

Dike, Darlene

From: Robert Habermann [REDACTED]
Sent: 28 February 2017 15:38
To: Planning
Subject: 100 Avenue Road

Sir,

RE: Rebuilding of 100 Avenue Road

I object to the rebuilding of 100 Avenue Road for the the enormity of the project.

The building as planned would dwarf the surrounding buildings. and the actual redevelopment of the site would create unbearable chaos to residents in the immediate area and affect sunlight to gardens in the immediate vicinity. Also it would create a major parking traffic problem; where would all the tenants park their cars and visitors

Should however it be reworked, I suggest that the building be renovated and turned into subsidised accommodation of studio apartments for the those working in the service industries London for nurse/ police/ other auxiliary workers, who live 2 to 3 hours away from their work in London. **But on no account can they be sublet.**

This would provide a good financial return for the landlords with major structural building; and at the same time provide necessary partime homes for those living outside the capital but who have essential work within.

The position of the 100 Avenue Road is accessible to any of the major hospitals and the nurses/ doctors/ police and the journeys would be reduced substantially.

Regards

Robert Habermann
52 Eton Avenue
London
NW3 3HN



Flat 3



Planning Dept:

14.2.17

regarding application

2016/6699/P. to discharge condition 31
to allow developer Essential Living to
demolish building no 100 Avenue Road.

Condition 31 states that

'no demolition of above or below ground
development may commence until full detailed
engineering plans for foundation & piling
works have been submitted, agreed by
TfL and approved by Camden Council.'

This condition imposed by the Secretary
of State was made to protect the Swiss
Cottage underground station below 100 Avenue
road and to make sure a disaster did
not occur. This condition (legal) cannot
be ignored or sidestepped.

The fact that this application has
be 'registered' leaves the local population

1 of 2

in a state of FEAR, not daring to use the Swiss Cottage underground station & the Jubilee Line which will create consequences for TfL.

It is absolutely essential that this application cannot be accepted as a 'discharge'; to do otherwise is to ignore the condition imposed by the Secretary of State requiring detailed plans regarding the engineering below ground, very necessary to such a large enterprise & to create a huge burden of responsibility on Camden Council to say nothing of the fears of the public & the effect it will have on them.

The local people are extremely worried & I do not speak solely for myself, need reassurance. Only a full report & opinion of a reliable civil engineering company, not open to graft of any sort - quite impartial + TfL's acceptance (also without pressure) is needed to assure the safety of residents & commuters.

I trust Camden Council to respond to the seriousness of this case.

E.F. Radford.

2 of 2

Michael Cassidy
Regeneration & Planning Development
Town Hall
Tudd St. WC1H 8ND

Ms A Plattner
52 Fairhazel
Gardens
London
NW6 3SL



20/2/17

Re:- 2016/6699/P - 100 Avenue Rd.

We understand that Essential Living have at last submitted foundation plans for the 24 storey tower block above Swiss Cottage tube station — 'above' being the operative word, as it seems that the 'below' ground plans have not yet been supplied.

As Condition 31 requires that all engineering plans be approved by Camden Council, how come that EL have registered the above application (2016/6699/P) to discharge Condition 31 which, if granted, would allow the commencement of the demolition of 100 Avenue Rd. before any of us are aware of the implications this could have for the tube station immediately below.

Has Condition 31 been re-registered? It apparently now includes important information which was not in the original application... e.g. the closure of the street market; the effect on live performances at the Hampstead theatre.

We strongly object to EL seeking approval to demolish 100 Avenue Rd. not only before full engineering plans have been submitted but also before said plans have been agreed by Transport for London & approved by Camden Council.

[Redacted]
Flat 5a, Waverley Mansions
66 Fairhazel Gdns.
NW6 3SN

[Redacted]
Mary Mackie
20 Fairhazel Gdns.
London NW6 3SL

[Redacted]
Flat 10
62 Greenwoolf
Gardens
NW6 3LX

[Redacted]
1/30 Cornfield Gdns
NW6 3NA

[Redacted]
Flat 3b.,
66 Fairhazel Gdns.
London NW6 3SL

182 Goldhurst Terrace
NW6 3HN.

Re: Application 2016/6699/P

25.2.17.

To: Michael Cassidy,
Camden, Town Hall, WCI 8ND.

Dear Mr Cassidy,

I wish to make my objections known re the
above application.

- It is crucial that all detailed foundation
plans are fully complete before work
of any kind is allowed. Condition 31 requires this.

- New material has been included in
the application - hence, the application
needs to be re-registered as a "variation".

Please take note and review this.

Yours sincerely



(STERN)

(computer is having problems hence hand-written but will check
to ~~be~~ ensure this is registered - + have kept a copy!) lol

Dike, Darlene

From: Edie Raff [REDACTED]
Sent: 02 March 2017 10:48
To: Cassidy, Michael; Planning; Beaumont, Elizabeth
Cc: Freeman, Roger (Councillor); Rea, Flick (Councillor); Vincent, Sue (Councillor)
Subject: APPLICATION NO 2016/6699/P

Ref.: 100 AVENUE ROAD LONDON NW3 – AMENDMENT OF CONDITION NO. 31 –APPLICATION NO 2016/6699/P

Mr. Michael Cassidy

Development Control

London Borough of Camden

Town Hall

Judd Street

London

WC1H 8ND

March 2, 2017

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 dispense 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**.

If the Council approves this latest attempt to demolish before **all** the safeguards are in, the Council will have enabled Essential Living to be in the **best position possible**: it can either build at leisure – or not at all (for there is still the chance that all the necessary permissions will never be granted or that the necessary adaptations to the site will prove 'unviable'). EL could leave the local community with a permanent demolition site until such time as they decide to sell it on – with planning permission – at great financial gain - the proceeds of which will of course go off shore.

Let us hope that the Council acts in the interests of the public at large and not solely in the interests of one grasping developer and a Council keen to pocket Section 106/CIL payments.

Kind Regards

Edie Raff
Chair, CHRA

Dike, Darlene

From: Judith Reinhold [REDACTED]
Sent: 02 March 2017 12:41
To: Cassidy, Michael
Cc: Planning
Subject: Ref Application No 2016/6699/P

Dear Sirs, As long-time residents of King Henry's Road, Swiss Cottage, we are writing to you to express in the strongest possible terms our concerns about the proposed development of 100, Avenue Road. When the plan to develop this site was originally put forward, local residents voted overwhelmingly against the proposal and at every turn of the way, Essential Living, TFL and Camden have failed to take into consideration the views of local residents. I understand that Camden Council now has to decide if the foundation plans currently submitted by Essential Living are sufficient to discharge Condition 31. We are currently facing disruption of catastrophic proportions, in the coming years from HS2, CS11 and 100 Avenue Road. I urge you to consider the views of local residents. HS2 will blight the lives of Camden residents for many years come; the plans for CS11 are ill-thought out and will do nothing to reduce traffic congestion in the area, and the construction of a tower block on this site will only exacerbate a disastrous situation. Yours faithfully, Judith and Sylvain Reinhold