

From: Elena Tyukalova [REDACTED]
Sent: 20 March 2017 13:11
To: Cassidy, Michael
Cc: Planning
Subject: Application no. 2016/6699/P – 100 Avenue Road

In light of the report by SDStructures Ltd., and, having so far failed to comply with Condition 31, neither Camden Council nor London Underground Ltd. can justify approval of Essential Living's Application no. 2016/6699/P. I urge that the Application be rejected forthwith.

Kind regards,
Elena Barrans
35 Belsize Park
London NW3 4DY

From: Gillian Cook [REDACTED] on behalf of Gillian Cook
Sent: 20 March 2017 14:53
To: Cassidy, Michael
Cc: Planning
Subject: Application no. 2016/6699/P - 100 Avenue Road

Dear Michael Cassidy

In the light of the report by SD Structures Ltd and, having so far failed to comply with Condition 31, neither Camden Council nor London Underground Ltd can justify approval of Essential Living's Application no. 2016/6699/P.
I urge that the application be rejected forthwith.

I live in hope.

Yours sincerely,

Gillian Deane

From: Mary Mackie [REDACTED]
Sent: 20 March 2017 14:56
To: Cassidy, Michael
Cc: Planning
Subject: Application no.2016/6699/P _ 100 Avenue Road

I am finding it hard to understand Camden's position over this application. Surely there is no question of the present building being demolished till Essential Living fulfill the request regarding the structural safety of building over the tube station. If they do attempt to demolish they will be in breach of the safety requirements (Condition 31) applied by the Secretary of State. Surely it is in Camden's interests to make sure this procedure is followed as the consequences could be horrendous.

Mary Mackie

From: Ruth Jackman [REDACTED]
Sent: 20 March 2017 17:09
To: Cassidy, Michael
Cc: Planning
Subject: Application no. 2016/6699/P – 100 Avenue Road

Dear Madam/Sir

Please immediately reject Essential Living's latest application. The reasons being the dangers to the local inhabitants identified by SDStructures in their recent report and because Essential Living has failed to comply with Condition 31.

Yours faithfully,

Ruth Jackman
235 Goldhurst Terrace
NW6 3EP

From: Shireen Fraser [REDACTED]
Sent: 20 March 2017 17:53
To: Planning; Cassidy, Michael
Subject: Application no. 2016/6699/P – 100 Avenue Road

Dear Mr Cassidy,

We were among the residents of Belsize Park who objected strongly to the development of 100 Avenue Road on the grounds of disruption during demolition and construction, unsuitable location for a tower, lack of keeping with scale of local buildings, ruining beautiful views, loss of light to leisure centre play area and gardens along local roads, no conviction it would help solve the housing crisis, increased congestion and an ugly design.

Having bulldozed the project through, against the residents' wishes and council's decision, we have now been made aware of some lack of rigour in assessing and following up on safety issues, in particular, regarding the SDS report and Condition 31, which I understand you are familiar with.

Given the failure to comply with Condition 31, we do not believe that Camden Council and London Underground Ltd should approve Essential Living's Application no. 2016/6699/P

Regards,
Sir Simon and Lady Fraser
8 Belsize Park, NW3 4ET

From: Katy Barron [REDACTED]
Sent: 20 March 2017 19:57
To: Cassidy, Michael
Cc: Planning
Subject: Application no. 2016/6699/P 100 Avenue Road

Dear Mr Cassidy,

In light of the report by SDStructures Ltd., and, having so far failed to comply with Condition 31, neither Camden Council nor London Underground Ltd. can justify approval of Essential Living's Application no. 2016/6699/P. I/We urge that the Application be rejected forthwith.

Yours sincerely,

Katy Barron and Matt Hervey

**Flat 5
35 Belsize Park
London
NW3 4DY**

From: Claire Rieger [REDACTED]
Sent: 21 March 2017 09:24
To: Cassidy, Michael
Cc: Planning
Subject: Application no. 2016/6699/P – 100 Avenue Road

Dear Sir

In light of the report by SDStructures Ltd., and, having so far failed to comply with Condition 31, neither Camden Council nor London Underground Ltd. can justify approval of Essential Living's Application no. 2016/6699/P. I urge that the Application be rejected forthwith.

Claire Rieger

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone](#)

From: secretary at office [REDACTED]
Sent: 21 March 2017 13:40
To: Cassidy, Michael
Cc: Planning
Subject: Application no. 2016/6699/P – 100 Avenue Road

I support this existing building must not demolish.

Yours sincerely,
Anne Valerie Solti
51 Elsworthy Road
NW3 3BS

From: Shelley Katz [REDACTED]
Sent: 21 March 2017 14:27
To: Cassidy, Michael
Cc: Planning
Subject: Demolition of 100 Avenue Road

Dear Sir

We know there is a report by SDStructures Ltd., and that Essential Living does not comply with Condition 31. Therefore neither Camden Council nor London Underground Ltd. should approve of Essential Living's Application no. 2016/6699/P.

We urge that the Application be rejected.

Shelley and Brian Harris
56 Eton Avenue
NW3 3HN