

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/2803/P	Jane Boardman	19A Belsize Crescent NW3 5QY	11/06/2016 10:56:15	OBJ	Quite why 100 Avenue road cannot be cleaned up and continue in its present use has not been explained. Please do not let Swiss Cottage become a building site again. After 46 years of something being built/about to be built this resident is fed up with 'temporary hoardings' up for decades and the mess and disruption from building works. This is public land important for its amenity value to local people and visitors and is a nice area for all at last. A demolished building for an indefinite period will mean loss of amenity to many people and must be refused.
2016/2803/P	Michael Gingold	24A Primrose Gardens	10/06/2016 13:01:48	COMMNT	Too large for the site. This building will block light from much of Eton Avenue and surrounding roads. Not enough social housing included. There is much local opposition to this Plan.
2016/2803/P	Anne Stevens	Flat 1 20 Netherhall Gardens London NW3 5TH	12/06/2016 17:22:56	OBJEMAIL	The Planning Inspector regrettably allowed Essential Living's appeal to be allowed to construct at 100 Avenue Road despite the Council's refusal and massive local objection. He did however hear a great deal of evidence and imposed conditions with care and justification. Those conditions, which the Secretary of State also accepted, were a crucial recognition of the validity of many local concerns. They should not be set aside and there is no justification whatsoever for doing so in this case. Moreover, because it is not yet known when, or even if the 100 Avenue road development can go ahead as planned, Camden Council must conclude that a demolition site for an indeterminate period, with an unknown outcome - whilst awaiting approval of foundation plans - would, by Camden's own definition, cause 'harm' to the community and amenity and in any case be considered a 'major'-material alteration to the original plan and not a 'minor' one. Permission to vary condition 31 must therefore be refused.
2016/2803/P	Anne Stevens	Flat 1 20 Netherhall Gardens London NW3 5TH	12/06/2016 17:22:37	OBJEMAIL	
2016/2803/P	Faiz Gulmohamed	8 Huson close Swiss Cottage NW33JW	12/06/2016 14:12:48	OBJ	I strongly challenge the application due to the height of the building, the potential impact on the surrounding Swiss cottage leisure area and children's play area and also the risk that such a tall building is placed directly above a Swiss cottage tube station and whether this can be supported. I have lived in the area for over 20 years and believe this has a major detrimental impact to local residents.
2016/2803/P	Patricia Morison	27 Downshire Hill	10/06/2016 11:09:02	COMMNT	I object to this application. The developers have no good case to be able to vary the conditions on which they were granted permission.
2016/2803/P	Patricia Morison	27 Downshire Hill	10/06/2016 11:09:02	COMMNT	
2016/2803/P	Sebastian Crewe	14 Elsworthy Terrace London NW3 3DR	12/06/2016 13:43:21	OBJ	The proposed design is highly inappropriate for the intended site. Anything above say 10 storeys would be an eyesore. The proposed number of units also seems high in terms of available resources.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/2803/P	Patricia Morison	27 Downshire Hill	10/06/2016 11:08:40	COMMNT	I object to this application. The developers have no good case to be able to vary the conditions on which they were granted permission.
2016/2803/P	Helen Bloom and Jeffrey Myers	37C Maresfield Gardens NW3 5SG NW3 5SG NW3 5SG	10/06/2016 12:44:57	OBJ	Cannot understand how this application appears to have been passed when so many objections have been made by member of the public, residents associations and MPs. Whilst new housing is always desirable, this proposal can only be described as a blot on the landscape and more relevantly the disruption that will be made to this exceptionally busy junction in relation to traffic flow, access and inconvenience to the general public, motorists, bus traffic and cyclists. We urge you to give further consideration to withdraw permission for this application to proceed. and be refused.
2016/2803/P	Lynsey Bell	7 Strathray Gardens London NW3 4PA	12/06/2016 22:38:33	COMMNT	As there is still no decision and final plan for the 100 Avenue Road development, a demolition site for an unknown period of time until such decisions are made, would surely cause 'harm' to the community and to the amenity. Therefore permission to vary condition 31 should be refused.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/2803/P	Peter Symonds	48 Canfield Gardens London NW6 3EB	11/06/2016 19:46:09	COMNOT	<p>The Combined Residents" Associations of South Hampstead (CRASH) objects in the strongest possible terms to this latest application.</p> <p>The Planning Inspector"s decision, when this building was approved at appeal, states that no demolition or above or below ground development can commence until full detailed plans for the foundation works for the 24-storey tower block have been submitted and agreed by TfL and Camden Council. It is quite clear that to allow the building to be demolished before those plans have been approved would risk significant harm to visual amenity and the amenities of the neighbourhood as well as open up the much loved and well-used green space - currently protected to some degree by the barrier provided by the existing building on Avenue Road - to increased pollution from traffic on the Swiss Cottage gyratory.</p> <p>A decision to approve this variation of condition so that Essential Living, the developer, can go ahead and demolish the existing building on this site when it is not yet known when, OR IF, those plans will be approved would be an act of gross negligence on the part of Council. It is very possible that approval of the foundation plans could be delayed for some considerable time - indeed, we have no guarantee that such plans will EVER be approved. If that proves to be the case then the Swiss Cottage area will have been laid waste for nothing, local residents will have to look out on a "bombsite" and the green space will be a "no-go area" for months if not years to come.</p> <p>Essential Living"s application is nothing more than a ruse to ensure that their already delayed proposal is forced through against the overwhelming opposition of local residents, in order to ensure that they can claim that work has started on site and so are not subject to the three-year permission rule.</p> <p>In no sense is this a minor material alteration to the condition. To those of us involved in the daily fight to protect our neighbourhoods against the selfish demands of unscrupulous developers this is a VERY MAJOR alteration to the condition and one which should be rejected by Camden councillors .</p> <p>CRASH respectfully asks you to refuse the application.</p> <p>Peter Symonds Chair The Combined Residents" Associations of South Hampstead</p>
