Accepted.	
3.1.2	Vale of Health Society are interested to see suggestions for more attractive fencing beside the path, but reserve the option to leave it as is. Also considered that the fence on the pond side of the path needs to be dog-proof (this is currently achieved with wire mesh), but the fence on the down side does not. H&HS suggest fencing style should be similar to existing and if existing fencing not used then the fencing should be in lower hardwood stanchions.	Accepted.	Palette of finishes / styles of fencing to be reviewed as part of detail design fencing will need replacing due to level change.
3.1.3	Consensus that path surfacing to remain similar to as it is now (no asphalt).	Accepted. Proposed finishes have been indicated on the Environmental Masterplans - footpaths will be reinstated to match existing.	
3.1.4	Crest restoration - 0.25m raising and 0.25m raised edge (with vegetation allowed to grow over) generally supported Vale of Health Society noted path to be raised (at the South end) by 250mm with a further 250mm upstand/kerb on the down side, where they would expect it to be quickly concealed by the natural vegetation.	Accepted. The design has been amended to show a simple raised edge. The height of the raised edge has been reduced from 250mm to 150mm.	The planting design along the raised edging will be carefully considered as part of the detail design.
3.1.5	Options requested on 0.25m raised kerb to achieve dam raising.	Atkins provided options in their Upstream Ponds Design Development Booklet.	
3.1.6	Footpath is occasionally used for emergency vehicle access.	CoL have confirmed that the dam crest footpath is not a designated route for emergency access.	

**Summary table of PPSG feedback from Seminars on 13 April, 10 May, 15 May and 9 June 2014 and how this has been/will be addressed**

3.1.7	Footpath used by several buggies and wheelchairs. Need gentle gradient.	Accepted.	Current proposed spillway side slope gradient of 1:12 to be reviewed as part of detail design.
3.1.8	Would like slope of spillway closer to Sequoia and to include natural dip.	The spillway is designed to avoid the natural dip which is a gully formed by erosion and could lead to further erosion of the dam fill. The general concept of this spillway is to carry water safely around the dam.	
3.1.9	Lighting to be retained.	Accepted.	
<b>3.2</b>	<b>VIADUCT</b>		
3.2.1	Clarity requested on alignment of spillway as it was considered that the spillway could take the water down the current path avoiding existing trees and shrubs.	The spillway should avoid the natural dip where the path sits as it could lead to further erosion of the dam fill. The general concept of this spillway is to carry water safely around the dam.	
3.2.2	Broken cladding to be repaired with similar timber. Review location of log piles. Behind fenced area would be ok.	Accepted.	
3.2.3	Mis-matching fencing to be retained.	Accepted.	
3.2.4	Self-draining path desirable as current path gets muddy. Split opinion on footpath finish - leave as it is or change to a bound gravel?	Noted.	May require further discussion with stakeholders and review of feedback during detailed design phase. General policy is to reinstate footpaths with the same finish as existing.
3.2.5	Wood piles should be located away from paths and ponds	Accepted and adjusted on Environmental Masterplans.	
3.2.6	Additional marginal planting should not encroach too far into the water.	Noted. Planting extents reviewed by Atkins Aquatic Ecologist and not considered to be an issue. Encroachment will be limited by either planting shelf width or tolerance of species to water depth. Species selection will ensure that encroachment is limited on ponds where plants are not constrained by geotextiles, as they will be established in constructed planting	

**Summary table of PPSG feedback from Seminars on 13 April, 10 May, 15 May and 9 June 2014 and how this has been/will be addressed**

		shelves.	
3.2.7	Comments were made regarding the use of the pond for fishing, the potential for four pegs and extending the pegs into the pond away from path Vale of Health Society considered no fishing pegs should be included.	Noted - Viaduct is an existing fishing pond. The quantity of silt and water quality currently prevents its use for fishing.	CoL considering requirement for fishing pegs to reduce conflict with walkers using the footpath across the dam. Discussions with the Hampstead Angling Society are continuing.
3.2.8	Concern that works might interfere with Kingfisher bank.	Atkins confirmed not affected by design.	
3.2.9	Proposed brick cladding at Highgate No.1 and Men's Bathing could be similar brick to that of Viaduct Bridge.	Noted.	Material selection will form part of the detailed design.
3.2.10	Meaning of the thicker black line was questioned.	Atkins has clarified on Environmental Masterplans.	
<b>3.3</b>	<b>CATCHPIT</b>		
3.3.1	Fencing around old Catchpit should be removed and possibly reused elsewhere on site. H&HS have suggested that if a fence is required that a low rail or even fencing is preferable to railing.	The fence will be removed as part of the dam construction, as the existing Catchpit will be filled in. As a design principle Atkins are trying to minimise new fences and may be able to avoid a new fence around the proposed inlet screen. The suggestion of reuse elsewhere on the Heath is noted.	
3.3.2	Boardwalk south of new dam could help access across wet area/ potential opened channel – not everyone agrees. H&HS suggest that the existing valley should be retained and not converted to wetland.	Noted.	Atkins will consider design of wetland area downstream of Catchpit in the context of the feedback from PPSG. The boardwalk will be replaced by a "crossing point", design to be developed.
3.3.3	Could the dam be made steeper to have smaller footprint.	Atkins advised that maximum slopes of 1:3 are desirable for maintenance (currently 1:3 north slope and 1:4 south slope).	
3.3.4	Previous concerns about loss of mature trees.	Atkins have addressed by moving the dam further north. This also results in less material required from the borrow pits.	
3.3.5	Could there be access across the dam.	Atkins confirmed there would be public access but informal	

**Summary table of PPSG feedback from Seminars on 13 April, 10 May, 15 May and 9 June 2014 and how this has been/will be addressed**

		only, so there would only be a reinforced grass surface on the dam crest.	
3.3.6	Will the dam be seen from Pryors Field?	Atkins confirmed there would be views initially but views could be screened by new vegetation once established.	
3.3.7	Request for tree planting to plug gaps around Catchpit dam.	Small tree and shrub planting is planned for the upstream face of the proposed dam and for surrounding area.	Planting proposals to be developed as part of detail design. Species which are suitable for coppicing will be selected.
3.3.8	Could there be replacement planting on the dam.	See above. Atkins advise only on the north slope and this would be smaller trees/shrubs such as Hawthorn/Blackthorn/Elder/Goat Willow.	
3.3.9	Planting required on both sides of dam.	See above but south side must be grass similar to current dam at Men's Pond to ensure PMF can pass safely.	
<b>3.4</b>	<b>MIXED BATHING POND</b>		
3.4.1	Concerns regarding proposals to reduce overhanging trees and impacts on nesting water birds.	Accepted.	CoL to review as part of Management Plan.
3.4.2	Ensure that planting palette results in only low growing marginal fringe so that views from dam are not obstructed.	Accepted.	
3.4.3	Cladding of wall to be finalised.	The proposal is to raise the dam by 0.5m with a bank, and 0.5 m wall which will be covered by marginal planting.	
3.4.4	Details of the proposed fence at the pond edge needs confirming.	The fence should be the minimum required to prevent people from unauthorised swimming from the dam.	
3.4.5	Retain the existing wooden post and steel rail on the Hampstead No 2 side of the dam although it was noted that the type may vary.	CoL to review requirement to retain this fence.	
3.4.6	Railing should match those on both sides. Discussion around railings which are safe but do not look imposing - fence should be the absolute minimum required for safety and also to prevent swimming from causeway.	See above.	

**Summary table of PPSG feedback from Seminars on 13 April, 10 May, 15 May and 9 June 2014 and how this has been/will be addressed**

3.4.7	Request for details of the low growing marginal flowering plants.	Accepted.	Detailed design phase, but note will be added to drawing regarding species, typical heights etc.).
3.4.8	More specific details of the northern end of the pond scrub clearance and reed bed construction.	Accepted.	More information provided at detail design regarding form of species, typical heights etc.).
3.4.9	Query if a speed bump should be included in access to slow people on bikes.	The existing speed bumps would be retained as these are higher up the slope than the proposed works.	
3.4.10	Path surface should match existing i.e. tar and chip but strong enough for vehicles – H&HS have suggested no black asphalt.	Accepted. Design principle is to reinstate footpaths with the same finish as existing.	
3.4.11	Trees – request for the term ‘self-seeding’ to be dropped as all trees on the Heath are this. Need to be aware that even category C trees are important parts of the landscape.	Self-seeding is an ecological term.	
3.4.12	How will the proposals at Mixed Bathing affect trees?	Atkins consider that five category C hawthorn and blackthorns within surveyed groups G27 and G1136 will be affected at east end of dam.	
3.4.13	Replanting of clump of hawthorn and blackthorn at south east corner where removed as they screen off an open bit of land and are a nice feature.	Noted.	
3.4.14	This is the only pond on this chain with wheelchair access for anglers. If there is to be no angling here, is there to be provision elsewhere?	There is a plan to provide disabled access at Hampstead No. 2 and at Model Boating Pond.	
3.4.15	Support for causeway solution (with 0.5m raising and 0.5m bund) proposed by Atkins is good and will improve the area as it is now.	Noted. This has been included on Environmental Masterplans.	
<b>3.5</b>	<b>HAMPSTEAD No 2</b>		
3.5.1	Culvert dimensions need to be included on the Environmental Masterplans.	Accepted.	These will be included on Environmental Masterplans.

**Summary table of PPSG feedback from Seminars on 13 April, 10 May, 15 May and 9 June 2014 and how this has been/will be addressed**

3.5.2	Why can't a mole be used to save both trees? Can the culvert move further west?	The Panel Engineer does not want to bore/ pipejack through the dam since this procedure has been known to cause leakage paths in the dam around the outside of new pipes (see the example of Warmwithens dam failure of 1970). A large tunnel boring machine would be required for this size of culvert. The residual risk of impact of trees would still exist. Engineers did consider alternative construction methods but they were unfeasible.	
3.5.3	Can the culvert be more curved to reduce impact on trees? H&HS have also suggested that the curve should be widened to avoid the plane trees.	The curve will remain the same but looking at pollarding the tree to potentially save the London Plane tree (No 0177).	
3.5.4	Consider ways to reduce erosion to the banks. Install fishing pegs on the west bank.	To be considered.	Discussions on fishing provision are on-going.
3.5.5	Install cladding to cover existing sheet piling. Cladding detail to be finalised.	Cladding to match culvert finish.	
3.5.6	Details of the 0.2m edging need to be provided.	Noted.	Details to be included with the planning application will provide information on the 0.2m edging. Exact shape and material can be discussed at detailed design.
3.5.7	Request for details of screening the inlet drop shaft as this will be visible from the Mixed Bathing Pond dam.	Noted.	Details to be included with the planning application on the inlet drop shaft - cover type and material to be discussed at detailed design.
3.5.8	Retain the existing style of fence.	Accepted.	
3.5.9	Request for an additional tree at east end of causeway to screen buildings.	There are landownership and utilities issues which mean it will be difficult to plant trees at eastern end of dam.	
3.5.10	Support for proposed tree planting – request for other species than just London Plane. Suggested existing stump good location.	Noted. Atkins have proposed semi mature tree planting on Environmental Masterplan.	



**Summary table of PPSG feedback from Seminars on 13 April, 10 May, 15 May and 9 June 2014 and how this has been/will be addressed**

3.5.11	Incorporate planted areas on east bank with fishing pegs. Concern that location in south east corner would be too limiting for disabled anglers.	Noted.	Discussions on fishing provision are on-going.
3.5.12	Dredge south-east corner where platform for disabled fishing access was proposed. Point made about wider issues through loss of disabled fishing access at Mixed Bathing and Model Boating Ponds.	Noted.	Discussions on fishing provision are on-going.
3.5.13	15 <sup>th</sup> May group did not like idea of wooden decking over the inlet dropshaft, preferred to extend a slab over the shaft, with the same surface to match the existing footpath. Conversely, H&HS have suggested that asphalt should not be used and that timber decking should only be used for fishing platforms.	The aim is to provide disabled fishing access from this location – an appropriate surface will be selected to enable this.	
3.5.14	Details of platform/cover over culvert outlet to next pond.	Noted.	Details to be included with the planning application Atkins to develop further as part of detail design.
3.5.15	On 15th May concern was expressed about possible “dog diving” if a platform is introduced over the culvert entrance. Pond dipping was not supported either.	Noted.	
<b>3.6</b>	<b>HAMPSTEAD No 1</b>		
3.6.1	Return periods for proposed design for Hampstead No1 and HG1.	The return period is at least 1 in 1000 years at both these ponds.	
3.6.2	Show the effect of the coppicing in the working area.	Accepted. Environmental Masterplan has been amended to show this.	
3.6.3	Plans to show the dimensions of the box culvert	Accepted. Environmental Masterplan has been revised to show all culvert / spillway widths.	
3.6.4	Request for detail on the screening of the box	Accepted. Environmental Masterplan has been revised to	

**Summary table of PPSG feedback from Seminars on 13 April, 10 May, 15 May and 9 June 2014 and how this has been/will be addressed**

	culvert inlet on the pond side.	show screening details including reed planting will be developed for the planning application drawings.	
3.6.5	Request for detail or the screening of the existing dam as this will be more obvious as a result of tree works.	Accepted. Proposed planting has been included on the Environmental Masterplan between the fence and the outlet - tree and shrub planting cannot be implemented on the crest or grassed downstream slope.	
3.6.6	Agreement in relation to creation of more reed edge planting.	Accepted.	
3.6.7	H&HS have advised no black asphalt should be used in any footpath surfacing.	Noted. The footpaths on or near the dam are not affected by the works for this pond.	
<b>4.0</b>	<b>HIGHGATE CHAIN</b>		
<b>4.1</b>	<b>STOCK POND</b>		
4.1.1	Similar fencing to be retained and dogs kept out of water	Accepted. This has been included on the Environmental Masterplan.	
4.1.2	Similar path surface to be retained as this is an important vehicular access route from Kenwood Yard - preference not black asphalt and reiterated by H&HS in their comments.	Accepted. This has been indicated on the Environmental Masterplan.	
4.1.3	Aerator would be too noisy at this tranquil spot.	Atkins advised a mobile aerator could be used if necessary.	Atkins will review during detail design.
4.1.4	No interpretation boards wanted.	Noted.	
4.1.5	Approval of suggestion to move footpath south (downstream) and save more trees.	Footpath has been repositioned to protect veteran Oak.	
4.1.6	Unhappy at level of tree loss at spillway and would like more information on why the spillway is sweeping around the side.	The general concept of this spillway is to carry water safely around the dam. If spillway is put on middle of dam, which is steeper then the flows will potentially be much faster. The location of the scour pipe (in the middle) is also an issue. Atkins has looked at alternative options with CoL but found that moving the spillway to the middle of the dam was not possible due the steep slope on the south side.	
<b>4.2</b>	<b>KENWOOD LADIES' BATHING POND</b>		
4.2.1	Existing building outline shown	Noted.	Atkins will amend on environmental plan to show

**Summary table of PPSG feedback from Seminars on 13 April, 10 May, 15 May and 9 June 2014 and how this has been/will be addressed**

			proposed layout option.
4.2.2	Sight lines into Ladies' Pond must be checked.	Tree removal will not affect view into Ladies' Pond as majority of tree loss is on north side of the path way. A site meeting with KLPA confirmed this.	
4.2.3	Trees at risk of removal should be marked.	Trees have been marked on a detailed map. A site meeting has also been provided.	
4.2.4	Consider bridging the spillway.	This has been discussed with the Kenwood Ladies' Pond Association (KLPA). The current option, however, is to minimise work at the spillway by not building over it.	
4.2.5	Use tree and shrub planting to plug gaps and provide additional screening.	Accepted.	Planting options to be discussed with the KLPA. Provides opportunity to enhance ecological value of existing planting.
4.2.6	Need to protect trees on boundary.	Accepted. This has been taken into account when locating the spillway on the dam. This avoids the trees which screen the pond from other parts of the Heath.	
4.2.7	Incorporate feed from Kenwood into valley.	Atkins have proposed some improvement works/check dams.	
4.2.8	Could the West path be made wider?	This path will be maintained as it is now.	
4.2.9	Path currently gets very wet – could a causeway help here?	Atkins consider that this is currently due a leak which adds to this problem. It is hoped this will be fixed after the work has taken place.	
4.2.10	Enclosure and privacy important.	Accepted	Environmental Masterplan – New planting along western edge to include shade tolerant, native evergreen species such as Holly or Yew. Provides opportunity to enhance ecological value of existing planting.
<b>4.3</b>	<b>BIRD SANCTUARY</b>		
4.3.1	Could fenced area be extended to stop people cutting around back and making route muddy	Noted.	To be discussed and agreed with CoL as part of the future

**Summary table of PPSG feedback from Seminars on 13 April, 10 May, 15 May and 9 June 2014 and how this has been/will be addressed**

	it was noted that some people in group like the muddy route.		management plan for this pond.
4.3.2	Show pipe location.	Accepted.	To be shown on the Environmental Masterplan.
4.3.3	Could we provide a bridge over north western boggy area connecting to Ladies' pond?	CoL's aim is to maintain a wet meadow and not to formalise this area in line with the Management Plan.	
4.3.4	General support.	Noted.	
<b>4.4</b>	<b>MODEL BOATING POND</b>		
4.4.1	Will the increased steepness of the west bank affect slope stability?	No. Safe slopes and adequate drainage are a fundamental part of the design.	
4.4.2	Slope gradient queried – will it be too steep to walk up plus concern expressed over appearance of hill - will it look like a quarry. Need to provide a better comparison between the existing east bank and the proposed west bank slopes. H&HS have suggested in their detail comments that the reprofiled west bank is no steeper than the landform on the east bank.	Noted.	Cross sections will be submitted as part of the planning application.
4.4.3	H&HS have suggested in their detail comments that an island is not required and an L shaped peninsula would be better as the channel would become silted up over time.	Accepted. Access to the island will be provided by a causeway as discussed with PPSG.	
4.4.4	Majority opinion that access should be provided to the proposed island e.g. to allow safe access to retrieve model boats. The island and pond should not become a nature reserve – concerned noted re litter. Not agreed exact details of this, could be bridge, boardwalk or a wet causeway to the island. Possibly include fencing on island.	Accepted. See above.	

**Summary table of PPSG feedback from Seminars on 13 April, 10 May, 15 May and 9 June 2014 and how this has been/will be addressed**

4.4.5	Varying opinions on whether or not to use board walk around planted areas on island to prevent heavy foot passage.	Boardwalk considered too formal for the Heath's natural aspect.	CoL advised this is not required.
4.4.6	Ensure the parallel paths on the west bank aren't too close together.	Noted. The upper path accommodates maintenance vehicles while the lower path is for pedestrians only.	
4.4.7	Ensure there is sufficient access to the water around the pond for model boats and fishing. Model Boating is the only pond with access all the way round. Is fishing from the island to be permitted? If so, from platforms?	A balance between hard and soft edging is being proposed to provide access for fishing and model boating.	
4.4.8	Are we having pegs on southern dam or just gaps in proposed planting, or no planting at all?	In consultation with HHAS, the proposal is to maintain fishing access and include disabled access.	
4.4.9	Requirement for fishing pegs on the east bank need to be discussed. Consensus that fishing pegs not required as currently no conflict between users and anglers.	Conflicts do exist and pegs/platforms are a means to help resolve these issues.	
4.4.10	Some stakeholders do not want softened edges to excavated banks or the raised dam, others do. Eg, concern over the safety of people in relation to the 1:3 slope into the water and the use of the planting platforms for access to the water.	The excavated bank will need to have a hard edge in some places so a channel can be of the correct depth. The hard edges will be softened with planting. Other areas on the western edge will have softened edges, as will the new raised dam. The new design will be safer for the public than the existing situation.	
4.4.11	Edge sections requested with planting details re to assess access issues. H&HS have suggested in their detail comments that at least 80% of the bank should be accessible and that the extent of marginal planting should be reduced.	Noted.	Typical details and cross sections will be provided for meeting on 26 June.
4.4.12	Request for timber cladding on the existing east bank sheet piling and concrete. 13 <sup>th</sup> April	East bank to remain in current state.	

**Summary table of PPSG feedback from Seminars on 13 April, 10 May, 15 May and 9 June 2014 and how this has been/will be addressed**

	and 10 <sup>th</sup> May groups preferred to continue cladding around entire pond perimeter. H&HS have reiterated this in their comments.		
4.4.13	Types of path surface including path across the dam should be reviewed. Tar and chip preferred on busier routes. H&HS suggested black asphalt should not be used.	Accepted.	Environmental Masterplan. Materials will form part of the detailed design.
4.4.14	Group on 15th May not supportive of fishing platforms. They do not think there is any conflict between anglers and walkers.	Conflicts do exist and pegs/platforms are a means to help resolve these issues.	.
4.4.15	Will forming a channel around the island affect the trees on the island – can they take extra saturation?	No.	
4.4.16	In regards to the Bronze Age landscape at the top of the Tumulus hill, a request for locations of trial pits and methodology of MOLAS when examining.	MOLAS have now prepared a watching brief. Nothing of archaeological interest was found.	
4.4.17	Would like clarity over what the proposal will look like.	Noted.	Atkins will submit verified photomontage views with the planning application as requested by LBC.
4.4.18	Request for access path to be moved further up the west bank and looped around the willow so the tree can be retained.	Accepted. Path to be repositioned to save tree.	
<b>4.5</b>	<b>HIGHGATE MEN'S BATHING POND</b>		
4.5.1	Supt needs to review the requirement for the "Pond Hut", could this be removed completely as a bund is having to be installed to protect it.	Upon review CoL have decided there is no requirement for a bund. Pond hut will be sacrificed in PMF event.	
4.5.2	Options for cladding the existing sheet piling. Timber or Brick - preference from West Hill Court and Millfield Cottage is a brick wall. H&HS have suggested in their detailed	Noted.	Materials will form part of the detail design.

Summary table of PPSG feedback from Seminars on 13 April, 10 May, 15 May and 9 June 2014 and how this has been/will be addressed

	comments that <i>'the wall should be faced on both sides with oak picket fencing, slightly higher than the wall, and no higher than the existing fence. This should be further hidden by low growing plants, or climbers such as honeysuckle, which would not need to be pruned continuously to keep it from growing above the fence.'</i>		
4.5.3	Options for preventing unauthorised access to the pond from the spillway should be reviewed.	Accepted.	CoL have asked Atkins to consider a collapsible fence.
4.5.4	Maintaining fishing access to the dam needs to be discussed. Can there be pegs or gaps in proposed planting on southern dam face for angling?	Noted. CoL aiming to retain fishing access from dam.	Further discussions with HHAS required.
4.5.5	Issue of safety and distance between new sheet piled wall and existing sheet piled wall.	Noted.	
4.5.6	Timber spillway deflecting wall to utilise corten steel posts and oak boards – need to avoid tropical hard woods. Designed to follow the profile of the slope.	Accepted.	Atkins to consider further as part of detail design.
4.5.7	Comments regarding both opening up views of the pond and avoiding disturbance to the habitat were recorded. H&HS suggested in their detailed comments that 2-3 windows should be opened up.	Noted.	CoL to review as management issue.
4.5.8	Concern expressed with regards cutting back trees that overhang ponds.	Noted.	CoL to review as part of Management Plan.
4.5.9	Can the guelder rose tree on the proposed spillway location be saved, as it rare on the Heath?	Arboriculturists have concluded that the tree in question is not a guelder rose but a non-native Cockspur Hawthorn.	
4.5.10	Can the path along top be widened – it is	This is a maintenance issue.	

**Summary table of PPSG feedback from Seminars on 13 April, 10 May, 15 May and 9 June 2014 and how this has been/will be addressed**

	encroached upon by trees.		
4.5.11	H&HS have suggested that black asphalt should not be used.	Accepted.	
4.5.12	Could there be a storage area created to the west of the Men's Pond where the ground is flat.	This would require a deeper spillway and a lot of excavation in an area where works are otherwise limited. Consequently this is out with the scope of the project as it would impact on the natural aspect of the Heath and would not be in line with the objectives of the Ponds Project and the management of the Heath.	Not to be taken forward.
<b>4.6</b>	<b>HIGHGATE No 1</b>		
4.6.1	Return periods for proposed design for Hampstead No 1 and Highgate No. 1.	The return period is at least 1 in 1000 years at both these ponds.	
4.6.2	Existing landscape to extend west, south and east of Highgate No. 1. (Significance of the area shaded light green needs clarification), to show direction and depth of flow of water beyond spillway.	Topographical survey has been undertaken.	The area downstream of the spillway will be modelled using the survey data.
4.6.3	Consideration of additional overflow at Highgate No. 1. (This is noted on your summary table of spillway details as tbc at DD stage) but is also part of our feedback.	City have reviewed design and spoken with Camden and Thames Water. An additional pipe to the sewer system will increase the flows off the Heath and is therefore would not be in line with the objectives of the project.	Not to be taken forward.
4.6.4	Crucial question from downstream residents is, 'how much safer will we be after the work has taken place?' These answers are needed now - the 1:2000 and the 1:5000 need to be modelled. We are trying to be supportive but it is very difficult without this information.	The key points are that, 1) the risk of flooding due to dam failure will be virtually eliminated and 2) the frequency of flooding will be the same downstream of Hampstead Chain and improved from 1:100 to over 1:1,000 on the Highgate Chain.	Modelling after detailed design will demonstrate standard of protection.
4.6.5	Depth of gas lines.	Query relates to additional storage. This is out with the proposed scheme. Creating storage on or within the hillside would impact on the natural aspect of the Heath and would not be in line with the objectives of the Ponds Project and the management of the Heath.	



**Summary table of PPSG feedback from Seminars on 13 April, 10 May, 15 May and 9 June 2014 and how this has been/will be addressed**

4.6.6	Consider arrangement of reed bed extensions and views into the pond.	Noted.	This will be picked up in the Management Plan.
4.6.7	Proposals to increase habitat complexity were agreed.	Noted.	
4.6.8	Plans need to show where trees on the dam will be coppiced. H&HS have suggested in their detail comments that the pond side of the wall should be screened with coppiced trees and low shrubs on the dam crest.	Noted. This has been indicated on the Environmental Masterplans.	
4.6.9	Concern regarding tree loss – on dam and in spillway. Details on the dam need sharing with neighbours.	Accepted. A meeting on site with residents took place on 4 June.	
4.6.10	Wall cladding – brick facing was requested for consideration. H&HS have suggested in their detail comments that yellow brick or an oak picket fence should be used on the pond side and as preferred by residents on the other.	Noted.	Material selection will form part of the detailed design.
4.6.11	West Hill Court RA have suggested that horizontal wood cladding would be a more attractive alternative to picket style fence.	Noted.	Atkins to consider further as part of detail design
4.6.12	H&HS have suggested in their detail comments that black asphalt should not be used for surfacing footpaths.	Accepted.	Material selection will form part of the detailed design.
4.6.13	West Hill Court RA have suggested that the footpath finish should not add sediment to the pond or lead to a deterioration in water quality.	Path surfaces will be chosen so they are appropriate for their location. Atkins has incorporated measures in the design to capture this sediment along the inflow stream.	
4.6.14	Tawny owls live here and are missed off the bird survey. They are important as they help control the rat population.	Information passed onto ecologist.	
4.6.15	Query on 15 <sup>th</sup> May if additional storage area for water could be created to the west of Highgate No 1.	This is outside the scope of the proposed scheme. Creating storage on or within the hillside would impact on the natural aspect of the Heath and would not be in line with the	

**Summary table of PPSG feedback from Seminars on 13 April, 10 May, 15 May and 9 June 2014 and how this has been/will be addressed**

		objectives of the Ponds Project and the management of the Heath.	
4.6.16	Request to save the lime tree on the dam with sheet piling or a bund.	Engineers have consulted with arboriculturalists but the location of this tree at the front of the spillway means this is not feasible.	

Work in Progress