

**From:** Saar shai [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 24 March 2017 04:00  
**To:** Cassidy, Michael; Planning  
**Subject:** Application no. 2016/6699/P – 100 Avenue Road

Hello

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 i.e not to allow Essential Living to carry out early demolition

Thanks

--

Saar Shai

**From:** Edie Raff [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 24 March 2017 13:41  
**To:** Cassidy, Michael; Planning  
**Cc:** Freeman, Roger (Councillor); Rea, Flick (Councillor)  
**Subject:** Fwd:Correct Version with Attachment of Objection to Application no. 2016/6699/P  
**Attachments:** [100 Avenue Road - SDS Comments on LUL response re 2016-6699-P FINAL.pdf](#)

Dear Michael

Please use this version of my objection to post on your website as it has the attachment I had meant to include in my earlier letter of objection.

Thank you

Edie Raff

[Objection to Application no. 2016/6699/P by Essential Living \(Swiss Cottage\) Ltd to discharge condition 31 for 100 Avenue Road, NW3 3HF.\](#)

Dear Michael Cassidy

I cannot believe that I need to register yet another objection to an application that should have been closed at the end of its consultation period but which appears to be allowed to drag on indefinitely by Council Officers.

Following London Underground's submission of February 20, 2017 stating that:

*"the planning applicant is in communication with London Underground engineers with regard to the development above. Therefore, we have no comment to make on the application except that the developer should continue to work with LU engineers."*

The local community was so incensed that Camden Planning Officers took this cavalier submission seriously that they commissioned and paid for their own report, the SD Structural report - which pointed up many serious conditions in Condition 31 that were as yet unfulfilled.

Camden so needed a credible and substantial response from London Underground that they extended the consultation period to wait for it. When it finally arrived on March 9, 2017, Mr Brierley's report merely stated that London Underground are:

*"content that the developer has met the requirements of condition 31"*

Mr Brierley's response did not bother to provide evidence to support London Underground's 'contentment' - which verges on contempt for the detailed SD Structural Associates Ltd report [02.03.17] that raised so many legitimate concerns and which he does not bother to respond to.

And p

erhaps

Mr Brierley did not notice that AECOM carefully distanced itself from future responsibility for any future problems that could arise were the conditions raised in Condition 31 not fully addressed.

It is also now Camden Council's responsibility to **address the serious issue** referred to in AECOM's own report – as to what impact HS2 might have on the building and its foundations.

In any case, when did the entire issue of permission for Essential Living to begin demolition works before all of Condition 31 had been satisfied rest with London Underground alone and not entirely with Camden Council - as laid down in Condition 31?

I ask Camden Planning Officers to resist the temptation to base their recommendation on this latest application by **Essential Living** on such a flimsy and almost contemptuous report by London Underground.

The Conditions carefully laid down by the Inspector and Secretary of State demand far greater scrutiny and scrupulousness in seeing that they are carried out.

Kind regards

Eddie Raff



Virus-free. [www.avast.com](http://www.avast.com)