HAMPSTEAD HEATH CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Tuesday, 12 November 2013

Minutes of the meeting of the Hampstead Heath Consultative Committee held at Education Centre, Parliament Hill Fields, Hampstead Heath, NW5 1QR on Tuesday, 12 November 2013 at 7.00 pm

Present

Members:
Jeremy Simons (Chairman)
Virginia Rounding (Deputy Chairman)
Xohan Duran (Representative of People with Disabilities)
Colin Gregory (Hampstead Garden Suburb Residents' Association)
Michael Hammerson (Highgate Society)
Ian Harrison (Vale of Health Society)
John Hunt (South End Green Association)
Susan Nettleton (Heath Hands)
Mary Port (Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Advisory Committee)
Ellin Stein (Mansfield Conservation Area Advisory Committee/Neighbourhood Association)
Richard Sumray (London Council for Sport and Recreation)
Simon Taylor (Hampstead Rugby Club)
Jeremy Wright (Heath & Hampstead Society)

Officers:

Alistair MacLellan	-	Town Clerk's Department
Esther Sumner	-	Town Clerk's Department
Sue Ireland	-	Director of Open Spaces
Simon Lee	-	Superintendent of Hampstead Heath, Queen's Park & Highgate Wood
Declan Gallagher	-	Operational Service Manager
Richard Gentry	-	Constabulary and Queen's Park Manager
David Bentley	-	Hampstead Heath Information and Communication Officer
Paul Monaghan	-	Assistant Director Engineering, City Surveyor's Department
Meg Game	-	Hampstead Heath Ecologist

1. **APOLOGIES**
   Apologies were received from Helen Payne, Susan Rose, Steve Ripley and John Weston

2. **DECLARATIONS UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THE AGENDA**
   There were no declarations.

3. **MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting dated Monday 8 July 2013 were approved as a correct record subject to the following amendments:

Members Present

Committee members to have the name of the group they are representing given in the list of attendees.

Item 1 Apologies

Ian Harrison noted that he had submitted his apologies for the 8 July meeting.

Item 4 Reports of the Superintendent of Hampstead Heath

'(Copies attached)' to be deleted.

Item 4.3 Progress Report on Enhancement of Landscaping Works to Bull Path and Surrounding Areas

'Three tupes of buttercup' to be amended to 'Three types…'

Matters Arising

Dog Walking

The Chairman noted that the report on commercial dog walking on the Heath, that had been intended for the present meeting, would now be submitted to the committee meeting in January 2014.

Planning

The Chairman noted that an update on planning decisions would form part of the Superintendent's update in the current meeting.

Affordable Art Fair

In response to a question from Ian Harrison the Superintendent confirmed that the Affordable Art Fair proposal for a 'Grow London' event had been submitted to, and approved by, the Hampstead Heath, Highgate Wood and Queen's Park Committee in September 2013.

London Borough of Camden Flood Warning Letter

The Superintendent apologised that he had not circulated a letter from the London Borough of Camden detailing information to local residents on the risks associated with flooding, as had been promised at the July meeting. He undertook to circulate the letter as promised, and took the opportunity to update the committee that Camden would be issuing maps of at-risk areas of surface water flooding in early December 2013. The information provided by Camden would similarly be circulated to the committee.

Cycle Stands

In response to a query from Mary Port over the installation of cycle stands, the Superintendent noted that this had been discussed at the recent committee walk on 2 November, and that he would update her on the issue outside of the meeting.

3.1 **Draft Minutes of the Hampstead Heath Sports Advisory Forum Meeting dated 23 September 2013**

At the invitation of the Chairman, Richard Sumray made some comments on the draft minutes of the recent Sports Advisory Forum meeting.

Places, People and Play
Mr Sumray drew the committee's attention to the issue of the funding position that was affecting refurbishment works on the athletics track and the cricket pavilion upgrade. He noted that the Ponds Project was resulting in a lack of staff resources, impacting on the ability to seek external funding for such works.

British Military Fitness (BMF)
Mr Sumray noted that BMF was keen to engage with wider activities on the Heath, such as the staging of classes at a recent 'Give it a Go' event. He argued that such willingness should be encouraged and put to good effect.

Charging Policy – Athletics and Cricket
Mr Sumray noted that the principles behind the planned charging policy were sound, but that he would be meeting with the Superintendent to discuss the best way to make progress.

Bowls and Croquet – New Lease
Mr Sumray noted that he would be meeting with the Superintendent shortly to discuss the new lease of the Parliament Hill Bowling Green. The Chairman noted that this would take place around 26/27 November.

Changing Facilities – Athletics Track
Mr Sumray stated that the lack of showers at the changing facilities currently on offer at the Parliament Hill athletics track was unacceptable. The Superintendent agreed, and noted the Director had been liaising with the Chamberlain's and City Surveyor's Departments to identify and implement a long term solution. In the meantime he informed the committee that portable showers would be arriving later in the week, on 17 November.

The Director of Open Spaces noted that she had been given an assurance from the Chamberlain that funding for a longer term solution had been identified and at present the timetable was for these funds to be approved in January 2014 and for works to commence in April/May 2014. There remained a possibility that the timetable for works could be brought forward but nevertheless she noted that greater clarity over dates was needed before the committee was briefed further. She confirmed that the short term solution of temporary showers would be kept in place until the works had been carried out.

In response to an observation from Mr Sumray that the problem over the delay in the procurement and installation of portable showers as a temporary solution may be due to centralised decision-making within the City of London Corporation, the Director of Open Spaces replied that new Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) were being developed which would focus on the completion

dates of projects, rather than their start-dates, in order to more accurately measure effective performance.

4. **SUPERINTENDENT'S UPDATE**

The committee agreed to amend the order of business so that the Superintendent's Update would be considered ahead of the Reports of the Superintendent.

RESOLVED: that the Superintendent's Update be moved from Item 5 on the published agenda to Item 4; and that Reports of the Superintendent be moved from Item 4 to Item 5.

St Jude's Day Storm

The Superintendent updated the committee on the impact of the St Jude's Day storm on 28 October. He noted that it had reached the Heath around 0630 and was largely over by 0715, and that the Sandy Heath area had been the worst affected, with some paths still closed as a result. Overall around 50 trees had been snapped or brought down on the Heath, with a further 50-60 trees suffering damage to their crowns. Nevertheless a lot of veteran trees on the Heath had been spared damage, thanks to recent works.

The Superintendent went on to note that Highgate Wood had been particularly affected, potentially due to it being located on higher ground compared to the Heath, with 100 trees damaged. He informed the committee that staff resources would be diverted from the Heath to Highgate Wood to deal with the damage. He noted that staff had been exemplary in their response to the storm, coming in early on the day and working hard to deal with the storm's impact. He concluded by saying that – with the fatality at Kew a year ago arising from a snapped branch – Highgate Wood with its high proportion of damaged trees had remained closed to the public for a few days after the storm whilst assessment and remedial works were carried out.

National Cross-Country Championships

The Superintendent informed the committee that the National Cross-Country Championships would be returning to the Heath in 2015, and that the decision to do so was secured by the Leisure and Events Manager.

Duathlon

The Superintendent noted that the Duathlon held on the Heath in September 2013 had raised over £1,169 for the Lord Mayor's Appeal.

Planning – Garden House

The Superintendent noted that the appeal to the Planning Inspectorate over the Garden House planning decision had been dismissed. At the invitation of the Superintendent, Ian Harrison commented further on the failure of the appeal, noting that it had not been as robust as similar appeals submitted to the Planning Inspector in the past, particularly a recent appeal that had focused on a point of law. He reiterated concerns that the application concerning the Garden House would see the road leading into the Vale of Health regularly obstructed by construction traffic, and that Vale of Health residents had little

faith in the London Borough of Camden's ability to enforce the efficient movement of traffic in the area during the construction period. He concluded by expressing appreciation on behalf of the Vale of Health Society for the City of London Corporation's support in opposing the Garden House application.

Planning – The Water House
The Superintendent updating the committee noted there was no indication of the Camden planning officer's view regarding the revised application for The Water House. The application if approved would see heavy use of Millfield Lane during construction works that from the Corporation's perspective is completely inappropriate.

Planning – Athlone House
The Superintendent noted that a planning application had been received by the London Borough of Camden but not yet formally logged.

Planning – Swain's Lane
In response to a query from Mary Port, the Superintendent indicated that he was aware of the planning proposal in question and that he would be considering its potential impact shortly.

Sports
The Superintendent concluded his update by noting that the London Youth Games and the Cross-Country Championships were upcoming on the Heath.

5. **REPORTS OF THE SUPERINTENDENT OF HAMPSTEAD HEATH :-**

5.1 **Progress Report on Construction of a Stumpery in the woodland walk way - Golders Hill Park**

The Operational Manager updated the committee on the creation of a stumpery within Golders Hill Park, phase one of which had now been completed. He noted that overall the project, that had seen cooperation between Hampstead Heath and Epping Forest staff, had been a success and that a great deal of appreciation for the stumpery had been expressed by members of the public. In response to a question from Colin Gregory, the Operational Manager confirmed that further stumps would be installed as part of a later project phase.

John Hunt expressed his congratulations on the project. He said that it might arguably rivalled its counterpart at Highgrove and that the stream was particularly notable. The Superintendent agreed and updated the committee on the intention to install a pump to allow the stream to flow.

Jeremy Wright informed the committee that the Heath Sub Committee of the Heath and Hampstead Society considered the stumpery to be brilliant.

The Operational Manager noted that the project had been very much led by staff within Golders Hill Park. The committee decided to place on record their appreciation to Sean Dillon and Ciaran O'Keeffe, the two staff in question.

5.2 **Report on maintenance works and future proposals at the Hill Garden & Pergola**

The Operational Manager introduced the report on maintenance works and future proposals at the Hill Garden and Pergola. He highlighted that a decade of repair works had been carried out in cooperation with the City Surveyor's Department and that the photographs appended to the report gave a good impression of what had been achieved. The repair works had also made it possible to give serious consideration to the use of the Pergola as a venue for marriages and civil ceremonies.

The Superintendent provided the committee with further background on the use of the Pergola for marriages and civil ceremonies. He noted that this had been an aspiration in the management plan but had been a relatively low priority. Nevertheless the City of London had been proactively approached by the Superintendent Registrar for Camden who was very supportive of the use of the Pergola for ceremonies. The Superintendent Registrar had confirmed that requirements for toilet facilities and an interview room could be met using adjacent facilities such as the café in Golders Hill Park.

In light of the strong support from Camden for an application to be submitted, the Superintendent noted that the question was now to decide on the appropriate balance between the number of ceremonies conducted, in light of the potential for revenue, versus the wish to ensure the Pergola remained open to the public. He informed the committee that this would be among a range of issues considered in a report that would go to the January 2014 meeting of the committee. He concluded by noting that the Hampstead Heath Business Manager had been on a fact-finding visit to Hylands Park Chelmsford to observe best practice in conducting ceremonies in public open space, and he further underlined the potential for much needed revenue arising from the use of the venue for ceremonies.

In response to a question from Colin Gregory, the Superintendent clarified the likely impact of ceremonies on public access. He noted that ceremonies would be restricted to a particular area of the Pergola and that the wider site would remain open to the public. Furthermore, only ceremonies rather than receptions would be permitted, which would dispense with the need to provide large temporary structures like marquees, and that any smaller structures associated with the ceremonies would be constructed and dismantled within two hours. He took the opportunity also to comment on the likely frequency of ceremonies, noting that the Business Manager's research indicated that two weekly ceremonies and two weekends of ceremonies per month was likely to be the maximum.

In response to remarks from Ian Harrison that a similar proposal put forward by English Heritage for Kenwood House had been poorly thought through and communicated, with little information on costs and projected revenue and predicted impact on public access provided, the Superintendent assured the committee that these issues would be addressed in the January 2014 report.

He noted that, judging from the market, people were prepared to pay for the uniqueness of location for ceremonies. He highlighted the example of the high level walkway at Tower Bridge at which each ceremony provided excellent revenue generation.

In response to questions from Ian Harrison over the potential for receptions to be held in the Spaniards Road side of the Hill Garden, and access for vehicles, the Superintendent replied that the Corporation would exercise caution on permitting receptions to take place, and that vehicular access would not be permitted. Instead attendees would have to make use of the nearby off-site car park at Jack Straw's Castle. It was mooted that brides could use bespoke transport to access the venue, such as carriages.

Richard Sumray noted that he was very supportive of the proposal and emphasised the need for clarity on the issues involved in the January 2014 report.

5.3 **Hampstead Heath's Hedges and Their Management**

The Hampstead Heath Ecologist introduced the report on Hampstead Heath's hedges and their management. She noted that she had surveyed the hedges on the Heath throughout 2012 and part of this process had meant defining what constituted a hedge. Of the definition adopted within the report, over 7km of hedges existed on the Heath, but this rose to 20km if a looser interpretation was applied. She concluded by noting that the landscape of the Heath, including its hedges, had changed significantly during the past century. A ten-year management plan had been drawn up, which was appended to the report.

In response to a comment from Richard Sumray that he found it hard to identify within the report the development of new, and the restoration of existing hedges, the Hampstead Heath Ecologist replied that it was extremely difficult to restore a hedge that had declined. She added that new hedges had been installed on the Heath in the past, particularly around the Bull Path, and that a balance had to be struck in maintaining the natural aspect of the Heath by ensuring the existing landscape was not broken up by inappropriate planting of new hedges.

In response to a question from Colin Gregory, the Hampstead Heath Ecologist replied that the management of hedges was included in the Hampstead Heath work programme and that it complied with existing strategic polices. The Superintendent added that the new Hedges Management Plan could be explicitly linked to policies in future documents.

Colin Gregory took the opportunity to remark on a hedge near the cricket pitch on the Hampstead Heath Extension, noting that its restoration as a narrow hedge would not be welcome due to its location in screening views.

Susan Nettleton thanked the Hampstead Heath Ecologist for her report and remarked that she welcomed the use of native hedge stock.

In response to remarks from John Hunt on the need to manage the buffer zones around hedges as well as the hedges themselves, the Hampstead Heath Ecologist replied that, in keeping with ensuring the natural aspect of the Heath be preserved, intervention in the landscape had to be minimised and a balance had to be struck between actively encouraging and managing visible buffer zones around hedges and focusing on the hedge itself.

In response to a suggestion from Michael Hammerson over highlighting the importance of hedges to the wider public, the Hampstead Heath Information and Communication Officer replied that such information could be included under the Heritage section on the City of London Corporation's website.

5.4 **Hampstead Heath Ponds Project - Preferred Options Report and Non-Statutory Consultation**

The Chairman introduced the report on the Hampstead Heath Ponds Project Preferred Options Report and Non-Statutory Consultation. He noted that the Ponds Project Stakeholder Group (PPSG) existed under the aegis of the Hampstead Heath Consultative Committee and that the PPSG had met on around 20 occasions over the past 12 months, and its members had shown commitment and energy to the task at hand throughout. The PPSG had been given the support and assistance of the Strategic Landscape Architect (SLA) Peter Wilder who had also facilitated a number of PPSG workshops. There now existed two preferred options on each chain of ponds which were detailed within the current report before the committee. He noted that the Corporation was obliged to follow the Institution of Civil Engineers (ICE) guidance on the works required on the Heath dams and that the project costs – over £15m – were not being allocated or spent lightly. He told the committee that the eventual works decided upon would be the minimum required. He concluded by saying the work of the PPSG had been key in informing the project to date, and noted that if works were restricted to the three statutory dams rather than spread across the two pond chains as currently proposed then the resulting impact on the Heath's natural aspect would be greater.

The Superintendent then took the opportunity to address the committee, and welcomed the Assistant Director of Engineering, the Responsible Officer for the safety and integrity of the Hampstead Heath dams. The Superintendent highlighted the core objective of the project, the prevention of the dams breaching as a result of storm events. He noted that a design philosophy had emerged throughout the project process to date. This philosophy was anchored on the need to preserve the natural aspect of the Heath as well as ensuring the safety of people resident downstream from the dams. These two principles meant that the design proposals attracted a range of views from a variety of stakeholders. The Superintendent highlighted the accepted principle that works should be spread across the two pond chains in order to minimise the impact of works. He then went on to summarise some key issues:

Probable Maximum Flood (PMF)
He noted that it was forecast that the PMF would see 38 tonnes of water per second flow over or around the Highgate Number 1 dam, and that this would be

reduced to around 30 tonnes per second under the Preferred Options. He emphasised that the project was anchored on dam preservation, not flood alleviation.

Legal Duty
He recognised that the City of London Corporation (CoL) had a duty to preserve the natural aspect of the Heath in accordance with the Hampstead Heath Act 1871, but this was a qualified duty.

Passive System
He acknowledged that there had been suggestions that, rather than a passive system of dam drainage being installed on the Heath, staff could operate drainage valves to ease pressure on dams in the event of storms. However, the risk to individual staff was unacceptable.

Early Warning
He reported that the Meteorological Office could not commit to providing sufficient early warning of convection storms, the most likely cause of xtreme rainfall events. He also referred to recent guidance from the Environment Agency/DEFRA on risk assessment for Reservoir Safety that stated that is was considered unlikely that in the UK context any effective warning would be given.

Preferred Options
He suggested that the PPSG underestimated the influence it had exercised over the identification of the preferred options. He noted that the two options were very similar in character due to the overarching need to follow industry and statutory guidance. He noted that many of the solutions incorporated into the Preferred Options had come from the PPSG and that they had provided a vital scrutiny function.

Consultation
He noted that the CoL was obliged to carry out works to ensure the dams were not at risk of failure, and failure to do so in a timely fashion would risk the CoL being issued with a s10 notice which would effectively remove the project from CoL control and risk an inappropriate and insensitive solution being implemented. He added that the period of non-statutory consultation would see the CoL asking people what they wanted to see done to the dams. He concluded by saying that the eventual option may be a variant of a Preferred Option.

The Assistant Director of Engineering said that the Superintendent had provided a fair summary of the issues involved. He added that the adoption of early warning would only allow timely evacuation and not ensure the integrity of the dams, which was the issue in question.

The Chairman invited committee members to provide their comments on the report.

Simon Taylor (Hampstead Rugby Club)
He noted that this was only his second committee meeting and therefore did not feel qualified to comment in great detail. He was nevertheless impressed with the level of dialogue carried out by the CoL and the emphasis that has been placed on the preservation of the natural aspect of the Heath.

Ian Harrison (Vale of Health Society)
He noted that despite his recent absence he had remained impressed by the work of the PPSG, and the quality of the paperwork produced by the CoL for this meeting. He felt the project had been heading in the right direction when he was last involved six months ago, and this remained his opinion. He noted that he was unable to comment upon the specific views of the Vale of Health Society but that he would be surprised if they had moved away from the VoHS's historic support. He made some specific comments of his own.

Regarding early warning – he noted that he was formerly employed in the chemical industry and that his experience told him that it was not appropriate or wise to rely on one safeguard alone – such as early warning –given catastrophic events often arose due to a number of related failures of different safeguards. Regarding 'Preferred Option' - he felt it would be more appropriate to refer to the options as 'Proposed' or simply 'Options'. Regarding consultation – he argued that, subject to the risk of a s10 notice, as much time as possible should always be allocated to public consultation, and that the current timeline looked very tight. Furthermore he argued that consultation material should avoid technical language as far as possible to ensure clarity for the general public.

Jeremy Wright (Heath & Hampstead Society)
He noted that the H&HS had submitted around 5 pages of comments on the Preferred Options which included an issue with the use of the word 'preferred', and the suggestion that 'proposed' would be more appropriate. He said that the H&HS agreed that some works need to be carried out and supported the principle of spreading the works over the entirety of the pond chains and increasing the capacity for storage in the central areas of the chains. However, the H&HS cannot support any options that were drawn up on an incorrect interpretation of the law and consequently would damage the natural aspect of the Heath.

The H&HS has issues with the Quantitative Risk Assessment (QRA) used by the CoL. He noted that the QRA states that in the event of dams overtopping during a 1/400,000 year storm, the likely loss of life (LLOL) is currently estimated at 1,100 and at 1,400 in the event of the dams failing, and therefore works would only lead to a residual improvement of 300 in LLOL.

He cited the information provided by Haycock to highlight the experience of the 1975 storm on the Heath, noting that during the storm it had taken 5 minutes for flooding to occur,, The emergency services very quickly received 2,000 calls for assistance from the public. By comparison it is estimated that in the event of a storm it will take six hours for the dams to overtop. Therefore emergency services will be well aware of the issue of flooding, and will be responding to

calls from within the area at risk of flooding well before the dams have overtopped. Therefore, the H&HS does not understand why the CoL is not adopting the principle of Early Warning. He continued by asking if the CoL really believed the content of the QRA. He said that the H&HS had submitted a number of questions on the document with the aim of probing some of the assumptions therein. The recent response that they had received from Atkins did not answer any of these queries. He stated that the H&HS regarded the QRA to be a suspect, factually wrong and misleading document.

He referred to a peer-review by Aecom Engineers which estimated the Bird Sanctuary Dam and the Mixed Bathing Pond dam to be at low risk of failure, and compared this to the completely opposite estimation put forward by Atkins that these dams were at high risk of failure. He said that despite these inconsistencies the CoL had chosen the QRA as the basis for its statement of 1,400 persons being subject to a LLOL in the event of dam failure. He urged the CoL therefore to issue a revised QRA and an acknowledgment, given the 1975 case study, that a storm will provide a natural degree of early warning. He noted that the SLA report was generally accurate. Lastly, he expressed sadness that the consultation will concern two options only.

Richard Sumray (London Council for Sport and Recreation)
He considered the two most significant documents to be the legal position set out jointly by the CoL and the H&HS and the paper outlining the forthcoming information-giving and consultation exercise. He felt that if it was considered to be necessary the judicial review mooted by the H&HS should happen sooner rather than later, given the clear divergence in interpretation of the law, and amount of money already spent by the City Corporation the implications of launching a judicial review once a further round of consultation had taken place. He suggested that further discussion could usefully take place between the H&HS and the CoL to attempt to resolve the difference over legal interpretation. He argued that the H&HS should decide what it wanted to do.

He felt the paper relating to the consultation exercise was well written but problematic. He noted that the process was largely about information-giving, but it was not clear precisely what the public was being asked to consider – if there are only two very similar options, how is the public to make an informed decision? He felt that the term ‘consultation’ was not appropriate as this was not what was really happening. The wording of the material used would be important. and feedback should be given to observations made by the public. Lastly, he said that if the Ponds Project went ahead then the opportunity should be seized to improve the Heath as much as possible as a result.

Chairman
The Chairman allowed Jeremy Wright to comment upon Richard Sumray’s observation regarding the possibility of a judicial review. **Jeremy Wright** remarked that H&HS would need to see the final options being considered for a planning application before it was in a position to decide whether or not to embark upon a judicial review. He concluded by saying that the H&HS would rather avoid mounting a judicial review and therefore if there was the possibility

to discuss the legal position further or for any friendly action to take place to clarify the position then this would be welcomed.

Ellin Stein (Mansfield Conservation Area Advisory Committee/Neighbourhood Association)
She noted she had been a regular attendee of the PPSG and that she was aware the project was a balancing act between varying dam heights, spillways and impact on the Heath. Nevertheless she felt uncertain over whether, informed as she was by the PPSG process, she could make a decision between the Preferred Options. She recognised that the core principle was dam preservation and not flood alleviation. She felt that examples of consultation material she had seen on the Resources for Change website had a patronising tone, and was too simplistic. Material presented should address real concerns, such as disruption posed by construction, and the effect of new dams on runners, anglers, swimmers etc. It should give an idea of the effect of construction traffic. Fundamentally, it should address why the project is necessary. Lastly, she said the consultation needed to have clarity of purpose – was it genuine engagement or simply a tick box exercise?

Xohan Duran (Representative of People with Disabilities)
He felt that the consultation should fully inform the public, and why the CoL feels it is necessary to spend £15m. He agreed that it should detail the disruption posed by construction, in terms of traffic and the alteration of the landscape. He argued that the end-result should comply with the statutory duty to preserve the natural aspect of the Heath. Lastly, he hoped that a s10 notice could be avoided.

John Hunt (South End Green Residents Association)
He felt that the public was faced with a common sense versus legal issue conflict. They are faced with two different, well informed legal opinions. Moreover, the number of variables in the project makes it almost impossible to make an informed choice between the options. He voiced admiration for the detailed critique provided by the H&HS. He concluded by saying that the South End Green Association (SEGA) were primarily interested in the lower chain of ponds and therefore did not welcome an increase in the height of Hampstead No. 1 and 2 dams.

Susan Nettleton (Heath Hands)
She felt that it was a shame that such fundamental differences remain this far into the project process and that ideally these needed to be resolved. She felt that the public consultation should make it clear the project was about the prevention of dam failure. In terms of project presentation and communication she welcomed the aerial plans but observed that the proposed spillways needed to be included in these, and that similarly a new path near the Boating Pond was not depicted. She noted that no detailed plans existed showing the impact of the spillways despite their significant extent, and that they should be depicted on the plans. Lastly she said that pictorial material of views should depict the dams up close rather than viewed from a distance.

Colin Gregory (Hampstead Garden Suburb Residents' Association)
He agreed with the issues identified regarding consultation by previous speakers. He was keen to know what the actual question under consideration would be, and emphasised that the process should provide information and invite views. He put forward the example of the construction of the Parliament Hill Staff Yard – none of the original options put forward were considered acceptable after consultation and so a brand new option was put forward. He used the example of consultation over the A1/North Circular – overall the majority of respondents were in favour of none of the proposals, and yet a proposal with only a small percentage of support was chosen simply so the project could proceed. He warned that the CoL risked a credibility issue if it took such an approach. He said that the CoL should make it clear why it had adopted its chosen position. He welcomed the site plans within the agenda pack, and observed that the legal paper focused on the Reservoirs Act 1975 and did not include any analysis of common law liability. He felt that it was key to canvass the views of the contractor that would be carrying out the works.

The Superintendent replied that it was the CoL's intention to bring the contractor in early to allow them to gain an understanding of the phasing of the project and the wider issues involved.

Mary Port (Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Advisory Committee)
She agreed that the legal issue remained a problem. She felt that the technical nature of much of the information would be hard to communicate to the public, and that much of the information failed to reflect how local people related to the Heath –dog walkers, runners etc. were concerned over natural aspect, not safety of dams. She agreed with the decision to focus storage on the centre of the chains of ponds. She felt that many of the diagrams were too technical, and that more explanation was needed over the nature of the spillways, including visual material.

Michael Hammerson (Highgate Society)
He felt that there was no consensus in the PPSG given it represented such a multiplicity of views. He remarked that some of the works proposed did not seem very well conceived and could be interpreted as 'window dressing' – particularly around the Bird Sanctuary dam. He felt that the large size of the spillways – 30-40m – needed to be demonstrated. He felt that the issue was boiling down to whether the work proposed was really necessary or if it was simply a legal issue. He argued the consultation process should aim to convince public why the CoL was willing to spend £15m, and it should avoid giving the impression that the two options were immutable. Visuals of how the Heath would look should be provided, and a description of what the construction process would involve. The CoL needed to get across that the Heath was not going to be developed and would recover over time. He warned that awareness of the project amongst the public at large was minimal – even among regular dog walkers on the Heath.

The Chairman thanked the committee and noted that these comments would be reported to the Hampstead Heath, Highgate Wood and Queen's Park Committee on 25 November 2013.

The Superintendent took the opportunity to make some comments:

QRA
In light of the criticism from the H&HS, he said that the document was not a design tool but something intended to assess impact, and it was usually produced in the civil engineering industry to identify the best outcome for a project.

Options
He argued both sets of options were very similar. .. He agreed that visualisation of the spillways needed to be improved. He said that the information-giving exercise was exactly that – information giving, and that an open ended question would be included to allow the public to comment as widely as possible. The information would set out the project process to date and make clear why the CoL was doing what it was doing. He concluded by saying that the CoL had produced reams of information, none of which provided an alternative to the options in question.

The Chairman emphasised that all comments would be going to the Hampstead Heath, Highgate Wood and Queen's Park Committee on 25 November 2013, and that the contractor would be engaged as soon as possible to allow early contractor involvement in the design process.

6. **QUESTIONS**
There were no questions.

7. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**
There was no other business.

8. **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**
The next meeting will be held on Monday 20 January 2014 at 1900hrs in the Education Centre, Parliament Hill Fields, Hampstead Heath, NW5 1QR.

The meeting ended at 9.15 pm

Chairman

Contact Officer: Alistair MacLellan
alistair.maclellan@cityoflondon.gov.uk