

Dike, Darlene

From: Charlie Rozes [REDACTED]
Sent: 17 February 2017 20:08
To: Cassidy, Michael; Planning
Subject: Fwd: 100 Avenue Road application: 2016/6699/P

I am resending this email as I have not seen it posted to the planning website and do not want it lost or overlooked. Many thanks.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Charlie Rozes** [REDACTED]
Date: Sun, Feb 12, 2017 at 8:51 PM
Subject: 100 Avenue Road application: 2016/6699/P
To: michael.cassidy@camden.gov.uk

The purpose of this letter is to STRONGLY oppose the application to discharge condition 31, and recommend it be disallowed. Instead, a proper, public consultation should be done as a variation - and not in the middle of the summer when few residents are here.

My family and I, including our young children, live on Adamson Road, within meters of this development.

Both engineering science and common sense say that foundations are the critical part of any building, whether a tool shack or a skyscraper. What makes 100 Avenue Road unique of course, is the extremely sensitive nature of those foundations, sitting directly on top of underground transportation lines - tube, train, and pedestrian - and squarely in the middle of a high density urban area. This development is also right in the heart of our Swiss Cottage neighbourhood - our leisure centre, library, Hampstead theatre, several schools like the Hall, UCL, and Swiss Cottage School, the Odeon cinema, and major transportation links in/out of London. With HS2 and CS-11 proceeding, despite community opposition, and forcing severe disruption on our small community, especially a very tight residential road network, discharging this condition now on top of those two projects, is condemning Swiss Cottage, plain and simple. Although it is bad enough that the present building sits vacant, it was be far worse to demolish it now, without detailed planning 100% complete, reviewed, and approved by all vested parties, given the sensitive nature of the foundations. I cannot condone the apparent strategy of the applicant to just 'lets tear it down now, and we'll figure out the important details later'. It doesn't take a rocket scientist to figure out the recklessness of this approach.

I am shocked to understand that the basic amenities, like our community market (for which people's livelihoods depend!) and underground access would be lost or severely curtailed. I am also shocked at the use of residential roads and the pedestrian plaza for heavy lorry traffic - such a plan is simply not compatible or practical in this area. These plans are unacceptable. I do not want a demolition site sitting there for potentially years while 'the details' are agreed. The amount of noise and particle pollution would be obscene, not to mention safety issues.

Please DO NOT approve this discharge and instead, have a full and open consideration of this important request as a variation.

If 100 Avenue is to proceed, it must be done correctly, safely, and transparently.

Charles Rozes
Connie Rozes
Aidan Rozes

Jason Rozes

Dike, Darlene

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 20 February 2017 09:41
To: Cassidy, Michael; Planning
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Urgent comments on/objections to Planning Application No: 2016/6699/P - 100 Avenue Road

Dear Mr Cassidy,

I was very concerned to learn that Camden had registered this application during the 3-week "email blackout period" in January, when Camden's "e-alert" email notification system to its residents of new planning applications was- for some unspecified reason- not working, leaving almost no time for comments and objections to be submitted by the 2nd February closing date, once Camden residents learnt of the proposals. Thank you for now having re-registered the application in response to requests from several residents associations, and for setting a new closing date for comments of 3rd March.

I strongly object to this application (**2016/6699/P**) to discharge Condition 31, which requires that all detailed foundation plans must be fully complete before demolition work, of any kind on the existing building at 100 Avenue Rd. is permitted. As a reminder, Condition 31 requires that *'no demolition or above or below ground development may commence until full detailed engineering plans for foundation and piling works have been submitted, agreed by TfL and approved by Camden Council'*.

Essential Living's report shows that, while the demolition outline methods for the existing building may comply with that requirement, the much more important below ground construction method and design appraisals, with all the serious implications for piling above the Swiss Cottage tube station which lies immediately beneath the proposed site, are very far from complete and have yet to be supplied and detailed. Furthermore, access to the tube from Eton Avenue and Avenue Road will be closed for unspecified periods during the demolition, meaning that there will be no tube access at all from the east side of Finchley Road. Demolition trucks and all materials will access the site over the pedestrian area of Eton Avenue, which will clearly have a serious impact on the street market, the residents of Mora Burnet House, the Hampstead Theatre and the Royal Central School of Speech and Drama, to say nothing of the houses, flats and businesses in the immediate vicinity.

Given that, I strongly question why Camden planners have allowed this latest application to be registered as a 'discharge' of Condition 31 when, clearly, it remains (as it was in July 2016 when Essential Living last tried to pursue this short-cut) a 'variation' of Condition 31. If approved, it will enable the developer to demolish the existing building before the necessary foundation and piling plans have been approved, with all the danger and chaos that that will entail.

As a reminder, in July 2016, when Essential Living last applied to demolish the existing building, Camden's planning officers were most unfortunately recommending approval of an application which required them, in effect, to ignore a legal condition imposed by the Secretary of State expressly to prevent the building being demolished before any official body had the chance to examine if Essential Living's detailed plans would support the tower block and stop it crashing into the tube station below! But for the many, many letters of objection from Save Swiss Cottage and CRASH members, Essential Living might not have withdrawn their application at the last minute. Camden, it appears, would have been quite happy to approve it, even without that information, and we would by now be gazing out on a decimated wasteland in the middle of Swiss Cottage with no sign yet of the start of construction. This would have been a gross incompetence on the part of Camden's planners imposing potentially years of a devastated wasteland in the heart of Swiss Cottage on your long-suffering residents.

Here is a brief summary of the main reasons for my objection:

- 1) The developers have yet to submit and receive approval for detailed plans for the construction and piling of the tower block. Condition 31 requires this approval before any decision is made.

2) The application includes new material, not included by Essential Living previously, such as closures to the market and access to Swiss Cottage tube. This application ought, therefore, to be re-registered as a 'variation' and not as a 'discharge'.

3) In view of the loss of trust in Camden's handling of this application, following the e-alert system failure, independent expert verification of all planned construction details of the development should be required before any decision is made.

In the light of the above, please can you now ensure that the following steps are urgently undertaken by Camden's Planning Dept:

1) Ensure that Essential Living and their agents do not commence any work or demolitions, until ALL detailed foundation plans are fully complete and approved.

2) Immediately re-register this application No. 2016/6699/P as a "variation" not a "discharge" – due to the addition of new proposals such as closures to the market and tube entrances- and so make this a public consultation.

3) Obtain and publish an independent assessment/report – via sealed bids – of the final, detailed foundation plans from a reputable, external civil engineering company.

4) Reintroduce the Council's original offer of "a further Condition to ensure a contractor is in place ready to erect the approved building following demolition" – to "give some assurances that demolition would likely be followed by construction without undue hiatus".

I look forward to hearing of your consideration and implementation of these important points, in the hope that this will demonstrably restore some trust in the integrity of Camden's planning process with regard to this most unfortunate development.

Yours sincerely,

Eric Peel

Swiss cottage Ward resident