

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Alan Fox [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 08 March 2017 10:44  
**To:** Cassidy, Michael; Planning  
**Subject:** Re: 2016/6699/p

Not sure why I have not received an acknowledgment of my objections.

To reiterate EL have not fulfilled all conditions in the condition 31 ruling, including the obvious risk from HS2.

They should be DENIED premature permission to demolish.  
Its obvious that Camden are in cahoots with EL , rather than following their legal duty to be on the side of local residents .  
Alan Fox

**From:** [Alan Fox](#)  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 16, 2017 4:15 PM  
**To:** [michael.cassidy@camden.gov.uk](mailto:michael.cassidy@camden.gov.uk) ; [planning](#)  
**Subject:** Re: 2016/6699/p

would you answer these points please.  
thanks  
A N Fox

**From:** [Alan Fox](#)  
**Sent:** Monday, February 06, 2017 10:22 AM  
**To:** [michael.cassidy@camden.gov.uk](mailto:michael.cassidy@camden.gov.uk) ; [planning](#)  
**Subject:** 2016/6699/p

100 Avenue Road.

I see this dreadful scheme is still in play. I objected to the proposal earlier.. and still object on grounds of massive over-development and loss of local amenity and blight to surrounding residents.

Please confirm that the latest submission by EL is a VARIATION , and thus requires full public consultation.

Their request for early demolition MUST be denied, as the detailed plans have not yet had independent scrutiny. Please confirm Camden will undertake independent engineering analysis of these plans.

Alan Fox  
15 Makepeace Ave N6 6EL

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Stevens, Anne [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 06 March 2017 13:13  
**To:** Cassidy, Michael; Planning  
**Subject:** 2016/6699/P Removal of condition for development of 100 Avenue Road

I am writing to object to the proposal that one of the conditions (condition 31) that were imposed on the development of the 100 Avenue Road site should be regarded as discharged or removed. The conditions were imposed by the Secretary of State for good reasons and on the recommendation of the planning inspector after exhaustive enquiry. Much more specific assurances that appear at present to be available should be obtained from TfL and London Underground that they are satisfied that no damage can occur to the underground lines from the proposed development, and this must involve extremely detailed basement and foundation plans and construction management plans. It is not clear that these details have been provided nor that the necessary assurances have been accorded with sufficient specificity and detail. The condition cannot therefore be regarded as having been fulfilled and therefore capable of being discharged, nor should it be set aside, given the weight of the Secretary of State's views. In addition the Council should be considering the impact of the route of the HS2 tunnel now that the necessary bill has been given the Royal Assent before agreeing any foundation and construction management plans.

Yours sincerely

Anne Stevens  
Flat 1 20 Netherhall Gardens NW3 5TH  
Personal telephone [REDACTED]



**From:** Camilla Quint [redacted]  
**Sent:** 05 March 2017 17:58  
**To:** Cassidy, Michael  
**Cc:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning ref: 2016/6699/P

I object to any variations of planning conditions to 100 Avenue Road.

Mrs C M Quint  
113 Hillfield Court  
Belsize Avenue  
London NW3 4BE  
Tel: [redacted]  
Ema [redacted]

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** David Reed [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 04 March 2017 11:42  
**To:** Cassidy, Michael  
**Cc:** Planning; Mayor of London; Leyland, Claire-Louise (Councillor); Freeman, Roger (Councillor); don1\_williams; Swiss Marshall; Vincent, Sue (Councillor); Rea, Flick (Councillor); Apak, Meric (Councillor); Wood, Abi (Councillor); Stark, Stephen (Councillor)  
**Subject:** COMPLICATED INTERACTIONS between 100 Avenue Road plans (Planning Application No. 2016/6699/P), CS11 (MGLA040117-8685) and HS2 will DESTROY Swiss Cottage!  
**Importance:** High

**Dear Mr Cassidy, Councillors and the Planning Officers involved in these processes,**

It is now becoming apparent that several massive projects are proposed which will massively impact the Swiss Cottage area for several years:

1. The destruction of 100 Avenue Road and its replacement with a disgusting 24-storey tower and 7-storey side block full of private flats will cause at least three years of chaos with construction traffic movements of up to 8 massive trucks per hour! They don't even KNOW how that will be managed!
2. CS11 Cycle route (MGLA040117-8685) will be completely remodelling the local road system over EXACTLY the same time period! HOW will that be managed?
3. HS2 concerns about the impact of underground works for the monster tower in addition to more tunnel-widening efforts, make its safety and viability DUBIOUS.
4. IN ADDITION, the HS2 works will result in YET MORE TRAFFIC from hundreds of vehicles involved in this massive construction project, which is also due to use the same roads in the same time frame! HOW will that be managed?

**For these FOUR MAJOR REASONS this matter CANNOT BE LEFT TO THE PLANNING OFFICERS TO DECIDE, there MUST be a FULL MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE and proper consultation with ALL LOCAL PEOPLE over this massive impending disaster.**

Local residents and users of the area are relying on YOU to make this happen; we pay your wages, think of us for a change!

**David Reed**  
**Save Swiss Cottage Action Group, representing ALL Residents and users of Swiss Cottage**

**David Reed, Flat 2, 56 Eton Avenue, London NW3 3HN, UK**  
**Tel:** [REDACTED] **Mobile:** [REDACTED]  
**Email:** [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Liz Fenner [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 03 March 2017 23:18  
**To:** Cassidy, Michael  
**Subject:** OBJECTION to Application 2016/6699/P re :“Discharge” of Condition 31

Dear Sirs

I have been appalled to learn that Essential Living, yet again in an underhand way, are seeking to minimize their determination to demolish 100 Avenue Road, ahead of approval being granted by Building Control, the Highways Authority, London Underground, TfL and Camden Council following future assessment of the safety of building a 24-storey tower block immediately above Swiss Cottage Underground station, by requesting a “Discharge” of Condition 31, rather than applying for a “Variation”.

New information concerning these works, such as closing access to Swiss Cottage Underground, requires the Application to be re-registered as a Variation, and not as a Discharge.

Any demolition, before such agreement is given to fully detailed engineering plans for foundations and piling works by the various authorities, would be illegal. When such plans are submitted, we require that an independent firm of civil engineers should be engaged by Camden to assess the detailed foundation, piling and construction works required.

The change of use and building works on this site will undoubtedly bring misery to those living and working in the surrounding area, affecting not only the recently-improved well-used grassed area surrounding the rill and water feature beloved of young children, but the popular Farmers’ Market, the Eton Avenue colleges and Hampstead Theatre, and the pleasure and quiet enjoyment of their homes by the surrounding residents.

Early demolition, without the engineering plans having been agreed, and a re-building schedule in place, could possibly leave us with years before building would commence.

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

In addition, it appears that Camden planning department has given no consideration to the effects of the HS2 project, recently passed, which will be taking place only 300-400 meters from 100 Avenue Road, and the Cycle SuperHighway on its doorstep simultaneously.

No work must be allowed before all future plans for this site are agreed by the authorities, following independent verification.

Please note my OBJECTION.

Elizabeth A Fenner  
35 Fairfax Place  
London NW6 4EJ

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Madeleine Slade [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 03 March 2017 15:46  
**To:** Cassidy, Michael  
**Subject:** Re; application number 2016/6699/P

Dear Michael Cassidy,

In the Inspector's report to the Secretary of State on Feb.18 2015 the inspector recommended that there should be no demolition of the existing building at 100 Avenue Road until detailed plans for the foundations had been received and approved by Camden Council and London Underground in order to ensure that there should be a short a gap as possible between demolition and construction to avoid the community being exposed to a pile of rubble and pollution from the gyratory for an indefinite period of time. On May 4th 2016 Camden Council refused the developers application 2016/2128/P because of "the risk of significant harm to the visual amenity and the amenities of neighbouring occupiers.

It now appears that Essedntial Living have again applied for discharge of Condition 31 which would trigger demolition inspite of the fact that examination of the foundation plans indicate that they are not complete (confirmed by an independent structural engineers rreport} in opposition to the advice given y The Secretary of State and Camden itself.

What is particularly worrying is a report by Essential Living's own engineerfs {AECOM submission part 10 Ground Related Hazards which states that The boundary of the site is within the HS2's safegaurd zone so that there is the potential for damage to the new building from HS2's tunnel construction and the probability of this happening is high.

It is difficult to see how Condition 31 could be discharged while this poential hazard is in the way.

Yours sincerely'

Madeleine Slade

9c Lawn Road  
London  
NW3 2XS

5<sup>th</sup> March 2017

Mr. Michael Cassidy  
Development Control  
London Borough of Camden  
Town Hall  
Judd Street  
London  
WC1H 8ND

Dear Sir

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

I write further regarding the above application to my previous objections.

In order for this application to proceed, the LB Camden would have to give permission for access to the market area, and also the public footpath, ancillary to the park, which presently is deemed Public Open Space.

In addition, the position is not clear relating to the basement access of the theatre site, as this is not covered by the land that Essential Living currently own?

It is contended that for the council to give permission for the use of any of the areas that it owns, this would have to be done only by the full council.

Yours faithfully

A solid black rectangular box redacting the signature of Terence Ewing.

**Terence Ewing**