




The Heath & Hampstead Society

NEWSLETTER

May 2006

Vol 37 No. 2



St. Stephen's saved

The Heath and Hampstead Society

Address: PO BOX 38214, London NW3 1XD. Tel 020 7813 1396
website: www.heathandhampsteadsociety.org.uk

Committee and Officers Reg. Charity No. 261782

Life President Peggy Jay JP
1a Gayton Crescent NW3 1TT. 7435 3192

President Lord Hoffmann

Vice President Martin Humphery
32 Willoughby Rd NW3 1UR.
Tel: 7435 5386 Fax 7431 6272
martin@humphery.fsnet.co.uk

*Representative on the Keats House
Consultative Committee and Hampstead
Conservation Area Advisory Committee*

Vice President Helen Marcus
38 Glenilla Rd NW3 4AN. Tel 7722 1414
helenmarcus@britishlibrary.net

Chairman Tony Hillier
36 Downshire Hill NW3 1NU 7435 6136
tony@hilliers.net

Vice-Chairman Tony Ghilchik
6 Morland Close NW11 7JG 8458 3039
tony@ghilchik.demon.co.uk

Vice-Chairman Gordon Maclean
12b Daleham Gardens NW3 5DA 7431
2975 gordon@gmaclean.wanadoo.co.uk

Hon. Secretary Janine Griffis
14 Denning Road NW3 1SU
7435 2962 grifkohl@aol.com

Hon. Treasurer John Smithard
23a Buckland Crescent NW3 5DH.
7722 9512

Frankie de Freitas 32 Maresfield Gdns
NW3 5SX 7435 0502 ffran32@dircon.co.uk

Jo Konrad 13c Wedderburn Road NW3
5QS 7435 0289 jo.konrad@btinternet.com

Peter Tausig 11 Downshire Hill NW3 1NR
7435 7099 peter_tausig@hotmail.com

Michael Welbank 1 The Porticos
53-55 Belsize Avenue NW3 4BN
7431 6789 mwelbank@aol.com

Jeremy Wright 17 Croftdown Rd NW5 1EL
7485 7903 wright@britishlibrary.net

Patrons

Lady Hopkins
Gerald Isaaman OBE
Sir Simon Jenkins
Bill Oddie
Sir John Tusa
Christopher Wade

Heath Sub-Committee

Chairman Tony Ghilchik
*Representative on City of London Heath
Management & Keats House
Management Committees;
E.H.Kenwood Landscape Forum*

David Dunbar 8455 9612
Michael Hammerson 8341 1437
Janis Hardiman 7435 2472
John Hunt 01604 846 705
Marc Hutchinson 7090 3063
Thomas Radice 8455 1025
Peter Tausig 7435 7099

*Representative on Heath Hands
Executive Committee*

Michael Welbank 7431 6789
Sir Charles Willink 8340 3996
Jeremy Wright 7485 7903

*Representative on City of London Heath
Consultative Committee;*

Adviser: Rupert Sheldrake

Town Sub-Committee

Chairman Gordon Maclean
Maureen Clark-Darby 7435 5841
Ann Eastman 7794 0355
David Evans 7431 6455
Ed Fordham 07974 950 512
Frank Harding 7435 3728
Jeska Harrington 07771 895892
Martin Humphery 7435 5386
Bruce Kohler 7431 2587
Jo Konrad 7435 0289
Janet Langdon 7624 3857
Margaret Rodgers 7435 8460
Juliette Sonabend 7794 9415
Mervyn Warren 7431 4821
John Weston 7209 4737

Legal adviser: David Altaras

Archivist Mark Collins

Auditors: Fisher Phillips and Co,
Chartered Accountants

Founded in 1897

Contents

	Page
Chairman's Report	1
<i>Tony Hillier</i>	
The AGM	3
Elections to the Committee	4
Treasurer's Report	5
<i>John Smithard</i>	
Society Accounts 2005	6
Independent Examiner's Report .8	
Judicial Review-the Garden House 9	
<i>Martin Humphery</i>	
Society News	10
Heath Report	11
<i>Tony Ghilchik</i>	
Town Report	13
<i>Gordon Maclean</i>	
Open Letter	14
Tree Policy Group	15
<i>Bruce Kohler</i>	
From our Archives: Kenwood 16	
Traffic and Parking	17
A hidden treasure at Kenwood 18	
Proms at St. Jude's	20
<i>Thomas Radice</i>	
LSPs	23
<i>Helen Marcus</i>	
Bulletin Board and Walks . .25,26	
<i>Editor: Helen Marcus</i>	
<i>Editorial Team: John Smithard, Frankie de Freitas</i>	
<i>Original Design: Sydney King</i>	
<i>Printed by Hillary Press, Hendon</i>	

Chairman's Report

by Tony Hillier

The Society has been as busy as ever in our efforts to protect Hampstead and the Heath from harm. The threat of harm usually has as its source some commercial interest, which in our opinion will unduly damage residents' and visitors' enjoyment of our wonderful environment.

We normally have to put our case before some tribunal, panel or committee of one of the authorities with the power to decide on these matters. What struck me in preparing this report to members is how often recently we find ourselves challenging proposals, which are driven by what we see as the unreasonably narrow monetary interests of those very authorities. The task is made harder when they seek to justify themselves by translating their perceived budgetary constraints into "policy". Recent examples concern English Heritage, the Metropolitan Police Authority (MPA) and Camden.

Keeping Watch on Officialdom

English Heritage have applied through their commercial partner IMG to increase the number of concerts and the permitted sound levels (virtually double for 15 minute periods) for their Kenwood concerts this summer.

Unfortunately we have not found English Heritage amenable to reasonable compromise on previous occasions. We understand the pressure they are under, due to central government cuts to their budget, to try to make large sums of money from Kenwood, but some of these initiatives (large marquees for private parties for example) have been singularly lacking in sensitivity. Now yet again we have the battle of the summer concerts. We have written to Camden as the licensing authority to object to what we consider to be a proposed unreasonable increase in noise from jazz

concerts, disturbing other Heath users on summer evenings. It's the noise level, not the concerts we object to.

The long saga of what will happen to the police station continues. We believe it would not be in the commercial interests of the property section of the MPA to look for another site in Hampstead, without first investigating in some depth the possible joint development of No. 261/2 Rosslyn Hill on the basis of competitive tender. They start from a policy decision that most of London's police stations should be re-located. We believe and hope that the police authorities will come round to our recommended approach, which we have put to them in some detail. They have promised the opportunity for consultation with local interests, as soon as they have formulated a plan, and before any final decisions are made.

I mentioned in my last report that we have formed a tree policy group to scrutinise Camden. Our experts have concluded that four of the five trees recently cut down in Fitzjohn's Avenue need not have been felled and that a non-intrusive ultrasound diagnostic inspection, using a technique used by some authorities, but not yet by Camden, could have revealed this. We are pleased at least that we have an informed and constructive dialogue on this sensitive topic under way with Camden and, in fairness to them, it is not just insurance premiums which drive them. There are crucial issue of public safety to consider as well. Bruce Kohler reports on page 15.

Keeping Watch on Pub Owners

Over the past year we have faced a lot of pressure on our environment from the drink trade to generate more cash by extending licensed hours for late night opening in

Chairman's report (cont)

Hampstead. A measure of the success we have had in putting our case to so many of Camden's Licensing Panels is that a number of the noisier and more troublesome premises appear to have given up and are now up for sale, in one case for change of use to offices.

Possible Litigation

Public protest and representations to authority, if the case is well argued, frequently suffice. Frustratingly, there are some crucial cases where this tactic has only limited effect. The Society has now for the first time taken advice on going for judicial review, a hazardous and expensive undertaking. We will not risk your funds, unless we are able to insure against adverse costs affordably, which is itself a good test of whether we have a reasonable chance of winning. Some decisions by our planning authority Camden, however, are just so bad (see letter from Camden Civic Society page 14) that we feel our constitution and *raison d'être* give us no choice but to challenge them. That is why we have applied to proceed against Camden for ignoring its own policy and all legal precedent in granting the owners permission to rebuild Garden House on a substantially increased scale on Metropolitan Open Land in the Vale of Health. Martin Humphery gives more detail on page 9.

Improving the Scene

I am very pleased to report that the hard work of Catherine Boyd and her many helpers has nearly reached the fund-raising target of a little over £13,000 to complete the re-equipment of the Vale of Health playground, over and above the £7500 given by the City of London and the Society from our reserves. I should like to thank and congratulate all members who have given so generously of their time and money for this cause. We hope that the Tracy Chevalier lunch

for members on May 2 will finally get us there. A brief official opening is scheduled for July 1 (see flyer). Peggy Jay will be there. We would encourage as many members as possible to come along to express all our appreciation of Peggy's immense work for the community

The *Seen From the Street* team will be in action again shortly. Nominations for special front gardens should be sent to Christine Winterburgh (see flyer) by June 16 and final judging will take place in the second week of July. This year we have decided to give out the prizes, which are generously sponsored by Capital Gardens, when members are back from holiday in September

Annual General Meeting

This year's AGM will take place at 7pm on Tuesday June 20. We have changed the venue back to Rosslyn Chapel on Rosslyn Hill, finding the cost and facilities at the Town Hall are no longer to our liking. (We understand, incidentally, that the Friends of Hampstead Town Hall and some other resident charities are concerned that current management practices do not reflect the full range of activities which was promised when the restoration took place a few years ago.)

I am delighted to report that one of our distinguished Patrons, Sir John Tusa, has accepted our invitation to be guest speaker at the AGM.

Stop Press Kenwood concerts

Following the hearing at Camden IMG are limited to 8 concerts (with 3 concert free weekends) and audiences of 8000. The noise level will be allowed to go up slightly to 52 Laeq (or dB(A))



Annual General Meeting 2006



The Annual General Meeting

will take place on

Tuesday 20 June 2006 at 7.00 pm,

at Rosslyn Hill Chapel

Rosslyn Hill, NW3

Agenda

1. Minutes of the Annual General Meeting held on 20 June 2005.
2. Election of President.
3. Chairman's report.
4. Accounts and Treasurer's report.
5. Election of Auditors.
6. Subscriptions for 2005-6. It is proposed that the annual subscription should remain unaltered for 2006.
7. Committee reports
 - (i) Heath: Tony Ghilchik.
 - (ii) Town: Gordon Maclean.
8. Election of Officers and Members of the General Committee.
(See notice on page 4)
9. Any other business.

Guest speaker

Sir John Tusa

Wine and light refreshments after the meeting

Elections to the General Committee 2006

Officers

The following are candidates for election having been duly proposed and seconded.

President: Lord Hoffmann

Vice Presidents: Martin Humphery
Helen Marcus

Chairman: Tony Hillier

Vice Chairmen Tony Ghilchik
Gordon Maclean

Hon Treasurer: John Smithard

Hon Secretary: Maureen Clark-Darby

**Representative on the City of London
Hampstead Heath Management Committee:**
Tony Ghilchik

**Representative on the City of London
Hampstead Heath Consultative Committee:**
Jeremy Wright

General Committee Members

Frankie de Freitas, Jo Konrad, Peter Tausig, Michael Welbank and Jeremy Wright continue the terms for which they were elected.

Janine Griffis having served as Honorary Secretary of the Society now offers herself for election to the General Committee having been duly proposed and seconded.

Maureen Clark-Darby, having served as a member of the Town Sub-Committee now offers herself for election as Honorary Secretary of the Society

Nigel Steward offers himself member of the General Committee having been duly proposed and seconded.

Note to members: Any other nominations for election as officers or committee members should be notified to the Hon Secretary in writing not later than 1 June.

Janine Griffis
Honorary Secretary

Notes on the candidates for election to the General Committee

Maureen Clark-Darby

Maureen Clark-Darby is a freelance consultant in accounting and financial IT systems to a range of clients from charities to multinationals. She has been a resident of Hampstead since 1999 and has played an active role in local amenity work, especially in support of residents' interests around South End Green, where many issues including the local transport terminals and licensing have kept her busy. She has been a member of the Society since 2003 and a member of the Town Sub-Committee since 2005, during which time she has acted as Secretary to the Society's very successful Licensing Group.

Nigel Steward

Retired Solicitor, living in Hampstead since 1978. Member of the Society for many years. Chair of the Hampstead Town Ward Safer Neighbourhood Panel, and on the Board of the Camden Community & Police Consultative Group. Committee Member of the Friends of the Heath Library and CPLUG. Former Member of the Hampstead Conservation Area Advisory Committee. Involved with Voluntary Sector work in Camden through the Community Empowerment Network. Former Treasurer of a NSPCC Area Committee.

Treasurer's report for 2005

by John Smithard

The accounts for 2005 show a satisfactory excess of income over expenditure. This was mainly due to an increase in subscriptions and a further instalment of a most generous legacy. A major item of income and expenditure was the implementation of the Carlingford Road/Rudall Crescent lighting scheme, for which funds were raised by local residents. A number of special events were held which raised funds for local organisations and the Society. The increased amount of activities and events meant an increase in secretarial expenses, despite the substantial contribution of volunteers. Inevitably there was a rise in Newsletter expenses, due to increased costs of paper and printing.

The Society's reserves are currently substantial, but these will be reduced this year and in 2007, as contributions will be made to a number of projects, such as the refurbishment of the Parish Church railings and the Peggy Jay playground on the Heath. Expenses will also be incurred in seeking professional advice on licensing applications, felling of suspected dangerous trees, etc.

Thanks to our auditors

It remains for me to thank Mr Neville Pollard, Mr Vic Demetriou and Mr Robert Ward of Fisher Phillips for carrying out the independent examination of the accounts.

Notes on statements as at 31 December 2005

1. Analysis of reserves

	Kate Springett Legacy	Lighting Fund	Total Designated Funds	General Funds	TOTAL RESERVES
Balance at 1 January 2005	29,385		29,385	57,858	87,243
Receivable during year		9,680	9,680	42,067	51,747
Notional interest	1,311		1,311	(1,311)	-
Expended in year	(1,224)	(11,512)	(12,736)	(24,036)	(36,772)
Transfer deficit to general fund		1,832	1,832	(1,832)	-
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	29,472	-	29,472	72,746	102,218
Add: increase in unrealised gains on investments				484	484
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Balance at 31 December 2005	29,472	-	29,472	73,230	102,702

The Kate Springett legacy fund is for the protection of wild bird life on Hampstead Heath

The Heath & Hampstead Society accounts for 2005

Receipts and Payments Account for the Year ended 31st December 2005

	2005	2004
Receipts	£	£
Subscriptions	15,095	12,889
Donations and legacies	17,551	12,073
Donations (Heath Walks)	166	208
Special events	4,618	4,099
Dividends & interest	4,474	3,398
Publications	163	149
Designated Income		
Lighting	9,680	
Total Income	51,747	32,816
Expenditure		
Secretarial & membership expenses	5,681	4,227
Heath expenses	75	2,563
Town expenses	2,329	10
Newsletter expenses	6,461	5,915
Special events & meeting expenses	5,326	7,273
Grants and donations	2,889	4,066
Subscriptions	460	490
Hampstead Card	814	881
Designated Expenditure:		
Lighting	11,512	
Springett Memorial Fund	1,224	904
Total Expenditure	36,772	26,329
Excess / (Deficit) of Income over Expenditure	14,975	6,487

Statement of assets and liabilities at 31st December 2005

	2005		2004
	£		£
Assets			
Investments			
300 M&G Charifund Income Units (valuation as at 31 December)	4,157		3,673
COIF Charities Deposit Account	97,453		81,156
	<u>101,610</u>		<u>84,829</u>
Current Assets			
Current Account	1,850	4,012	
Sundry debtors	176	320	4,332
	<u>2,026</u>	<u>4,332</u>	
Total Assets	<u>103,636</u>		<u>89,161</u>
Current Liabilities			
Deferred subscriptions received relating to next period	934		1,918
	<u>934</u>		<u>1,918</u>
Net Assets	<u>102,702</u>		<u>87,243</u>
Financed by			
Reserves at 1 January 2005	87,243		80,300
Surplus for the year	14,975		6,487
	<u>102,218</u>		<u>86,787</u>
Add: increase (reduction) in unrealised gain on investments	484		456
	<u>102,702</u>		<u>87,243</u>
Note 1			
Tony Hillier <i>Chairman</i>			
John Smithard <i>Treasurer</i>			
12 April 2006			

Independent Examiner's Report

Independent Examiner's Report to the Trustees of the Heath & Hampstead Society

We report on the accounts of the Trust for the year ended 31 December 2005 which are set out on pages 5, 6 & 7.

Respective responsibilities of trustees and examiner

The charity's trustees are responsible for the preparation of the accounts. The charity's trustees consider that an audit is not required this year (under section 43(2) of the Charities Act 1993 (the 1993 Act) and that an independent examination is needed .

It is our responsibility to:

- examine the accounts (under section 43(3)(a) of the 1993 Act):
- to follow the procedures laid down in the General Directions given by the Charity Commissioners (under section 43(7)(b) of the 1993 Act); and
- to state whether particular matters have come to our attention.

Basis of independent examiner's report

Our examination was carried out in accordance with the General Directions given by the Charity Commissioners. An examination includes a review of the accounting records kept by the charity and a comparison of the accounts presented with those records. It also includes consideration of any unusual items or disclosures in the accounts and seeking explanations from you as trustees concerning any such matters. The procedures undertaken do not provide all the evidence that would be required in an audit and consequently we do not express an opinion on the view given by these accounts.

Independent examiner's statement

In connection with our examination, no matter has come to our attention:

- 1) which gives us reasonable cause to believe that in any material respect the requirements
 - to keep accounting records in accordance with section 41 of the 1993 Act; and
 - to prepare accounts which accord with the accounting records and comply with the accounting requirements of the 1993 Acthave not been met: or
- 2) to which, in our opinion, attention should be drawn in order to enable a proper understanding of the accounts to be reached.

*Fisher Phillips
Chartered Accountants
Summit House, 170 Finchley Road,
London NW3 6BP*

12 April 2006



Judicial Review - the Garden House

by Martin Humphery

As we go to press we are awaiting Leave to Proceed from the High Court for an application we have made for Judicial Review of a decision by the Camden planning committee to give permission for a large replacement house on the banks of the Vale of Health pond.

This is the first time we have been driven to such a major and expensive course of action, but we feel confident that our members will support this important step in protecting the fringes of the Heath and the integrity of Metropolitan Open Land.

It has long been a scandal that there is no way in which individual citizens, or their representative groups, can challenge a grant of planning permission, except by this difficult and expensive route. In trying to protect our common heritage from indiscriminate development, we are pitted against Camden, who are using our money, and a developer who stands to make huge profits. After all, we are merely seeking a decision by the court as to whether Camden's decision is lawful. We believe it's not, but, in any event, we seek no monetary compensation, just clarification of the law. That we should have to spend serious sums of money to achieve a decision in the public interest seems quite unjust.

Parts of the Vale of Health and other important green areas in the borough are classified as Metropolitan Open Land and enjoy, by law, the same protection as Green Belt Land in rural areas. The Garden House stands on such an

important site, part of the fringes of the Heath, and overlooks the beautiful Vale of Health pond.

In January Camden's Development Control Committee agreed to grant planning permission to the owners, allowing the demolition of the present unassuming house and its replacement by a modern building of about four times its size. The regulations governing Metropolitan Open Land require that such a replacement should not be "materially larger" than the original building.

Since we considered that this development would seriously harm the appearance of this quiet corner of the Hampstead Conservation Area, we mounted a deputation to the committee meeting. Despite our well-founded objections, the committee granted permission and it is this decision which we are now engaged in challenging in the High Court. We are supported by the Hampstead Conservation Area Advisory Committee, the City of London and the Vale of Health Society.

Provided that we receive the go-ahead to progress to a full hearing, we will be looking for financial support from our members and other interested parties before going further. We have received encouraging assurances of support from several quarters.

Your committee considers that this is a "watershed" moment in our century-long fight to preserve the Heath and its surroundings from inappropriate development and we look for your support.



Society News

Committee changes - thankyou's, farewells and other matters

Ann Eastman

A member of the Society for many years, Ann first became actively involved with committee work during 2001. She was particularly keen to help increase membership, bring in more young people and generally raise the public profile of the Society and, with her flair and imagination, she has succeeded brilliantly.

Her idea of starting the Hampstead Card was an inspired one, and out of that success she developed a whole programme of events, in collaboration with Jo Konrad, which has added enormously to what we can offer members.

Ann also brought her editorial skills to bear on Society publications. She produced our new membership leaflet and oversaw the design and production of the recent *Heath Vision* publication.

Ann now wishes to devote more time to her other great passion of painting. Although she is stepping down as a Town Sub-Committee member, we are delighted that we will not lose contact with her as she has kindly agreed to continue to look after the Hampstead Card scheme for the time being.

Nota Bene:

Change to Heath Walks

You will see from the programme of our monthly walks listed at the end of this newsletter that two of them have had to be swapped. Edward Milner is not able to lead his walk as planned, so Charles Willink has agreed to bring his walk on 'Plants of the Heath' forward to 2nd July and you will have to wait until 3rd September for Edward's 'Spider Foray'.

Janine Griffis

A graduate in history from Princetown University, Janine settled here in 1986 and has put her remarkable energy and skill to the service of the community. In addition to her role as Honorary Secretary of the Society since 2001, she has also been active with local schools, her local residents association, and with the Hampstead police/community liaison group.

With a background as a publicist and press secretary, she galvanised the Society's records, setting up a computerised database which has been of immense help in all aspects of the Society's work.

She also initiated the regular Society Christmas Parties, organising them with superb efficiency and flair, so that they have become a star social event in our calendar. We are delighted that she will remain on the General Committee.

Your e-mail addresses

It really is useful to be able to consult you on certain issues by e-mail. We can keep you informed of important matters when they happen and committee members don't feel quite so on our own in making difficult or controversial decisions. About 25% of you have given us your email addresses - so, please let us have a few hundred more. Contact us through our website:
www.heathandhampsteadsociety.org.uk

Arranging social events

We would like to ensure that Ann Eastman's work continues by setting up a small group to continue to arrange attractive events for members. If anyone is interested to be involved with this do get in touch.

Heath Report

by Tony Ghilchik

As we come out of a cold dry winter to the start of a hosepipe ban, it is not just our gardens which are likely to be suffering in a month or two, but the trees on the Heath – especially the veterans where the old oaks can drop whole limbs in order to conserve moisture. In spite of the early April showers, the ponds are lower and the ground dryer than normal for this time of year. There is little we can do in the short term, but we do need to be planning for climate change.

City name change

Work has started on the City of London's new Management Plan (note their new name: at the start of the year the Corporation of London was re-branded the City of London Corporation and the old 'Corporation of London' name on literature, signs etc. will slowly give way to 'City of London' as items come up for replacement/ renewal.).

Management issues

The Heath Vision booklet which we produced two years ago (sent out with the May 2004 Newsletter) gave our thoughts on how to deal with the various pressures and conservation issues for the benefit of everyone who cares about the Heath, and set out the more detailed policies we champion. This booklet was developed from our earlier input into the Corporation's very first Management Plan and, we believe, covers much of what is needed to set the long term aims of the Management Plan. As part of our input into the development of this new Plan, members of the Heath Sub-Committee have looked again at the main areas of the Heath and expanded on the specific conservation management issues described in 'Heath Vision'. As we said in that booklet:

"Hampstead Heath is a unique relic of London's former countryside. The Heath is particularly

varied as it not only straddles the Hampstead-Highgate ridge of Bagshot Sand, known as London's 'Northern Heights', but also passes across a stratum of Claygate Beds as it descends on to London Clay. Each type of sub-soil has produced its own ecology and many springs arise where water, after draining through the sand, hits the clay. The area thus provides a special combination of varied landscape and wildlife close to the centre of London.

"The stretch of countryside surviving within one of the largest urban areas of the world, a *rus in urbe*, provides quiet enjoyment and contact with nature. The Society regards that as the essential purpose of the Heath, a concept far removed from that of an urban park."

The geology of the Heath is the key to how it has developed over the centuries and a good understanding of how water flows through it is essential to conservation management. For the new Management Plan the City has commissioned a comprehensive hydrology study for the Heath. The complexity of the study becomes apparent when you realise that there are four water catchments in our small area – with water flowing down through the valley of the Highgate Ponds; through the valley of the Hampstead Ponds; westwards through the West Heath and Golders Hill Park, and northwards through the Seven Sisters Ponds on the Heath Extension. When the study is complete, we look forward to it showing how more water can be retained on the Heath (even at the expense of more of those boggy areas), and it being developed into a full hydrology plan.

Vale of Health Children's Playground

We have been delighted with the response to our appeal for funds to refurbish the Vale of Health Children's play area and name it in honour of

Heath Report (cont)

Peggy Jay, our Life President. We are close enough to the target for the equipment to be ordered and an official opening scheduled for 11am on July 1st. Work is also about to start on the far larger Parliament Hill Children's play area.

Kenwood

Over in Kenwood, the work to strengthen the dam between the Wood Pond and the Thousand Pound Pond is nearing completion. Great care has been taken to keep to the original line of the dam and the result is a credit to all involved – it will look even better when the marginal plants along the side of the dam start to grow.

We are far less pleased with the proposals for this year's concerts. Last year we had great hopes that the new sound system would succeed in cutting out the sound spilling outside the concert arena. Although the theory was impressive the result was disappointing and IMG, who organise the concerts, admit that 'most events had periods when the levels were very close to the limit, and sometimes above the limit whilst still adversely affecting the music noise levels for the audience'. To our minds this is the final proof that Kenwood is not a suitable site for highly amplified concerts.

The grounds of Kenwood are a magnificent setting for concerts, but any amplification must not be to a level which causes the sound to overflow the concert site and cause a public nuisance to those who do not wish to attend the concert, be they local residents or summer evening walkers on the Heath.

Last year eight of the eleven concerts exceeded the maximum sound level set by Camden. Their ruling, which aimed to be a compromise between the wishes of those residents who sought complete tranquillity and the concert

promoters, was that the music noise level at any noise sensitive premises should not exceed background noise level by more than 12dB over any ten minute period. We had hoped that the IMG response this year would have been to arrange concerts in a way which fits calmly into the magnificent surroundings of Kenwood House, grounds and lakes. Instead, they are seeking to increase the sound level for the concerts by getting permission for two things. Firstly to bring the stage and its associated speakers forward on to a pontoon on the lake itself, and secondly for a doubling of the maximum permitted sound level at surrounding noise sensitive premises.

We have objected to the application and asked that the licence be granted only for a stage erected on the pond bank and with the same maximum sound level as set for 2005.

Springett Lecture

This October will see the 11th of our annual Springett Lectures. It will be on Thursday 12 October, at Burgh House, with Cindy Blaney talking on 'Finding and monitoring bats in Hampstead and Highgate'. Cindy is North London's premier bat specialist and is part of the City of London's team in Highgate Wood. She is also leading a walk 'Bats about Hampstead' as part of the Hampstead & Highgate Festival so, if you want to see the bats as well as hear about them, phone 0870 033 2733 to book for her walk. (It's on 17th May, starting from Hampstead Heath Station, South End Road, at 9pm. The walk costs £6 and is in association with the Bat Conservation Trust.) The numbers for the walk are limited so, whether or not you are lucky enough to get on that, make a diary note for Burgh House on the 11th October.



Town Report

by Gordon Maclean

Much of the Town Subcommittee's time during the past three months has been spent on Planning matters, notably on the disturbing affair of the Garden House in the Vale of Health.

The Garden House

This proposal, for a large and conspicuous house replacing a smaller unobtrusive one, on the edge of the Pond in the Vale of Health, was granted Planning Permission by Camden by 6 votes to 5 in Committee, the members appearing to vote on party lines. Needless to say, we objected very strongly, as did the Conservation Area Advisory Committee, the City Corporation, the Vale of Health Society, and many individual residents.

The site is in Metropolitan Open Land, on the Heath itself, and we saw this as a direct threat and challenge to the integrity of the Heath and to the several vital Planning policies, both Camden's and National, that are supposed to protect it.

We were both astounded and profoundly disturbed by the Committee's decision. It was clear that this was an issue of far-reaching importance, carrying implications of precedents for other Heath sites.

Our decision, to take the rare and potentially expensive step of calling for a Judicial Review on the matter, was therefore almost inevitable.

We had to defend one of the fundamental principles on which the Society was founded.

Martin Humphery (who has done much of the work on this), writes elsewhere on how the matter has been progressed.

Parking Enforcement

This is a subject close to the hearts (and pockets) of many members, and when Camden

issued a consultation document on this last month we knew this was something on which many of you would want to express an opinion. As usual, time was short, and we had to distil the questions down to the vital minimum, before putting them to you by e-mail.

The questions were; Are Camden's parking enforcement policies a) too harsh, b) too lenient, or c) about right; with particular emphasis on clamping and vehicle removal. We thought that you might go for a) and drafted a response accordingly, and asked for your views.

The response was encouraging - 72 replies from about 500 enquiries. 60 supported our draft wholly (some vehemently), 3 supported some of it, 8 thought Camden was about right, and one thought them too lenient. We took this as a pretty conclusive vote, and Camden now know our views. Can we expect changes?....

This exercise indicated to us, incidentally, that we don't have nearly enough of your e-mail addresses; about 25% of you only. It really is useful to be able to consult you on such issues; committee members don't feel quite so out on our own in making difficult or controversial decisions. So, please let us have a few hundred more: contact us through our website: www.heathandhampsteadsociety.org.uk

Trees

The Fitzjohns Avenue trees have gone. The stumps have been inspected by our new Tree Group and an expert arboriculturist. See Bruce Kohler's article.

Street Name Signs

We now have a task force looking at the condition of our distinctive tiled street signs. Several have suffered damage and need repair.



Town Report (cont)

Other places might benefit from new tiled signs to replace later designs. We have established a promising dialogue with the Camden department dealing with street furniture and hope for some progress here. New signs are expensive, and Camden may not be willing to pay for replacements, and it may be that local street associations or groups would be called upon to raise funds if there is enough interest.

FLASK WALK NW3

Other issues

We continue our involvement in a number of other matters of current interest: the future of the Rosslyn Hill Police Station; badly-needed repairs to the Tollhouse in Spaniards Road; Tesco and their Heath Street shopfront and loading obstructions; the continuing work on monitoring and opposing public house and bar licence applications; contributing to various committees and discussions on such topics as school run traffic, the South End Green renovations, road safety, the Royal Free Hospital etc.

Protest about Camden's planning procedures

an Open Letter to Camden Council from Camden Civic Society

Before the May elections Camden Civic Society sent an Open Letter to the Leaders of the main political parties in Camden spelling out the widespread concern in the community about the current operation of Camden's planning processes.

They asked the leaders of the main political parties to examine critically how they can improve this aspect of the Council's work that impinges most closely on so many of its citizens, often with lasting effect.

They asked that:

there should be a programme of continuing planning education for residents and potential developers, Conservation Area Advisory Committees (CAACs), and the press;

the Development Control Sub-Committee should be more user-friendly, in particular that members of the public can actually hear what is being said;

all planning applications delegated to Officers should be discussed in public, with the latter having the right of audience;

the process should ensure that developers understand the dangers of permitting a development to diverge from the terms of the permission;

there should be better notification to 'neighbours' of all planning applications;

the decision not to publish details of applications in the local newspapers should be reconsidered.

Finally they declared their support for the request of the Heath and Hampstead and the Highgate Societies for Camden 's planning processes, especially in Conservation Areas, to be the subject of a comprehensive Scrutiny Panel Review.

Tree Policy Group

by Bruce Kohler

In response to increased concern among Society members about various issues involving street trees in Hampstead and Highgate, the Town Sub-Committee has set up a Tree Policy Group (the TPG), whose members include myself, (as chairman), Gordon Maclean representing the Belsize Residents Association, Michael Hammerson for the Highgate Society and Jo Konrad and Jeremy Wright for the Heath & Hampstead Society. Initially the TPG is focusing on Camden's policies and practices in the areas of (a) street tree maintenance and decay control and (b) resident claims of subsidence damage from street trees.



Late last year Camden posted ten-day felling notices on five mature London plane trees along Fitzjohn's Avenue because of the presence of fungal decay in those trees. The newly formed TPG asked Camden to delay the work and to meet with us to explain their reasonings for the fellings. They responded positively to our request, and in December

Mark Stanton, Head of Parks and Open Spaces for Camden, chaired a meeting with Camden officers and councillors and representatives of the TPG and the Society.

Officers explained Camden's maintenance programme and policies for street trees, and provided additional technical information about the Fitzjohn's Avenue trees. They also described their approach to balancing their commitment to preserving and improving the tree canopies in Camden with their duties to protect the safety and property of the public.

There was a candid and open discussion about how communications and the sharing of information could be improved between Camden and the Hampstead/Belsize/Highgate community. As a result the group agreed on the creation of a protocol under which Camden will host a half-day seminar annually for representatives of the Society and other interested parties to review in detail Camden's maintenance program for the coming year. This will include the identification of street trees that are scheduled for felling and technical bases for the decisions to fell.

That agreement, together with agreements from Camden to provide much more detailed information about their street tree maintenance programme on their website and to provide post-felling photographs and data for diseased trees, were major positive outcomes of the meeting.

Camden's current policy is that they will fell any street tree in which they discover specified fungi that can lead to substantial basal or root decay in trees. The presence of such fungi was the basis for felling the five Fitzjohn's Avenue trees. The TPG has retained an independent

Tree Policy Group (cont)

tree consultant to inspect the extent of decay in the felled Fitzjohn's Avenue trees and to advise the TPG on the reasonableness of Camden's policy. His report will form the basis for further study and discussion with Camden.

Camden has committed to replacing the felled trees on Fitzjohn's Avenue with young London plane trees, which will be planted during the 2006-2007 winter planting season, when such trees have the best opportunity to establish and thrive.

In response to a request from the TPG a further meeting was held in February with the TPG and the head of Camden's Insurance Section, who oversees Camden's response to subsidence claims.

The meeting, also chaired by Martin Stanton, was very informative and the TPG gained a much greater understanding of the competing issues that arise in connection with such claims.

The two meetings with Camden have been useful, in terms of obtaining useful and detailed information and, most importantly, reaching agreements that provide a framework for a more productive working relationship with Camden on tree issues.

The TPG will continue its open dialogue with Camden and its independent research into tree issues that are important to the Society's members.

From our Archives - concerts at Kenwood

Our Autumn 1985 Newsletter gave news of the House of Lords second reading debate on the future of Kenwood, and the Society's concern for the future of the concerts following the abolition of the GLC

Lord Elton, the Minister of State, gave a very full and courteous reply to amendments tabled by Lord Cottesloe, our President.

Those amendments tried to ensure that various grey areas in the draft legislation were clarified: that the Heath should pass as a whole to the London residuary body rather than be dismantled...and that regard should be had to the future of the lakeside concerts.

This last point caused some difficulties. The Government had stated that English Heritage would take over Kenwood House but would be free to continue the concerts when the GLC was abolished. The amendment aimed to reconcile this promise with the undertakings

about the Heath's future by requiring the Secretary of State to consider the concerts when making relevant orders.



Unfortunately the civil servants labouring at the Department of the Environment apparently misunderstood the point and gave Lord Elton a brief which said that for English Heritage to continue the concerts would require them to control the land and lakes. This was not, and is not, our understanding: a right to continue the concerts could be granted through an order requiring access to the Heath for that purpose in

the same way that the Iveagh Bequest (Kenwood) Act 1929 required the trustees of the land added to Hampstead Heath to allow access to the house.

Traffic and Parking

What price consultation? Helen Marcus reports on changes proposed by Camden.

The article at the end of this newsletter about LSPs informs us that the government wishes there to be “greater involvement of citizens and communities in the improvement of policies and services”. Yet two major changes are being prepared by Camden with virtually no consultation with those citizens at all.

College Crescent one way

A measure to make College Crescent one way from Fitzjohn’s Avenue to Finchley road was brought forward under Camden’s ‘Safer Routes to School’ programme in response to a request from parents who take their children to the school there by car.

It has already been approved. Yet most residents were not told of any consultation and given no opportunity to make their views known. Apparently there was a ‘consultation’ in January when parents at the school were given the opportunity to make detailed responses. The Belsize Residents Association found out about it and managed to send in a response on behalf of people who live in the area. Their views were ignored.

The officer’s report stated that it is a rat-run but brought no statistical or other evidence forward to support this claim. Those of us who actually use the road know that it is empty most of the day. It is another example of a 24 hour solution to a 2 hour problem. Furthermore, as the recent Easter holiday demonstrated, when the schools are on holiday there is no traffic at all.

Changes to the Belsize parking zone

Camden Street Policy Department has sent out letters to certain selected ‘consultees’ stating that:

“As you may be aware, parking activities in Camden were recently the subject of a cross-party Scrutiny Panel...which made a series of recommendations including one that concerned the size of the zone in the Belsize area.

“Groups and individuals in the Belsize area made representations to the Panel arguing that smaller zones were required around tube and railway stations.”

The letter assures us that “I wish to stress that these considerations are at a very early stage and the Council has no view regarding local zoning arrangements”. Yet it also says that the Council is considering setting up a Consultation Steering Group of local representatives to advise them on local problems and “to assist in the development of new zoning arrangements”.

Watch this space!

London Transport Liaison Group Public Meeting 26th June

Your chance to have your say about public transport in the area.

The London Transport Liaison Group is meeting on Monday 26th June at 10am in the Council Chamber at Camden Town Hall

The meeting is open to the public and the minutes are fed into the various Council processes.

A hidden treasure at Kenwood

A recent edition of English Heritage's members' magazine, Heritage Today, contained a fascinating article by Sandy Mitchell about a little known archive of historic wallpaper which is held at Kenwood. We give here a summary of Sandy Mitchell's article in which she discussed the collection with its curator, Treve Rosoman, author of the definitive work on London wallpapers. By kind permission of the Editor of the Editor of Heritage Today.

High in the attics of Kenwood House is a tiny room containing one of English Heritage's most fascinating treasures: an entire compendium of English wallpaper. There are more than 1,000 samples - some early items are mere scraps of



paper, others immaculate yard-long runs - all rescued from the long-vanished interiors of London houses. They tell the story of wallpaper, covering

the last 300 years, a tale of shifting fashions, sudden technological leaps, and the ever changing patterns of city life.

Wallpaper made its appearance in middle-class English houses in the latter part of the seventeenth century as an affordable imitation of the sumptuous imported materials such as tapestries, brocades, silks and velvets with which wealthy people decorated their homes.

The papers were made from 20 by 23 inch rectangular sheets which had to be laboriously pasted together to cover whole walls. Their mainly floral designs were copied from textiles and created with wooden printing blocks.

It was a painstaking and sometimes dangerous business and the skilled craftsmen working in the new trade of 'paper-staining' ran heavy risks. The paper was produced from rags and old clothes, which could occasionally contain parasites or spread contagious diseases to the workers pulping them in vats of filthy water. The pigments used in the colours often contained arsenic and white lead. More than a century slipped by before a machine that made continuous rolls of paper was patented in 1802, and even then it was not widely used for many years.

However, none of this had any effect on the burgeoning popularity of wallpaper, or limited its developing sophistication and beauty.

It took no time at all for the government to see that wallpaper could be a gold mine for the Exchequer. A tax on 'stained paper', at a rate of one penny per 12-yard roll, was introduced in 1712. A further tax was put on the paper itself, while makers of wallpaper were required to pay an extra licence fee of £2 for the pleasure of being in business. Anyone who flouted the tax risked the death penalty.

Despite these costs, wallpaper still remained far cheaper to buy than fashionable alternatives such as damask wall-hangings, and it enjoyed a second crucial advantage in a city where memories of the devastating Great Fire were still painfully fresh: wallpaper was seen as far more flame-resistant when applied to a plastered wall than the widely used wood panelling.

Such was the demand by the end of the eighteenth century, that rags had to be imported at a rate of thousands of tons a year, from as far




afield as America, and a huge export market for the finished product also developed. Over 170,000 square yards were sent from London to Spain, to name just one country, in a single year. By the 1830s, a wallpaper factory in Marylebone, one of many in and around London, was employing a massive workforce of 600.

Treve Rosoman told Sandy Mitchell that the provenance of most of these papers can be traced not merely to particular houses, but also to particular rooms within those houses: 'On the corner of the samples, you can frequently read pencil notes of the street address, together with the name of the particular room where the paper once hung.' He recalls one particular find from a house at 26 Soho Square 'which we knew from the owner's sales receipt had been supplied by Thomas Chippendale in 1759. Pencil marks on the back of the wallpaper

were almost certainly a sketch by Thomas Chippendale himself for the curtain arrangement of the window. What Chippendale had done - which decorators still do today - is sketch his design on the raw plaster. And when the wall had been "sized" [spread with paste], his pencil marks transferred themselves to the wallpaper.'

The English Heritage collection shows the wide range of designs and styles. There's an example dating from 1690, of an exquisitely elegant pattern of a scimitar - waving Turk alongside his pleasure dome, the design encircled with foliage (block-printed in dense black on a buff ground). Within another 50 years, gorgeous and daring multi-coloured floral patterns had arrived, as well as much more delicate and quite modern-seeming abstracts. 'We know from these samples' says Mr. Rosoman, 'that people in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were not afraid of bright colour, and they weren't frightened of pattern either. They were far more imaginative in interior design than we are today.'



The wallpaper collection at Kenwood is open for research purposes only, and by appointment with the curator, Treve Rosoman

email: treve.rosoman@english-heritage.org.uk

Proms at St Jude's 17–25 June 2006

We are fortunate to have a wealth of cultural activity in this area. We recently sent members the brochure for the Hampstead and Highgate Festival. We now have pleasure in bringing you news of this year's Proms at St Jude's—the annual music festival held in Hampstead Garden Suburb



Thomas Radice, co-ordinator of the Friends' scheme for the Proms and a member of the Society's Heath Sub-Committee reports.

Now in their 14th year, the Proms are one of the leading cultural events of the area around Hampstead Heath and conveniently follow the Hampstead & Highgate Festival by just a month. We hope that Society members—particularly those less familiar with Dame Henrietta Barnett's dream at the top end of the Heath—will come and enjoy another splendid programme of music and other events in the unique atmosphere of the Garden Suburb. At the same time they will be helping to raise large sums for two charities: Toynbee Hall, the powerhouse of social and welfare reform founded in Whitechapel in 1884 by Canon Samuel Barnett and his wife Henrietta; and the

North London Hospice. For the past few years the proceeds of the Proms have been distributed to the charities in the ratio of 3:1. Last year a total of over £40,000 was raised. This year we shall be dedicating one of the concerts to the memory of Jack Profumo, who selflessly devoted over 40 years of his life to Toynbee Hall.

What makes the Proms so special?

As David Sonin put it in the Ham & High in 2004: 'an event that has grown in stature and musical quality over the years as well as generating tens of thousands of pounds for the two charities. . . The Proms are devised, managed and staffed by volunteers in what is

best described as a model of community action and one that offers a broad spectrum of quality musical entertainment in the relaxed and amiable traditions of a summer English house party.’ The party atmosphere starts from the moment of arrival—marquees serving wine and other refreshments, including delicious home-made sandwiches, are open before the concerts and during the intervals.

An incomparable setting

Then there is the incomparable setting of the concert venue itself, the Church of St-Jude-on-the-Hill, described by H&H Society patron Simon Jenkins as Sir Edwin Lutyens’s ‘architectural masterpiece’. There are only two buildings in the Borough of Barnet listed Grade I: St Jude’s and the nearby Free Church, also by Lutyens—who indeed designed most of the surrounding houses and other fine buildings on Central Square (many of them listed II*) to a master plan by Sir Raymond Unwin.

If the weather is kind to us, why not come to the Proms on foot? As you descend from Sandy Heath over the Heath Extension, still retaining its old tracks and hedgerows, you will experience something of Dame Henrietta’s dream. Silhouetted on the skyline, with the semi-rural landscape in the foreground, the unmistakable spire of St Jude’s comes into view. From the playing fields at the far end the way to the Church leads, with studied theatricality, up the terrace and steps bisecting Unwin’s great wall (the formal northern boundary of the

Heath) and along the quasi-ceremonial avenue of Heathgate. As Pevsner remarked over half a century ago, it is the only truly monumental approach to the Suburb—a fitting prelude to a memorable evening.

The programme

The programme strikes a balance between established celebrities and rising stars and makes the most of local connections.



Proms at St Jude's (cont)

This year, for instance, distinguished local pianist Martin Jones will play Brahms's second piano concerto; the London International Orchestra (based in Golders Green) will accompany an Opera Night; the North London Chorus will perform Mozart's Requiem; and local cellist-conductor Robert Max (for many years associated with the Saturday morning Youth Music Centre in Bigwood Road, NW11) will conduct the now traditional Last Night of the Proms.

Flagship events

Among other flagship evening events are a recital by Freddy Kempf - the latest in a succession of Proms celebrity pianists which have included Nikolai Demidenko and Hampstead resident and Proms patron John Lill; and concerts by the Fibonacci Sequence and the Sacconi String Quartet—outstanding young chamber groups who have performed to great acclaim at the Wigmore Hall and elsewhere.

Free lunchtime recitals

In addition there is a full programme of free lunchtime recitals by promising young artists and local groups. (Pianist Nicola Eimer, now the

star of this year's H&H Festival Finale, has twice given one of these.) There will also be opportunities to discover unexpected delights of Hampstead Garden Suburb through guided walks led by experts in architecture, town planning and local history, and a strawberry tea in aid of the Hospice on the afternoon of Friday 16 June.



Prom leaflet front cover illustration courtesy Shizue Takahashi

Booking details

Postal booking is already open, and until 22 May applications from Friends of the Proms will be given priority. For information about the Proms (including Friends' membership during my absence this month)

please contact Yvonne Baker on 020 8455 8687.

Telephone booking is available on 020 8933 5365 from 29 May onwards.

A brochure with booking form and full details is enclosed with this Newsletter. We are most grateful to the Editor and her team for arranging distribution to members of the Society.

LSPs, local government and democracy- what future?

A personal view by Helen Marcus

You may never have heard of a Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) yet the government has just concluded a consultation the aim of which appears to be to turn these bodies from advisory committees into local service providers. It is just one of a welter of such documents emanating from the Offices of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) and the Mayor of London, which closely affect our lives but over which we have little say despite the specious platitudes about “consultation”.

“What are LSPs?” I hear you asking. Indeed few people understand what they are or know that were introduced as part of Local Government Act 2000. They bring local service providers together with the Council to discuss service provision. Local communities are also represented but how their role is supposed to fit in has never been made clear. In theory it is a good idea. In practice the confused thinking as to how it is supposed to work raises mounting concern.

Inconsistency permeates the latest consultation document: *Local Strategic Partnerships: Shaping their future*. It makes clear that LSPs are to move “towards a greater delivery co-ordination role, as opposed to operating in a purely advisory capacity”. Thus, while purporting to consult, it has already been decided that more and more local government functions will be transferred to LSPs.

Yet, having told us that LSPs will “move from advisory bodies to commissioning bodies”, we then read that: “LSPs are voluntary unincorporated partnerships which do not discharge any statutory functionswe have no plans to make LSPs statutory bodies”. How can voluntary bodies that have no statutory functions, and are moreover, unelected and

unaccountable, commission, coordinate and deliver statutory services? The paper itself admits that: “Research conducted with LSPs in London* highlighted a lack of clarity, for many LSPs, about their overriding purpose”. Indeed!

The paper’s claim that: “The LSP is accountable ,.....to local people through the democratic process” is contradicted in an *LSP Evaluation Report** which identifies “a lack of clarity on a number of aspects including the accountability of the LSP to partners, and the accountability of partners to the LSP, as well as wider public accountability.” Most people have a pretty hazy idea at best of what local government is about. If they do not even know that the LSP exists, how can it possibly be accountable to them?

More contradiction is revealed over the role of local councillors. The paper attempts to justify its proposals with talk of: “the local authority’s democratic mandate and accountability”. What democratic mandate is there for making LSPs into commissioning bodies? We are assured that: “elected members of local authorities have a unique role in carrying responsibility for the overall balance of governance.....and being directly accountable to citizens.their support to the LSP and Community Strategy process is crucial to achieving success.” But further on it is admitted that “the precise role of elected members of the local authority, both the executive and back-benchers, is currently not understood”. The LSP Evaluation Report confirms this: “...the lynchpin role is that of the local councillor, yet many are not closely connected to, or in sympathy with, the LSP, and it is not clear, even where (mostly senior) councillors are actively and positively engaged with the LSP, that they necessarily prioritise issues of democratic accountability.” In other words even those in local government do not understand the role of the LSP.

There is even a suggestion that members of Parliament should become involved. Yet MPs have always been insistent that it is not their role to get involved in local government.

It is apparently intended that LSPs will become involved in planning and environment issues. The aim is “to ensure that the LDF [Local Development Framework] can become the spatial expression of the Sustainable Community Strategy” (a prize piece of gobbledegook referring to another set of committees which will govern our lives, and whose existence, again, hardly anyone is aware of). The Royal Town Planning Institute has been commissioned by the ODPM to provide advice to LSPs on “how to make the most of opportunities presented by reforms to the planning system”. The LSP Evaluation Report refers to: “tensions between conservation and development in one place” and “conflicts between competitiveness and cohesion in another.” Or, put another way, as our Chairman remarks in his report in this Newsletter, “we find ourselves challenging proposals, which are driven by what we see as the unreasonably narrow monetary interests of [the] authorities”.

The document is shot through with the inevitable meaningless “commitments” to “empowerment of local people”; “LSPs help to ensure the views of neighbourhoods....can influence strategic local service delivery”; “the Government has also set out its commitment to greater involvement of citizens and communities in the improvement of policies and services”. And on and on, on every page, as if by constant repetition, people might eventually come to believe it is true.

The many Societies like ours, registered charities with constitutions, democratically run AGMs and elections to committees, who know their areas well, would welcome the chance to “influence

strategic local service delivery”. But when they try to make a contribution they are at best ignored and at worst denigrated by being labelled as “usual suspects”, or “unrepresentative”. It is worth noting that many local amenity groups have far more members than any of the political parties, either locally or nationally. Why are their views deemed less representative than those of the politicians? Many local councillors (and MPs) have held their posts for decades – does that not make them usual suspects too? On the basis of falling electoral turnouts are not their mandates now questionable?

These LSP proposals are ill-thought-out and unsafe; they appear to be a further step towards the under-mining of any semblance of democratic accountability begun by Local Government Act 2000. The truth is that after 5 years of this dreadful Act things have only got worse. So far from being listened to, we are, for the first time in our history, having to resort to judicial review to challenge a planning decision because our views, based on the law, have been disregarded.

Unfortunately it is typical of so much recent controversial legislation, such as the Identity Card scheme and the Legislative and Regulatory Reform Bill, which appear to be not only badly drafted, but seek to alter the time-honoured balance of trust between the citizen and the state. As Helena Kennedy’s recent report for the Power Commission suggests, the legitimacy of the democratic process is itself in question.

** LSP Evaluation - Executive Summary Report: a National Evaluation of LSPs commissioned by the ODPM and the Department for Transport (DfT), carried out by the Universities of Warwick, Liverpool John Moores, West of England, Bristol and the Office for Public Management.*

***LSPs and Neighbourhood renewal in London: the story so far. Association of London Government. 2003*

Bulletin Board

Burgh House re-opens

After eighteen months of construction work and disruption the new improved Burgh House is again fully open.

The Museum has been refurbished; there is a new entrance and the Peggy Jay Gallery at the rear of the House; and the David and Ann Sullivan Garden in the Courtyard.

A larger reception area will accommodate more guests at catered functions and more display space is available for temporary and permanent exhibits in the Museum.

The Buttery was recently included in *The Times*' Eat for a Fiver offer. In addition to their delicious meals, teas and snacks - ideal to round off your walk on the Heath - they sell excellent breads, artisan cheeses, homemade relishes and jams to take home.

The bookshop stocks a wide range of interesting publications including those of the Heath & Hampstead Society.



**Information about
Burgh House Museum
Buttery and Bookstall
can be obtained from**

Burgh House

New End Square NW3

Tel: 7431 0144

***Open Wed - Fri, & Sun, 12 - 5.00pm
(Saturdays by appointment)***

Good News for St Stephen's

We are delighted to report that grant of £2.45 million from the Heritage Lottery Fund for the restoration of St. Stephens has now been confirmed. As we reported in January, the St. Stephen's Restoration and Preservation Trust has raised over half a million pounds from donations and £400,000 from English Heritage.

Work will at last be able to start on completing the restoration and opening for concerts, theatre, exhibitions, conferences, weddings and functions for the the community.



Your help still needed

The Trust still needs your support towards the last bit of match funding. So please be generous and give the Trust a further donation towards that new lease of life.

The Hampstead Card List of Traders



***is enclosed separately with this
Newsletter***

Heath Walks

Walks are arranged on the first Sunday of every month EXCEPT January. They are arranged by Michael Welbank who can be contacted on 020 7431 6789 or by e-mail at mwelbank@aol.com.

Starting point: Burgh House, New End Square, Hampstead. There is one exception:

4 March 2007 2.30pm which will start from the entrance gate to the Kitchen Garden, Kenwood House, Hampstead Lane

Start time: 10.30 am or 2.30 p.m. as shown in the list opposite.

Donations, suggested as £2 per adult, will be collected on each walk and will be used in furtherance of the objects of the Society.

The Society does not organise any walks specially for children, but they are always welcome provided that they are accompanied by an adult who takes full responsibility for them, and that they can walk reasonable distances. Walks last approximately two hours and do not always follow paths, so stout footwear is advised.



2006

4 June 2.30pm A Painter's Perspective, led by Janis Hardiman

2 July 2.30pm Plants of the Heath led by Sir Charles Willink

6 August 2.30pm Ecology of the Heath, led by Corporation of London Ecologist

3 September 2.30pm A Spider Foray, led by Edward Milner

1 October 10.30am Birds of the Heath in Autumn, led by Alix Mullineaux

5 November 10.30am A Fungus Foray, led by Jo Weightman

3 December 10.30am Active Conservation, led by Rupert Shelldrake

2007

January: No Walk

4 February 10.30am Artefacts of East Heath, led by Michael Welbank

4 March 2.30pm Hidden Heath, led by Michael Hammerson (starting from the Kitchen Garden, Kenwood House)



11th Annual Springett Lecture

Thursday 12 October Burgh House 8.00pm

Cindy Blaney

North London's premier bat specialist and a member of the City of London's team in Highgate Wood.

Finding and monitoring bats in Hampstead and Highgate