

Dike, Darlene

From: Mary Knight [REDACTED]
Sent: 22 February 2017 18:18
To: Planning
Subject: 100 avenue road. Ref. App. 2016/6699/p For the attention of Michael Cassidy
22/2/17

Ground Related Hazards re 100 Ave Rd. The main ground related hazards that are likely to affect the proposed development include; obstructions and old foundations, unknown buried services and the nearby proximity of underground structures (including the HS2 tunnel) This Mr Cassidy is exactly what I was thinking, that given the age of Swiss Cottage tube you never know what you will find. What with Victorian sewers collapsing due to their age. Swiss Cottage tube was not built in the past to have a 24 story erection on it, so the engineering challenges could be there. As I'm confident that the planning department would not agree to any application that's conditions of complete safety were not met, I am very interested to see what's found. As HS2 is planning to be under my neighbour in Fellows roads garden which is in line to be very near 100 Ave Rd. this definitely needs investigation. My family and I are directly affected by this application as we would lose our access to the Eton ave. entry to the tube and would lose our 'Heart of the Community' markets. Also access to College Crescent is essential to us. My personal concern is the hundreds of polluting lorries using my road, as my lungs are suffering enough as it is. My thoughts are that this application is for demolition only, what else could it be, as it's so incomplete. To demolish without the conditions being met, would be a great disruption and distress to all the community. Also not knowing what will happen to the site. The dust alone would be awful. Best wishes.

Maeve Tornero
53c Eton Ave.,
London NW3 3ep

Dike, Darlene

From: Edie Raff [REDACTED]
Sent: 23 February 2017 19:32
To: Cassidy, Michael; Planning
Subject: Application No: 2016/6699/P

Ref: Application No: 2016/6699/P

Dear Michael Cassidy

In addition to my earlier objection sent on Feb.4, 2017, I am writing with a further objection to Application No: 2016/6699/P in regard to premature demolition of 100 Avenue Road.

It has come to light in the AECOM Geotechnical Interpretation Report [Report 10, Table 6-1: Ground Related Hazards] that **HS2** is considered a **Geotechnical Hazard** to the site because 100 Avenue Road's Southern boundary is within an HS2 "**safeguard zone** with a "**HIGH probability for potential damage**" to the new building from future HS2 tunnel construction.

The report recommends that Essential Living discuss with HS2 the implications for design and construction that this potential HS2 hazard poses for their build and that EL undertake "**ground impact assessments** to assess the effect of the proposed development on underground structures and the effect of the proposed HS2 tunnel on the building in order that the it **meet HS2 requirements.**"

If the Council has **not** actually seen these ground impact assessments or if the Council has seen some but is not entirely satisfied that all the necessary plans are in place to meet HS2 requirements (and surely they must be - given the horrendous ramifications if it turns out they were not) - then it should be **inconceivable** that the Council will allow demolition – let alone premature demolition - to take place with such major, serious potential breaches of the safety conditions laid down by the Inspector in his Condition 31.

I repeat: the Inspector fully intended for **all** the conditions in Condition 31 to be met – **before demolition is to take place** – otherwise he would not have laid them down as a pre-condition for early demolition.

I find it utterly reprehensible that the Council so far appears willing to even contemplate dispensing with its legal obligation to ensure that Condition 31 is carried out to the letter and to choose, rather, to aid and abet Essential Living's urgent push to establish the hole in the ground it desperately needs in order to hang on to its planning permission for the site.

The public understands only too well that once Condition 31 has been discharged and demolition begins, Essential Living will **automatically** achieve **Planning Permission with NO TIME LIMIT for the whole development**. That is to say, the hole in the ground will establish that the **3 year time limit** [Condition 1 of EL's Planning Permission] is **set aside**.

And the public will understand that that the Council will have enabled Essential Living to either build at leisure – or not at all (it is still possible that not all the necessary permissions will ever be granted) and to leave the Green Space a permanent demolition site until they can sell it on – with planning permission – at great profit.

We can but hope that Council Officers will choose to honour the legal obligation to satisfy in full Condition 31 - above their impatience to get their hands on the Section 106/CIL million pounds' bonanza that has been the guiding light of this entire planning application process.

Kind regards

Eddie Raff

Chair

Cresta House Residents Association