

HAMPSTEAD HEATH CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE Monday, 7 April 2014

Minutes of the meeting of the Hampstead Heath Consultative Committee held at Parliament Hill Conference Room, Parliament Hill Staff Yard, Parliament Hill Fields, Hampstead Heath, NW5 1QR on Monday, 7 April 2014 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)
Dr Gaye Henson (Marylebone Birdwatching Society)
John Hunt (South End Green Association)
Nigel Ley (Open Spaces Society)
Susan Nettleton (Heath Hands)
Helen Payne (Friends of Kenwood)
Susan Rose (Highgate Conservation Area Advisory Committee)
Ellin Stein (Mansfield Conservation Area Advisory Committee/Neighbourhood Association)
Richard Sumray (London Council of Sport and Recreation)
David Walton (Representative of Clubs using facilities on the Heath)
John Weston (Hampstead Conservation Area Advisory Committee)
Jeremy Wright (Heath & Hampstead Society)

Officers:

Alistair MacLellan	- Town Clerk's Department
Sue Ireland	- Director of Open Spaces
Bob Warnock	- Superintendent of Hampstead Heath
Declan Gallagher	- Operational Services Manager, Hampstead Heath
Richard Gentry	- Constabulary and Queen's Park Manager
Jonathan Meares	- Conservation and Trees Manager
Paul Monaghan	- City Surveyor's Department
Richard Litherland	- City Surveyor's Department
Katherine Radusin	- Open Spaces Department
Esther Sumner	- Open Spaces Department

In Attendance:

Steve Evison	- Resources for Change
Nick Bradfield	- Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Advisory Committee
Stewart Purvis	- Vale of Health Society

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Mary Port and Simon Taylor. It was noted that Mary Port would be represented by Nick Bradfield.

2. **DECLARATIONS BY MEMBERS UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THE AGENDA**

There were no declarations.

3. **MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 20 January 2014 were approved as a correct record subject to the legislation being described as of 'secondary significance' (item 4), Ian Hammerson being corrected to Ian Harrison, where appropriate, 'size of new property' amended to 'size of new property, if any' (item 5.4) and the model farm being attributed to the former Caen Wood Towers (now Athlone House) rather than Kenwood House (item 5.4).

Matters Arising

London Borough of Camden Flood Warning Letter

The Chairman noted that this had been circulated to the Committee.

Hill Garden & Pergola

The Chairman noted that a report on proposals for marriages and civil ceremonies at this venue would now come to the June meeting of the Committee.

Ponds Project Correspondence

In response to a question from Ian Harrison, the Chairman stated that the City of London would be happy to make the correspondence between the City and the Heath and Hampstead Society between December 2013 – March 2014 public, subject to the agreement of the Society.

Planning – Athlone House

Susan Rose noted that an application to list Athlone House had now been submitted.

Storms

The Chairman noted that issues arising from winter storms would be dealt with under item 5.3.

Graffiti – Hill Garden Shelter

The Superintendent noted that the City Surveyor's Department would be inspecting the shelter at the end of April 2014 and would discuss the composition of the render with English Heritage.

Dog Control Orders (DCOs)

The Chairman noted that this issue would likely be submitted to the November 2014 meeting of the Committee. The Director of Open Spaces noted that the Epping Forest & Commons Committee had recently decided to proceed with

statutory consultation on implementation of DCOs at Burnham Beeches. Meanwhile the Anti-Social Behaviour Bill was progressing through the House of Lords and the measures arising from Parliament would be considered by the Open Spaces and City Gardens Committee, likely in June 2014. It was expected that Dog Control Orders would continue for a further 18 months before requiring to be converted into new Anti-Social Behaviour Orders.

The Good, The Bad, The Ugly

The Chairman noted this would be dealt with under item 5.7.

Parliament Hill Athletics Track Charges 2014/15

In response to a question from Richard Sumray on behalf of Simon Taylor, the Chairman confirmed that the Hampstead Heath, Highgate Wood and Queen's Park Committee had agreed to freeze the 2014/15 season ticket charges at 2013/14 level as a gesture of goodwill.

3.1 Hampstead Heath Sports Advisory Forum Minutes

The Committee received the minutes of the meeting of the Hampstead Heath Sports Advisory Forum held on 27 January 2014.

The Chairman noted that a report on the 2013 fatality in the Ladies' Pond would be submitted to the Forum before being reported to the Committee.

3.2 Additional Work Programme Bids - 2015/16

The Committee agreed to consider item 5.8 ahead of other reports to allow for the City Surveyor to depart the meeting early. It was therefore considered as item 3.2.

The City Surveyor introduced a report on proposed bids for the Additional Work Programme 2015/16 (AWP). He noted that these were cyclical works and recent examples included renovations to the tennis courts at Parliament Hill and renovations to the Parliament Hill Changing Rooms. He added that there were plans to renovate the shelter in the Hill Garden, and that planned works to the Belvedere in the Hill Garden had been delayed following the discovery of nesting bats.

He went on to clarify that the proposed bids for 2015/16 had not yet been approved, and represented an ideal list of works that had varying levels of priority. Proposed works included work on the paddling pool and more work to the Parliament Hill Athletics Track. He concluded by noting that the City Surveyor's Department worked closely with Hampstead Heath staff in drawing up planned works. He stressed that whilst works were cyclical in character, improvement works could be incorporated into the planned programme. Lastly he noted that all projects were drawn from the overall 20-year maintenance plan for the Heath.

Colin Gregory noted that it was difficult to respond to the request to comment on the proposed bids, given the bids before the Committee did not have any indication of their relative priority. For example, the Committee were not sure which of the 2014/15 projects would be proceeding. Moreover, it was difficult to gauge whether the £100k bid for works to the Pergola represented

the minimum needed to bring it up to standard, or if more monies were required to do so. The City Surveyor replied that any projects that were not accepted in each annual bid could be deferred to the following year, and that the Pergola would be the subject of a dedicated report that would be coming before the Committee. The Chairman added that feedback on the sums secured could be reported to the Committee.

In response to a question from Richard Sumray regarding what represented an ideal amount to be secured for 2015/16, the City Surveyor replied that the cyclical nature of the works meant that the ideal sum varied from year to year and that low priority projects could, as noted previously, be deferred until a following year.

In response to a question from John Hunt regarding the possibility of works associated with the Hampstead Heath Ponds Project being extended to include buildings associated with the Men's and Mixed Bathing Ponds, the City Surveyor replied that the City of London would not want the buildings to deteriorate, and therefore he would be consulting with the Superintendent on the issue.

In response to a comment from John Hunt that the paddling pool had been the subject of works a couple of years previously, the City Surveyor replied that this had indeed been the case but that the surface of the pool was now cracking and therefore it was proposed to install a rubberised surface to make the pool surface more resilient.

In response to a question from Gaye Henson regarding which ponds were subject to the £50k bid for dredging, the City Surveyor replied that this was for ponds outwith the scope of the Ponds Project.

In response to a request from Ian Harrison, the City Surveyor agreed that future AWP bid reports would include a map. The Superintendent concluded the item by noting that overall the bids represented good news for the Heath – the bids represented a three-year funding cycle and therefore any monies not spent could be carried over into future years.

The City Surveyor left at this point of the meeting.

4. SUPERINTENDENT'S UPDATE Hampstead Heath Ponds Project

The Superintendent noted that the Partnering Contract between the City Corporation, Atkins, Capita and BAM Nuttall Ltd had been signed on 14 March 2014. BAM Nuttall had based their operations in the City of London's Kenwood Yard, and ground investigations had commenced on 24 March. The locations and dates the ground investigations are being carried out are mapped on the City of London's website. BAM had given a presentation to the Ponds Project Stakeholder Group (PPSG) on 24 March. Ground investigation work had been completed on the Ladies' Pond and the Stock Pond, and work had commenced on the Boating Pond. Trial pits would commence on 14 April, and surveys of bird nesting were being carried out to assess likely impact. Locations for bore holes had been changed and in some cases cancelled based upon the likely impact. Seminars would be conducted for the PPSG on 13 April and 10 May, with the 13 April seminar focusing on the upper chains of ponds.

Planning – Water House

The Superintendent noted that a review of the basement impact assessment had been carried out and submitted to Camden, and that the developer had been requested to respond to the assessment's conclusions before the documents are placed on the website.

Planning – Archway Tower

The Superintendent noted that he had met with the developer, Essential Living, to discuss the proposed conversion of Archway Tower from office to residential use. Proposals included the profile of the building to be set back, and aerials to be removed. The application would be considered by the Islington Planning Committee on 23 April, and the City of London had asked to be consulted on the eventual palette used for the façade of the building.

Planning – Athlone House

The Superintendent noted that the applicant had not responded to concerns raised with them regarding the likely impact of their proposals.

Planning – Garden House

The Superintendent noted that there was no further update from the January meeting of the Committee.

Planning – Swains Lane

The Superintendent noted that the City of London was objecting to the proposed scheme on grounds of its inconsistency with national planning policy guidelines and its lack of suitability to the character of the surrounding location.

Property - Parliament Hill Athletics Track

The works to replace the boilers and showers was progressing according to the programme. The Superintendent noted that he had liaised with the Highgate Harriers to secure electricity supply for their 10 April event. He expressed his appreciation for the club's co-operation whilst the works were progressing.

Lido

The Superintendent noted that the 14 February storm had caused a collapse of 25m of perimeter walling and works to remedy this were still progressing and forecast to continue for the time being. Thought was therefore being put into ensuring there would be additional space for users of the Lido on the sun terraces during the summer. He added that anti-climb paint would be applied to the hoarding surrounding the works.

Pergola Belvedere

The Superintendent, as per item 3.2, confirmed that an inspection would take place on the Belvedere on 21 April.

National Grid

The Superintendent noted that gas leaks had continued to be a problem during January-March 2014. Nevertheless the football pitches had now been restored and restoration works to the Education Centre Secret Garden were due to commence. The costs of the works would be charged to the National Grid.

Southern Counties Cross-Country Championships – 25 January 2014

The Superintendent reported that the cross-country championships held in January had been a great success and that the course was recovering well, due in part to a dry March. The Conservation Team had fenced areas of the course off to assist in the natural recovery of damaged areas. It was expected that the National Championships would take place on the Heath in 2015.

Hampstead Heath Diary 2014/15

The Superintendent noted that the new diary would be available from 14 April.

World War One Centenary

The Superintendent noted that a field of poppies would be planted in Golders Hill Park to mark the centenary of the Great War.

Christmas Tree Sales – East Heath Car Park

The Superintendent noted that a proposal had been received for the sale of Christmas trees on East Heath Car Park during the festive season and this was currently under consideration. A report would be submitted to the Committee in due course.

Hampstead Heath Constabulary Dogs

The Superintendent reported that one of four Constabulary Police Dogs has failed the Home Office Licence and has consequently been re-homed. Working with Constabulary and Queens Park Manager he has launched an informal consultation proposing a restructure of the Constabulary. The proposed structure comprises 2 Sergeants, 2 Constable/Dog Handlers and 8 Constables. This retains the Constabulary at 12 Officers but reduces the number of Constable/Dog Handlers to 2.

In response to a query from Richard Sumray over why a restructure was being considered, the Superintendent replied that it was felt that the Constabulary could operate effectively with two dogs rather than four. A reduction in the number of dogs would remove the issue of having to backfill a Constable's role whilst on the annual 16-day refresher training for dog handling.

In response to concerns that, given the Constabulary operated on a two-shift rota, there would be no dogs on patrol on the Heath for significant periods of time, the Superintendent replied that the deployment of dogs could be planned based on experience and knowledge of particular times of day when dog patrols would be most effective.

In response to a comment by Jeremy Wright that the Constabulary used to have six dogs to call upon if needed, the Superintendent replied that the reduction to two dogs was a proposal and that he was currently consulting staff on their professional views to establish if a reduction in the dog team was feasible.

Parliament Hill School – Partial Demolition

In response to a question from Susan Rose, the Superintendent confirmed he was aware of proposals to partially demolish Parliament Hill School and that

these were being monitored to assess how these proposals would affect the Heath.

Pitt Arch Sign

In response to a query from Helen Payne, the Conservation and Trees Manager confirmed he would investigate the issue of the Pitt Arch sign and report back to the Committee.

5. REPORTS FOR CONSIDERATION:-

5.1 Resources for Change - Ponds Project Consultation Results

Steve Evison of Resources for Change introduced the report on the recent Ponds Project Information Giving and Non-Statutory Consultation Exercise, noting the exercise's two key elements of sharing information to raise awareness of the project alongside consulting members of the public on their preferred option for the dams.

Mr Evison noted that overall the achievements of the exercise had been comprehensive, with 4,000 persons having been contacted face-to-face on the Heath, and a further 800 persons contacted face-to-face at off-site stands such as that at Hampstead tube station. A further readership of 120,000 persons had been reached through local media and information cards had been delivered to 79,000 households. Furthermore, stakeholders had been proactively contacted by email and a series of guided walks had been offered on the Heath itself.

Commenting on the information stands in particular, he noted that substantive face-to-face comments were more common at the stand located on the Heath itself, rather than those located off-site due to the fact persons at tube stations tended to prefer collecting hardcopy information rather than stopping to express an opinion. He added that for the number of persons that had been made aware of the project, the number of consultation responses received was relatively low. He noted that it was important to keep in mind that those with strong negative opinions were arguably more likely to express an opinion, with a significant number of persons who lacked a strong opinion or felt that the issue had been dealt with through the design process to date being less likely to engage with the consultation.

He continued by noting that a reasonable number of persons were totally opposed to the project, and based their opposition on legal, engineering and data-quality grounds. Some persons suggested alternative design solutions, e.g. concentrating works at either higher or lower ends of the pond chains; or that Thames Water improve sewage systems south of the Heath to cope with excess water in the event of a flood event. Some persons argued that better emergency response procedures be implemented, rather than improved dams.

Mr Evison continued by outlining further themes that had emerged from the consultation responses. These included the broad preference for natural design solutions over 'hard-engineering', but that paths should be properly surfaced to ensure they were safe to walk on in the event of poor weather. Some concerns had been expressed over health and safety for the public – both adults and children – in the event of major works being carried out. Some respondents had focused on the need to preserve existing views on the Heath as much as possible – both 'short' (in close proximity to new dams) and 'long'

(wider vistas from points overlooking new dams). Some respondents had commented on the potential the project offered to improve and enhance the environment of the Heath for wildlife, particularly around the Model Boating Pond.

He added that not many consultation responses had been option-specific, but that some comments had expressed a general liking for the improvement of the Model Boating Pond on the Highgate Chain, including the creation of an artificial island. Responses for the Hampstead Chain had been even less option-specific, except for some requests for more information on the Catchpit. There was some appetite for alternative engineering designs, and for the information-flow around the project to continue. He concluded by noting that the exercise had been particularly notable for the number of people who had been given an awareness of the Ponds Project.

The Superintendent noted that the information received through the information sharing and consultation process was very important and that it would assist Atkins in reaching a Preferred Design Solution.

The Committee proceeded to discuss the report, with the following points being made:

- Ellin Stein commented that the non-option-specific bias in consultation responses was probably due to poor visual information on the various options being provided. She added that the images provided needed to be clearer.
- Richard Sumray agreed that the exercise had been useful in terms of information sharing, and that he was not surprised on the lack of option-specific feedback, given the alternative options were quite narrow. He added that it was important that it was communicated clearly how the feedback received had helped inform the Preferred Design.
- Susan Nettleton agreed, noting that the consultation responses received seemed to be balanced and that feedback on how these informed the project was important.
- Colin Gregory said he welcomed the information sharing aspect of the exercise. He expressed disappointment that the report did not discuss how alternative themes could be considered – it gave the impression that the exercise was simply ‘tick-box’ in its approach.
- The Chairman suggested that there should be a mechanism to provide feedback on the opinions raised.
- Ian Harrison suggested that the City of London identify the main themes expressed in the consultation responses and respond to these on its website, and think of ways in which to communicate this feedback to the wider general public.
- In response to a query from Susan Rose regarding the timetable of the project from here on, the City Surveyor replied that the consultation feedback would be incorporated into the report on the Preferred Solution currently being drafted by Atkins.
- In response to a query from John Hunt over the term ‘non-statutory consultation’, the Ponds Project and Management Support Officer replied that this was intended to ensure the process was distinct from statutory consultation that took place during processes such as planning

applications. The Director of Open Spaces confirmed that it was to make clear there was no legal requirement for the consultation to take place.

- Richard Sumray suggested that the local media be used to communicate feedback to the public.
- The Ponds Project and Management Support Officer commented that improved images would be provided to the PPSG, and that whilst the project timetable from here on was indeed tight, Atkins had been provided with the consultation results as soon as they had been drafted and therefore work was well underway to incorporate the comments into the Preferred Design. Thanks were due to the staff who had manned the consultation stands during the consultation period.
- Michael Hammerson commented that it was important to make clear in any feedback that the opportunity to comment further on the project would come in the statutory planning consultation phase.

Steve Evison left at this point of the meeting.

5.2 STEM and Policy Education Programme - Policy Initiatives Fund Application

The Committee discussed a report of the Director of Open Spaces regarding a STEM and Policy Education Programme.

Richard Sumray noted that he was supportive of the idea and felt that it was excellent, no matter what one's personal opinion of the Ponds Project might be. John Hunt agreed, and suggested that the programme perhaps include a theme on conflict resolution. Jeremy Wright concurred and suggested that the Institution of Civil Engineers (ICE) be contacted to see if they wished to contribute to the programme in some way. The Ponds Project and Management Support Officer agreed and noted that the City of London was pursuing in-house contacts with the ICE.

Jeremy Wright noted that, if the programme proceeded, both sides of the argument should be presented fairly and equally to the children in question. Michael Hammerson noted that the ecological and archaeological impact of the project on the Heath should also feature in the programme. Richard Sumray suggested that young people also be asked to contribute to the development of the education programme.

In response to a question from Gaye Henson, the Ponds Project and Management Support Officer replied that the City of London was not aware of any peer examples of such a project. In response to a further question from Susan Nettleton, she confirmed that the schools immediately adjacent to the Heath would be among those contacted regarding the programme.

5.3 Tree Management Update Report

The Conservation and Trees Manager introduced a report on Tree Management during 2013. He outlined issues dealt with in the report, including evaluation of tree and woodland resources, the arboricultural skills resource across the North London Open Spaces, the growing threat of tree disease and impact on workload, recent storm damage and extreme weather events, and the impact of the Ponds Project on adjacent trees.

Colin Gregory welcomed the report and paid tribute to the dedication, skills and expertise of the Tree Team, and further welcomed the fact that succession planning was being carried out to ensure these skills were kept. He posed two questions regarding the difference between the iTree software package versus the Capital Asset Value for Amenity Trees (CAVAT) package; and over what thought was being put into replacement trees in the event of severe tree loss due to disease.

In response the Conservation and Trees Manager replied that replacement planting of elm had been conducted over the past few years to counter the effect of Dutch Elm Disease, and that a replacement programme of Wild Service Trees was also being implemented, mainly around hedgerows. Regarding planning for the event of a major outbreak of tree disease, he noted that current advice in the event of an outbreak of Ash Dieback was to leave trees in situ to avoid spreading the disease further by removing them.

He added that the iTree and CAVAT systems were distinct but complimentary – whilst the iTree system had been developed in the USA, CAVAT was a system designed by the London Tree Officers Association to secure political awareness of the value of trees. They would therefore likely be used in conjunction with one another.

In response to a comment from Jeremy Wright regarding the replacement of trees with species more likely to cope with climate change, the Conservation and Trees Manager replied that this was an issue that was being considered. Jeremy Wright expressed his appreciation for the work of the Tree Team and the hope that their expertise would be maintained.

Michael Hammerson noted that it was important to raise public awareness of the work of the team to ensure the public appreciated the importance of trees and the work that was required to maintain their place in public open spaces. The Chairman replied that reports such as the one under consideration were available online, and that the Tree Team would be the subject of his forthcoming column in the *Ham&High*. The Director added that the City of London had sponsored a conference in early 2013 on the management of tree disease in London and would be funding a small exhibit raising awareness of Oak Processionary Moth at the Chelsea Flower Show in May 2014.

In response to a request from Ian Harrison, the Conservation and Trees Manager agreed to define what constituted a ‘tree incident’ in a future report. Ian Harrison expressed his appreciation for the report overall and noted that should a tree be lost, a ‘like for like’ replacement should not be the default option – instead more thought should be put into what would benefit the landscape overall.

5.4 Partnership Management of Bowling Green at Parliament Hill Fields

The Committee discussed a report of the Superintendent of Hampstead Heath. In response to a comment from Jeremy Wright that he had seen no evidence of effort by the Bowling Club to increase their membership despite this being a requirement set out in the agreement, the Operational Services Manager replied that the club were actively recruiting. Ian Harrison agreed, noting that both the Bowls and the Croquet Clubs were taking their obligations seriously.

He expressed his appreciation for the support of the City of London in helping secure the partnership management of the Bowling Green.

Nick Bradfield noted that the parking arrangements on page 163 should be amended to Monday to Friday between 10.00am-12.00pm.

The Chairman thanked Richard Sumray for his role in helping secure the partnership management plan.

5.5 Review of the Hampstead Heath Constabulary 2013

The Constabulary and Queen's Park Manager introduced a report of the Superintendent of Hampstead Heath on the work of the Constabulary during 2013.

In response to a question from Richard Sumray, he confirmed that individuals caught attempting to carry knives on the Heath and attempting to access facilities such as the Lido would have the weapon confiscated before being excluded.

In response to concerns expressed by John Weston regarding the potential reduction in police dogs, the Superintendent reiterated that deployment of dogs would be based on data and experience of trouble spots.

In response to a query from Jeremy Wright, the Constabulary and Queen's Park Manager said that poor dog control on the Heath was often due to individual dogs rather than groups of dogs being exercised by commercial dog walkers.

In response to a query from Colin Gregory over what the proposed action plan for dog control would involve, the Constabulary and Queen's Park Manager replied that it would seek to improve engagement with dog walkers and commercial dog walkers. For example the Constabulary were aware around 30-40 commercial dog walkers used the Heath and therefore it would be useful to engage with them and work with them to ensure the Heath was used responsibly.

In response to a query from John Hunt, the Superintendent replied that the City of London was investigating whether to license commercial dog walkers.

In response to a question from Susan Rose, the Constabulary and Queen's Park Manager replied that the increase in reported dog incidents was due to improved reporting processes.

In response to a question from Michael Hammerson, the Constabulary and Queen's Park Manager replied that metal detecting was not a problem on the Heath.

5.6 Update on Hampstead Heath - Public Sex Environment Outreach Work 2013

The Constabulary and Queen's Park Manager introduced a report of the Superintendent of Hampstead Heath on public sex environment (PSE) outreach work carried out during 2013.

In response to a question from Colin Gregory, he replied that litter remained a problem but that it was often concentrated in specific areas that, in liaison with frontline staff, could be cleared quickly. The Superintendent replied

that there was an associated issue of drug abuse which he has asked the Terrence Higgins Trust to help address within their outreach programme.

In response to a question from Jeremy Wright, the Constabulary and Queen's Park Manager replied that there had been some increase in the geographic area of the PSE, but no increase in the number of persons involved.

Helen Payne commented that she often walked her dog each morning across the area in question and that there had been a noticeable increase in litter in recent years, and therefore she wished to express her thanks to the efficient litter-pickers.

The Constabulary and Queen's Park Manager endorsed the excellent work being done by the small and dedicated team responsible for this area, and the Committee went on to endorse the continuation of the partnership work with the Terrence Higgins Trust during 2014.

5.7 Proposal for the Temporary Installation of The Good, The Bad and The Ugly at Parliament Hill Fields

The Chairman introduced a report of the Superintendent of Hampstead Heath regarding the temporary installation of artwork at Parliament Hill Fields.

Ellin Stein commented that, whilst she had liked the Writer and the Visitor, this proposal was poor by comparison and that Jake and Dinos Chapman had run out of creative steam a long time ago.

John Hunt felt that it was a fantastic proposal but expressed concern that the location would affect neighbouring trees. The Operational Services Manager replied that it would not, and that the location had been selected in liaison with the Hampstead Heath Ecologist.

Colin Gregory noted that he was in favour of the proposal.

Jeremy Wright reported that the proposal had been discussed at great length by the Heath & Hampstead Society (HHS). He noted that the HHS was supportive of appropriate artwork on the Heath in the right place and for the right period of time. In considering if the proposal was artistically appropriate, the HHS was of the majority view that it was ugly and not child-friendly. It would be more suited to the more municipal surroundings of Golders Hill Park. Its proposed location on Parliament Hill Fields was on the cusp of where the more municipal part of the Heath gave way to its natural aspect, and that it would be better sited on the southern slopes, nearer the athletic track. Moreover, a one year installation was unacceptable and a six-month installation would be more appropriate.

Susan Nettleton noted that people had managed to climb over the 9-metre tall Writer, and therefore were likely to climb over the much smaller proposal under consideration. The metal looked sharp and dangerous.

Helen Payne commented that the pieces would be vulnerable to graffiti. Jeremy Wright agreed, noting that the pieces were corten steel, which is designed to rust evenly. This would make cleaning graffiti incredibly difficult.

The Operational Services Manager commented that the installation would require the use of a crane, hence the decision to avoid Golders Hill Park where access would be difficult. The reason for the cusp location on Parliament Hill Fields was at the request of the artists, who wanted the pieces to be displayed in a semi-rural location – moreover the Hampstead Heath Consultative Committee had agreed to the use of the location in question in

principle, at one of its past meetings. In their current location, adjacent to the Gherkin, they have been barriered off, but this was to stop shortcutting not for safety reasons. Susan Nettleton commented that it was more likely teenagers would attempt to climb them rather than young children.

5.8 **Education and Play Activities on Hampstead Heath**

The Superintendent of Hampstead Heath introduced a report on education and play activities on the Heath. In response to a question from John Hunt he confirmed that Wild About Hampstead Heath remained a partnership project led by the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds.

Richard Sumray commented that, in keeping with many of the reports before the committee, it would be useful if the information they contained be communicated more widely to the general public.

Jeremy Wright expressed his congratulations to the Hampstead Heath Education Service for the quality of their work.

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 2 June 2014 in the Parliament Hill Conference Room, Parliament Hill Fields, Hampstead Heath, NW5 1QR at 7.00pm.

The meeting ended at 9.15 pm

Chairman

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

This page is intentionally left blank