



**Ponds Project Stakeholder Group**  
**Sunday 13 April 2014, 10am**  
**Parliament Hill meeting room**

**Present:**

Karen Beare	KB	Fitzroy Park RA (Acting Chair)
Jeremy Simons	JLS	City of London elected member (Deputy Chair)
Nick Bradfield	NB	Dartmouth Park CAAC
Lynda Cook	LC	Heath & Hampstead Society
John Dollar	JD	Highgate Men's Pond Association
Michael Hammerson	MH	Highgate Society
Ian Harrison	IH	Vale of Health Society
Neil Goulding	NG	Environment Manager, BAM Nuttall
Muriel Mitcheson	MM	West Hill Court RA
Ed Reynolds	ER	Oak Village RA
Bob Warnock	BW	Superintendent of Hampstead Heath
Armorer Wason	AW	West Hill Court RA
Peter Wilder	PW	Strategic Landscape Architect
Jennifer Wood	JW	Communication Officer, City of London (notes)

**Alternate members observing**

Harley Atkinson	HA	Fitzroy Park RA
Armorer Wason	AW	West Hill Court RA

**Officers observing:**

Philip Everett	PE	Project Board Director, City of London
Declan Gallagher	DG	Operations Service Manager, Hampstead Heath
Paul Monaghan	PM	Assistant Director of Engineering, City of London
Peter Snowdon	PS	Project Consultant, City of London
Esther Sumner	ES	Ponds Project and Management Support Officer

**Presenters:**

Ben Jones	BJ	Engineer, Atkins
Neil Manthorpe	NM	Landscape Architect, Atkins
Ian Morrissey	IM	Aquatic Ecologist, Atkins

**Apologies**

Prem Holdaway, Tom Brent, Mary Port, Rachel Douglas, Susan Rose, Harriet King, Janis Hardiman  
Jane Shallice, Rachel Douglas, Virginia Rounding

**Approval of note of previous meeting**

- KB – have any amendments been made to previous note?
- JW – yes LC asked for her whole statement from PW's brief to be added in and MH asked for some clarification on points he made on archeology.
- LC – can notes be sent out not blind copy so members of group can have discussion?
- JW – City have advised that due to data protection groups should not be emailed except using blind copy.
- IH – can an exception be made if all members of group give express permission?

- BW – we will check on this and update the group.

### **Introduction by PW**

- PW introduced the day and went through the agenda.
- LC – Is it correct that hydrology and flood modeling are not going to be discussed today or on 10 May or on 19 May?
- PW – that is correct – discussion is now moving forward to the topics the PPSG can influence.

### **Design Overview**

- BJ, NM and IM gave a presentation on design overview and the environmental masterplan of each of the upper ponds.

Questions asked and points raised:

- JLS – can Mixed Pond causeway be raised by 1 meter with loss of only one tree?
- BJ – we are working on this and will have more information at the next Seminar dealing with the lower ponds.

### **Vale of Health**

- IH- there are only a few routes into the Vale of Health and track along the top of the dam has been used by emergency vehicles in the past and should remain an emergency access route.
- LC – when will PPSG get to see engineering drawings?
- PM – they should be available for the next seminar – 10 May.
- NB – will there be a dip in the path over the spillway?
- BJ – yes, there will be a 1 in 12 slope. Spillway will be reinforced with inca mat. The location of the spillway has been chosen to avoid the Giant Sequoia.
- KB – what is the category of tree that is to be removed?
- NM – category B.
- LC - how wide is the spillway?
- BJ - 5m at base and 12m at top
- IH – what is depth of spillway?
- BJ – 10cm.
- IH – this is a major access route onto Heath and anything that impedes this will not be welcome.
- NM – spillway can be raised in different ways and we want to get views – it could be a kerb or the entire path could be raise.
- KB – are you looking to raise the crest by 0.25m or by 0.5m?
- BJ – crest restoration to 0.5m – but this can be 0.25m raise and 0.25m kerb.
- IH – how far does this need to be finally decide before planning?
- BJ – there will be further opportunities when in detailed design phase (after planning).
- LC – will Atkins accept comments at future dates.
- BJ – yes.
- KB – further details will be discussed at walk on site.

### **Viaduct**

- Spillway will be 4m wide at base and there will be no tree removal. Pond will be de-silted to remediate water quality problems.
- LC – how long does it take to de-silt?
- IM – it is proposed that a suction technique be used which is less invasive. It will take around 3-4 days.
- MH – what are the implications for vehicle movements?
- NG – silt can be removed in a 6 inch pipe so no need for vehicle movements. A vehicle will be required to bring pump in.
- IH – will whole pond be de-silted?

- IM – yes. At top corner, silt will be re-used to create planting.
- IH – important to retain open water, particularly north of Viaduct Bridge.
- PW – notice wood piles on map. These should be located away from ponds and paths.
- IM – yes – this is a good way to reuse material and creates good places for invertebrates to live.
- KB – what is happening with the sheet-piling?
- IM – the sheet piling is clad with timber but some of that has eroded – so we intend to repair this cladding.
- BW – this has historically been a fishing pond but due to poor water quality and low fish stock it has not been used recently. We may want to put pegs out into the ponds to take the anglers off the path.

### **Catchpit**

- LC – how will it be accessed during construction?
- BJ – there will be routes from both sides. Hope to win fill from the sports pitch so most of the access will be required here.
- LC – how many trees will have to be removed?
- NM – approximately 60 however the location has been decided to avoid the veteran and important trees. Most removed here are category C.
- ER – note says it has been curved to avoid tree loss but it does not look curved.
- BJ – there is a very slight curve to avoid an important tree – can't see it very clearly on plans.
- KB – contours need to be more clear on plans.

### **Stock Pond**

- LC – how many trees lost here?
- NM – total at risk is 22. These are located in or adjacent to the spillway but working with BAM Nuttall to try and reduce this number.
- MM – where there is a big area of ground affected which has no public access, what about the impact to small animals?
- NM – we have an ecologist on site who will be working up a plan to mitigate any impact to animals and all wildlife.
- KB – how many significant trees?
- NM – they are all category B.
- KB – we need to be clear how the sight lines into Ladies Pond will be affected by tree removal in this area.
- NM – we will look at this on site.
- PW – an aerator is mentioned on this plan – is this necessary? Will noise be disturbing?
- IM – we have chosen the quietest aerator and it possibly will not be required all of the time – just good to have it as an option.
- KB – it is one of the quietest spots on the Heath.
- LC – agree it is the most tranquil spot on Heath.
- MH – there may also be visual intrusion from equipment in the pond.
- IM – there is the possibility of having mobile aerators which can be brought in when needed.

### **Kenwood Ladies Bathing Pond**

- LC – is the existing building outline marked on the proposed map?
- BJ – apologies this is a mistake it should say 'proposed'
- MM – path currently gets very wet – could a causeway help here?
- BJ – there is currently a leak which adds to this problem. It will hopefully be fixed after the work has taken place.

### **Bird Sanctuary**

- LC – how will the channel be dredged and how long will this take?
- IM – it will be cut using a small mechanical excavator – which should take between 1 and 2 days.
- IH – will channel stay open and not just silt up?
- IM – it will silt up eventually but with management it should be fine.
- LC – any tree loss here?
- NM – none.
- IH – contour lines need to be clearer.

### **Walk on Site**

The following points were made during the site walk to the upper ponds:

#### **Vale of Health**

- Can spillway not be more diagonal, rather than curved, and still avoid all of the significant trees? Under current proposals it would seem there needs to be more excavation.
- Route must still be able to be used for emergency access to Vale of Health
- Vale of Health Society would support the replacement of current fencing
- 0.25m raising and 0.25m kerb (which could be hidden by vegetation) generally supported.
- Path needs to be made of material which can withstand vehicles but not tarmac.

#### **Viaduct**

- Potential to have four fishing pegs.
- Group happy with proposal to repair cladding with similar timber.
- IH & LC not happy with encouraging fishing on pond.
- Group generally happy with mis-matched fencing as it is although IH said fence at top left is visually intrusive.
- Current path surface gets very muddy – could it be a self-draining path.
- AW raised the point about proposed walls at Highgate No. 1 and Men's Bathing Pond being made of a similar red brick to that of Viaduct Bridge.
- IH said the new pond margins should not encroach too far into the pond so that expanse of water is lost.

#### **Catchpit**

- Group happy that no fencing should be used here.
- At bottom of Catchpit, pipe will discharge water which could make areas muddy (as it is now) – would a boardwalk be appropriate here? There was some debate whether a boardwalk here would encourage more people to use this path, which might not be popular with Mixed bathers. Group agreed to see how it goes and this decision could come later.
- AW asked about longevity of Hybrid Black Poplar. Jonathon Mears thinks it could last another 40 years.

#### **Stock Pond**

- Group agreed tress loss at Stock Pond will have no impact to Ladies Pond as there are more trees further down creating an effective screen.
- LC wanted more details on which exact trees would be affected.
- Group agreed fencing should remain the same and keeps dogs out of the water.
- Tarmac path to be retained as this is an important vehicular access route from Kenwood Yard.
- Stock Pond will be de-silted.

### **Ladies Bathing Pond**

- Consultation with representatives from Ladies Bathing Pond taking place.
- 12 trees at risk at this pond.

### **Bird Sanctuary**

- No spillway here. Minimum intervention.
- Scrapes to the west of pond to be added – these provide good habitat and reduce silt entering the pond from the stream entering the pond from the west
- NB – could Bird Sanctuary be extended to stop people cutting through and making path extremely muddy – path inaccessible without welly boots.
- AW – some people like this route.

### **7. Next Meetings**

- Saturday 10 May (seminar)
- Monday 19 May
- KB – can people let JW know of attendance.
- Seminar will follow same format as today - 10am until 4pm.