

## **Enirayetan, Oluwaseyi**

---

**From:** helena [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 03 February 2017 13:29  
**To:** Planning  
**Cc:** Beaumont, Elizabeth  
**Subject:** Fw: 100 Avenue Road Application: 2016/6699/P

Dear Sir/Madam

Please see below an email I sent to Michael Cassidy on 1st February relating to 100 Avenue Road.

Since I have not had confirmation of receipt, I am forwarding it to you to make sure by concerns with the application from Essential Living to demolish the existing building are logged with the Planning Department.

Please confirm receipt.

Yours faithfully  
Helena Djurkovic

---

**From:** helena [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 1, 2017 6:59 PM  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** 100 Avenue Road Application: 2016/6699/P

Dear Mr Cassidy

I understand that Essential Living has applied to discharge 'Condition 31' of the above planning application which would allow it to demolish the existing building at 100 Avenue Road.

I also understand that Camden Council has failed to send out Planning e-alerts to local residents, meaning most residents are unaware of Essential Living's move. Despite this failure to discharge its responsibilities, Camden Council has maintained the original deadline for comments.

The Council has clearly failed in its duties to local residents despite the fact that the demolition of the building will cause extraordinary levels of disruption to the area given access points to Swiss Cottage tube from Eton Avenue and Avenue Road will be closed during the demolition and the fact that all the demolition trucks and material will access the site over the pedestrian area of Eton Avenue.

Furthermore, given these very serious issues, the Council's decision to class the Essential Living application as a 'discharge of planning condition 31' rather than a 'variation of planning Condition 31', seems highly contestable.

It is vital that if Camden Council is to act with the level of transparency and integrity that local residents are entitled to expect, then it must:

- Re-register application no. 2016/6699/P and send it to all those registered for planning e-alerts.

- Categorise the application as a 'variation' of planning Condition 31 and open a public consultation on the issue of Underground access and use of the pedestrian area on Eton Avenue for site access, with the public safety risks and severe disruption to the local market that this implies.
- Obtain and publish an independent assessment of the final, detailed foundation plans for 100 Avenue Road from an independent, trustworthy civil engineering company.

Yours sincerely  
Helena Djurkovic

19 Adamson Road, London NW3 3HU

## Enirayetan, Oluwaseyi

---

**From:** Parry-Wingfield, Simon [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 03 February 2017 14:26  
**To:** Cassidy, Michael; [REDACTED] Planning  
**Subject:** 100 Avenue Road

I have heard that a new application has been submitted in relation to 100 Avenue Road. I have not received any alert relating to this application so have not had full time to consider the implications. However, from what I have seen, the application seems particularly objectionable and seems not to satisfy the terms that were laid out by the committee previously. I therefore strongly object to you allowing the demolition to commence and hope that you will push back hard on the attempts of the developers to push this through without proper inquiry and detail.

In particular, I object to the following:

1. This application being rushed through without proper notice being given to local residents and full time to consider the implications.
2. It will be unsafe and dangerous for local residents not to have access to the tube on the east side of the Finchley road. The developers should not be allowed to use the market area outside Hampstead Theatre for delivery trucks. There are lots of children, students, bicycles and other pedestrians who use that area. It will be both inconvenient and unsafe for large lorries to be in the area. They will also no doubt cause a lot of damage to the market area and loss of business for the theatre and the market stall holders.
3. The new application has insufficient detail as to construction methods, which was a previous requirement before permission for demolition can proceed.

There needs to be a proper consultation to all the new information that is coming out and proper scrutiny of what the developers are planning to do. we should not have to accept the huge damage this will cause to local people, homes and businesses.

Please do your duty and put local residents first

Many thanks

**Simon Parry-Wingfield**  
Morgan Stanley | Investment Banking Division  
20 Bank Street | Canary Wharf | Floor 05  
London, E14 4AD  
Phone: [REDACTED]  
Mobile: [REDACTED]  
Fax: +44 [REDACTED]

Be carbon conscious. Please consider our environment before printing this email.

---

NOTICE: Morgan Stanley is not acting as a municipal advisor and the opinions or views contained herein are not intended to be, and do not constitute, advice within the meaning of Section 975 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act. If you have received this communication in error, please destroy all electronic and paper copies and notify the sender immediately. Mistransmission is not intended to waive confidentiality or privilege. Morgan Stanley reserves the right, to the extent permitted under applicable law, to monitor electronic communications. This message is subject to terms available at the following link: <http://www.morganstanley.com/disclaimers> If you cannot access these links, please notify us by reply message and we will send the contents to you. By communicating with Morgan Stanley you consent to the foregoing and to the voice recording of conversations with personnel of Morgan Stanley.

**Enirayetan, Oluwaseyi**

---

**From:** Susan Hadida [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 03 February 2017 19:05  
**To:** Cassidy, Michael; Planning  
**Subject:** 2016/6699/P 100 AVENUE ROAD

I am writing to object to discharge condition 31 not being fully adhered and the utmost importance to be given to no demolition taking place until all foundation plans are fully approved by independent civil engineers and accepted by Camden and the London Underground as safe.

This whole project is a planning disaster and a blot on the landscape, so let's at least make unfailingly sure that it is not going to have any adverse impact on safety.

Susan Hadida  
67 Greencroft Gardens  
London, NW6 3LJ.

**Enirayetan, Oluwaseyi**

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 04 February 2017 09:12  
**To:** Cassidy, Michael; Planning  
**Subject:** Ref: Application No: 2016/6699/P

Dear Mr Cassidy

Please note my strong objection to the above application.

Developers, whoever they are, must provide proper professional assessment of underground impacts and other technical reports before they start. The above application wants to start demolition before the proper sensible process has been undertaken. Camden cannot allow short-cuts.

And that is what this application is, a short-cut.

Closing the Swiss Cottage market and entrance to the tube has a MAJOR impact on the people, like me, who actually live in this neighbourhood. It is unacceptable to take away our amenities in this way for a developers profit. Please, as the council of this area, you cannot allow that. I am sure you would not like your amenities, the things that you enjoy about your neighbourhood and that you use daily to be changed for someone else's profit when it is unnecessary.

Thank you for listening and please do not agree to this.

Please register this objection.

Please do not approve this application for a short cut.

Thank you

Nehal

Sent from my iPhone

**Enirayetan, Oluwaseyi**

---

**From:** Edie Raff <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** 04 February 2017 13:19  
**To:** Cassidy, Michael; Planning  
**Subject:** OBJECTION to Application: 2016/6699/P

**Ref: Application No: 2016/6699/P**

Dear Michael Cassidy

I am writing to object to Application No: 2016/6699/P in regard to early demolition at 100 Avenue Road.

1.

I object that this application has been filed as a 'Discharge' of notice when it is clear that the new issues it raises – such as the closing down of the local community market and the closing of a major access point to the Swiss Cottage Tube Station – clearly indicates that it should be determined as a '**Variation**' of notice in which case a proper **Public consultation** would be triggered with all the attendant rights to the local community that would encompass.

2.

I object – yet again – to Essential Living's latest (of many) attempts to force permission for early demolition of 100 Avenue Road **before** they have submitted **complete** plans demonstrating that **all** the necessary foundation plans are in place and have been deemed acceptable by **all** the relevant parties: London Underground, Building Control, and The Highways Authority.

EL's application seems to show that while the demolition outline methods are complete (nothing new here: they were complete in their last application), construction methods for below ground appear to be almost entirely incomplete - yet **both** must be complete to satisfy condition 31.

In a building of this height that is plunked directly on top of a functioning tube and tube station – I cannot for the life of me see how Camden can make a decision to allow demolition to begin without being 100% certain that all the essential preconditions have been met.

3.

I would also like to register my cynicism and distrust of Camden's email Alert System that for some reason:

1) stopped sending out e-alerts to only certain members of the local community (many of whom are vocal objectors to the scheme) for more than 2 weeks - at exactly the same time that the 100 Avenue Road application appeared online.

2) sent out e alerts that went from one alert and then jumped over the 100 Avenue Road alert and on to the following alert – omitting the 100 Avenue Road discharge application altogether.

Objectors to 100 Avenue Road have still not recovered from the mysterious IT malfunction that lost the first 4 weeks' worth of objections when the Consultation period for 100 Avenue Road opened all those years ago.

It is for the above reasons that I ask Camden, again, as they have done over and over again in the past months/years: to reject this application for early demolition outright.

It would be very helpful, too, if Camden would refuse EL all further such 'Discharges of Condition 31' – until such time as they actually do have **all** their paperwork in order. Such time wasting!

Kind Regards

Edie Raff (former Chair of Save Swiss Cottage)

**Enirayetan, Oluwaseyi**

---

**From:** Danielle Bloom [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 04 February 2017 13:23  
**To:** Cassidy, Michael; Elizabeth Beaumont; Planning  
**Subject:** Application no 2916/6699/P

Dear All,

I am writing to you to express my deep concern about the new 100 Avenue Road application and ask why Camden Council failed to send out Planning e-alert to local residents. (I am a local resident).

Essential Living applied to discharge "condition 31" which would allow them to demolish the building at 100 Avenue Road before all the foundation plans are complete.

I am totally opposed to this application which contains worrying new material like :

- the tube access on Eton Ave and Avenue Road will be closed at certain stages of the demolition.

- all demolition trucks and material will access the site over the pedestrian area of Eton Avenue with an impact on the farmer's market and pedestrian access.

This new application is a "variation", therefore must be subject to public consultation.

Camden Council must obtain and publish an independent assessment report of the final detailed foundation plans for 100 Avenue Road from a trustworthy, independent, external civil engineering company.

I already stressed in previous letters the damaging consequences of allowing Essential Living to demolish the existing 100 Avenue Road building while still waiting the approval from London Underground, Building Control, and The Highways Authority.

The lives of all residents will be severely disrupted and especially the children whose only "green" space, playground and safe area in Swiss Cottage will become unsafe.

Regards,  
Danielle Bloom  
50 Eton Court  
Eton Avenue  
NW3 3HJ

Sent from my BlackBerry® wireless device



## **Enirayetan, Oluwaseyi**

---

**From:** Sanjay Khanna <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** 04 February 2017 18:04  
**To:** Cassidy, Michael; Planning  
**Subject:** 100 Avenue Road application: 2016/6699/P

I was surprised to read about the application by Essential Living to discharge condition 31 and would like to object to this application for the following reasons

1. The developer has not submitted the detailed designs requested by the local planning authority especially as they relate to the potential risk to the Jubilee line
2. The developer does not seem to have submitted their proposal to accommodate and safeguard the current location of the LU structure, In fact it appears they are now proposing to block access to Swiss Cottage station from the existing Avenue Road and Eton Avenue entrance and exit points for the duration of the project. This seems to be a variation to their original proposal.
3. The developer also seems to be proposing that site traffic would go through the current pedestrianized area in front of Hampstead Theatre and the Royal Central School of Speech and Drama – causing disruption and blight to the area and impacting the farmers markets that all of us rely on for our day to day needs. This will be especially disruptive to the students of the college as they regularly use the food stalls in this area for their meals.

Points 2 and 3 are clearly unacceptable and the developer needs to design and submitted a better proposal to minimise disruption while their project is being completed.

There seems to be a large number of documents submitted , piecemeal, by the developer, making it very difficult to understand that overall impact. I would request there be a face to face briefing/consultation with the residents of the area to highlight and discuss the key areas of impact , before this condition is treated as satisfied. Permission to start demolition should not be given under the council, and the residents, are satisfied that the conditions have been met,

Camden council has paid a stellar role in keeping the developers 'honest' on this project and look forward to your continued support on this matter to ensure that the project is delivered in safe manner, does not harm the area and its residents and , equally important, does not clash with the work being done for CS11 by TFL

Sanjay Khanna  
Flat 32  
NW3 3HJ

## Enirayetan, Oluwaseyi

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 05 February 2017 17:29  
**To:** Cassidy, Michael  
**Cc:** Planning  
**Subject:** Ref: Application No: 2016/6699/P – 100 Avenue Road London NW3 3HF

Att: Michael Cassidy

Ref: Application to discharge Condition 31.

I understand that this Application has been re-registered and that there is now a further period to voice concerns.

As I have stated before it is entirely unreasonable to demolish the existing building until the new building has received full and complete consent. If this was to happen we might have a lengthy period in which there is a destroyed building and a blot on the landscape at Swiss Cottage. It would be an environmental catastrophe that can be avoided quite easily by enforcing Condition 31. Why would Camden Council create a potential environmental problem? What is the benefit to residents and those who elect the Council to look after our interests? Surely common sense would ensure that the whole plan was fully approved and deliverable before allowing any work to begin.

In addition, if it subsequently proved that the planned development was impossible for any reason, technical or otherwise, then other potential plans, hopefully less harmful to the environment, would probably be considered. These might be adversely compromised by allowing the current building to be destroyed.

Regards,

Roger Perrin  
m: [REDACTED]

35 Belsize Road,  
NW6 4RX

----- Forwarded by Roger Perrin/TCS on 05/02/2017 16:38 -----

**From:** Roger Perrin/TCS  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Date:** 16/06/2016 23:21  
**Subject:** Fw: Re: App/2016/2803/P – 100 Avenue Road London NW3 3HF

---

Dear Zenab,

I understand that there may be an intention to approve the demolition of 100 Avenue Road based on dubious and duplicitous new conditions.

In a briefing letter [25th May] from Camden's planning team to counsellors it is suggested that there is a contractor appointed and ready to erect the building once approved. This condition to article 31 seeks to draw a veil over the possibility that final consent for the building may not be given as it is contingent upon approval for the foundations plans. Should approval not be given for the foundations after the building has been destroyed we will have a building site, an eyesore and an environmental mess at Swiss Cottage for an indeterminate period. **This would be the case whether or not a contractor was "standing by" to construct the proposed building. This is clearly the case and must not be allowed.**

Camden Council, by its own definition, confirmed that this would cause 'harm' to the community and amenity and so be considered a 'major'-material alteration to the original plan and not a 'minor' one. It would be totally dishonest to

allow the demolition to take place knowing full well that the proposed amendment is meaningless. **Once demolition has taken place there is no way back and there may be several years of blight and argument causing the neighbourhood "tangible and continuous harm".**

**Permission to vary condition 31 must therefore be refused. Foundation plans must be fully approved before any demolition takes place. There is no good reason to destroy the current building until a new one is fully approved.**

Yours sincerely,

Roger Perrin  
m: [REDACTED]

35 Belsize Road,  
NW6 4RX