


Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3838/P	Anne Stevens	Flat 1 20 Netherhall Garde NW3 5TH NW3 5TH	20/07/2017 13:04:56	OBJ	<p>I object to the proposal 2017/3838/P related to wind mitigation measures on the site of 100 Avenue Road on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It appears that the proposal requires that concrete planters should be constructed and trees and shrubs grown in them in the passageway between the Theatre and the Green Space. Such planting and construction will seriously narrow the space and make it impossible for emergency vehicles (and indeed maintenance vehicles maintaining the green space) to reach the space, or access the rear of the new building through this access point, which could have serious implications, for example in the case of a fire within the proposed new block. The application should be refused on public safety grounds.</li> <li>2. It is not clear that the planting proposed would have the desired effect. Much of the planting proposed is deciduous and, for example Amelanchier and Malus species (mentioned in the plans) have rather open and widely spaced branches. Council officers are welcome to inspect the mature Amelanchier growing in my front garden to verify this, or indeed to observe those in the O2 carpark. If fully mature plants are to be provided from the start they will be especially vulnerable on account of having been moved. If they are not to be provided fully mature, then the proposed protection would not be in place for several or indeed many years. This is not acceptable.</li> <li>3. It is proposed that Taxus or Buxus should be planted. Buxus is subject to box blight disease and may not survive. Taxus is highly toxic to people and animals: it may be suitable in a churchyard or a private garden but not in a public space. These proposals are not acceptable.</li> <li>4. No details are given in the application form of any provision for ongoing maintenance or an obligation to preserve any planting. Planting, including trees, can die if not regularly maintained, watered etc, and planters very rapidly become unsightly. Equally the wind effect within the passageway could break branches. If this planting is allowed (which it should not be on the other grounds enumerated) no permission should be given until very strong and legally binding commitments to maintenance, and like for like replacement of any damaged, dying or dead plants as required, have been entered into.</li> <li>5. The expected nuisance from the wind tunnel effects caused by the new building is not confined to this site. No permission should be granted until the submission and approval comprehensive plans for all areas of the site environs, confirmed by wind tunnel studies, that will ensure that no inconvenience to pedestrians with umbrellas, push chairs etc will occur.</li> </ol> <p>On all these grounds this proposal is inadequate and unsatisfactory and should not be accepted as fulfilling the planning condition imposed by the Secretary of State.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3838/P	Barrie Tankel	43a Lancaster Grove London NW3 4HB NW3 4HB	21/07/2017 00:02:12	OBJEMPER	<p>2017/3838/P</p> <p>100 Avenue Road London NW3 3HF</p> <p>Proposal Details of microclimate mitigation measures, including a balustrade to the west-facing balustrade and a landscaped planter to the east boundary of the site adjacent to Hampstead Theatre, as required by condition 15 of planning permission 2014/1617/P dated 18/02/2016.</p> <p>We object to the proposed solution to mitigate the wind issues caused by this development.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RWDI state they 'EXPECT that the height and density of the planting suggested will be sufficient to mitigate the strong winds which occurred at receptor 7.'<sup>1</sup> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An expectation brings insufficient confidence that this solution will work.</li> </ul> </li> <li>RWDI further state           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>'The use of evergreen trees and planting is particularly beneficial, as well as the close location to the receptor itself. The deciduous shrubs, despite having bare branches during the windiest season, are expected to have suitable density of branches to provide a mitigating effect during the winter months.'</li> <li>The statement that the bare branches are EXPECTED to have suitable density of branches means this is an INADEQUATE solution to this problem.</li> <li>What happens when branches fall off or are vandalised? Or trees die?</li> <li>How long will it take for the proposed trees to mature?</li> <li>How long will it then take for replacement trees to mature?</li> </ul> </li> </ol> <p>We do not think that the measures proposed (some shrubs and trees in planters) will go anywhere near dealing with the wind issues caused by the development.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fire safety and emergency access           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed planters in the narrow lane between the proposed development and the Hampstead Theatre would be a major and insurmountable obstacle to emergency vehicle access, both for the tower itself and for the Green Space.</li> <li>Has London Fire Brigade approved this solution?.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Inadequacy of the proposed provision           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RWDI accept that the site area adjacent to Hampstead Theatre will have winds so strong they could 'impede walking' at</li> </ul> </li> </ol>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3838P	Sarah Gottlieb		18/07/2017 12:42:01	Obj	<p>I wish to object to the above planning application for the following reasons.</p> <p>I would also be grateful if you could redact my details for the reasons outlined in my previous objections to aspects of this development.</p> <p>The Council should not approve the measures that have been submitted for the following reasons:</p> <p>(1) Fire safety and emergency access:</p> <p>The proposed planters in the narrow lane between the proposed development and the Hampstead Theatre would be a major and insurmountable obstacle to emergency vehicle access, both for the tower itself and for the Green Space. The Council's Planning Committee has a duty to take the issue of Fire Safety seriously.</p> <p>I note that no approval from London Fire Brigade has been sought for blocking this key emergency access route with permanent planters, granite slabs and tall trees of up to 6 metres high.</p> <p>(2) Inadequacy of the proposed provision:</p> <p>The proposal will not meet the key requirement to provide mitigation to pedestrians. Indeed, given some of the suggested trees are fruiting varieties, they risk making the path more dangerous for pedestrians.</p> <p>In RDW's technical note attached to the application, it is accepted that, as a result of the development, the site adjacent to the Hampstead Theatre would have winds so strong they could 'impede walking' at certain times in the year [para 1]. RDW do not give a clear assurance that the mitigation measures will be any more than 'likely' to offer suitable conditions [para 3].</p> <p>In the Section Arrangement from Camlins attached to this application, various planting which might act as mitigation are outlined. These trees do not match the specifications set out by RDW. I.e. Most of these trees would take up to 20 years to reach maturity, some are highly likely to succumb to disease. Moreover there is no evidence that the trees being proposed will have the suggested 'dense branches' during the winter season.</p> <p>RDW's report concludes that despite the mitigation, it is likely that strong winds in excess of Beaufort Force 6 may occur for more than one hour per year... [para 7].</p> <p>I do not accept RDW's assertion that winds of Force 6 magnitude would 'not cause significant nuisance to pedestrians on thoroughfares'. Beaufort force 6 is defined as 'strong breeze' of approx. 48 kmph where pedestrians 'would have difficulty opening umbrellas'.</p>

Application No:    Consultees Name:    Consultees Addr:    Received:

Comment:    Response:

(3) Inappropriateness of proposed provision.

Given dead trees at Ballymore development in West Hampstead, the planning committee must ensure that in complying with microclimate conditions, developers choose appropriate trees. None of the trees or plantings detailed in the detailed plan are suitable. There is every indication that if this development goes ahead, the area will quickly be characterized by dead trees and unmitigated windy conditions.

i. Prunus nigra. It is inappropriate to use a fruiting variety on a public access route used by elderly and disabled people. It would create a risk of slippage particularly in the windy conditions. Moreover this tree would take 10-20 years to reach its mature height. In the interim it would not be a sufficient windbreak.

ii. Amelanchier Lamarkii. Again, this is a fruiting variety, creating a risk of slippage on the path. For optimum growth, it requires a sunny disposition facing South. The pathway does not provide this. Again, the tree would take 10-20 years to reach optimum height during which time it is not offering full wind mitigation.

iii. Amelanchier Canadensis. A fruiting variety again creating a slip hazard. Inappropriate in this location as it requires sunshine. Takes 20 years to reach ultimate height.

iv. Acer griseum. With its 'paperback' peeling bark in such a windy location, the tree would be inappropriate and create a mess and hazard. In terms of hardiness, it only has an RHS rating of 5 and requires a sheltered position which, as the developers admit, this is not. Given this, it is unlikely to survive the 15 years necessary to reach maturity.

v. Malus Evereste: A fruiting variety of crabapple creating a slip hazard in this access route. It is highly susceptible to disease and is unlikely to survive the 10-20 years projected for maturity.

vi. Taxus bachata (yew hedge) This is a highly toxic hedge which is totally inappropriate for low level planting in a public space with many children playing. It is very susceptible to disease.

vii. Buxus sempervirens (box hedge) Again highly toxic and susceptible to disease and waterlogging.

(4) Errors in statement;

Mr. Evans's letter refers to a 'pine tree'. This does not appear in the drawings. This seems to suggest that this statement and these drawings have been cobbled together to give the appearance of complying with this condition.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>(5) Mitigation at other sites not detailed:</p> <p>The proposed mitigation does not deal with the areas of high wind which the tower would cause outside Swiss Cottage tube station on Eton Ave, at key locations in the Swiss Cottage Farmer's market, at the proposed cut-through between Avenue Road and the Green Space and at the start of the proposed CS11 cycle lane beside College Crescent.</p> <p>In short, the microclimate mitigation measures detailed here are totally inadequate to deal with the severe wind blight that would be created by this tower.</p> <p>Moreover, the measures would themselves create new dangers, particularly as they block emergency access.</p> <p>In the wake of the Grenfall tragedy, I would request that, at a minimum, Camden Council requests a report on these measures and their impact on fire safety of the site from the London Fire Brigade before any decision can be reached.</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3838/P	David Reed	Flat 2 56 Eton Avenue London NW3 3HN	19/07/2017 12:23:13	OBJNOT	<p>Dear Planning Officers,</p> <p>Objection to 100 Avenue Road London NW3 3HF application no. 2017/3838/P</p> <p>Submitted on behalf of ALL SWISS COTTAGE RESIDENTS, by the Save Swiss Cottage Action Group.</p> <p>Proposal Details of microclimate mitigation measures, including a balustrade to the west-facing balustrade and a landscaped planter to the east boundary of the site adjacent to Hampstead Theatre, as required by condition 15 of planning permission 2014/1617/P dated 18/02/2016.</p> <p>The Council should not approve the measures that have been submitted by Essential Living as they are ENTIRELY INADEQUATE, as will be detailed below.</p> <p>The proposed mitigation measure, a few large planters, does not deal with the areas of high wind which the tower would inevitably generate around it. These winds, which the developers admit would cause significant nuisance to pedestrians using these essential thoroughfares, will affect all the local pedestrian routes outside Swiss Cottage tube station on Eton Ave, at key locations in the Swiss Cottage Farmers' market, at the proposed cut-through between Avenue Road and the Green Space and at the start of the proposed CS11 cycle lane beside College Crescent.</p> <p>These winds are an inevitable creation of the poor design proposed: a 24-storey tower with a separate 7-storey side block creates a gap between the buildings which, coupled with the effect of the massive blocks and the skyscraper on local air currents, will create intolerable wind loads throughout the whole area.</p> <p>Even now, with just a six-storey tower there are days when the wind burden is intolerable: I have seen market stalls and people blown over on occasion! The massively taller tower will inevitably create greater wind speeds.</p> <p><b>AIR QUALITY OF GREEN SPACE DESTROYED</b></p> <p>More importantly, the Air Quality Monitoring Station at Swiss Cottage routinely records some of the highest levels of pollution in the WHOLE OF Camden, and this bad design will funnel all that NOISE AND POLLUTION DIRECTLY INTO THE OPEN GREEN SPACE.</p> <p>This is the only place where children can play and adults relax away from these dangerous burdens to health and for that reason alone you must refuse this application.</p> <p>And there are other aspects which will create major hazards:</p> <p>Page 77 of 80</p>

Application No:    Consultees Name:    Consultees Addr:    Received:

Comment:    Response:

(1) Fire safety and emergency access:

Putting large planters in the narrow lane between the proposed development and the Hampstead Theatre would be a major and insurmountable obstacle to emergency vehicle access, both for the two sets of buildings and the Green Space.

The Council's Planning Committee has a duty to take the issue of Fire Safety seriously. We note that London Fire Brigade has NOT EVEN BEEN ASKED about the impact that blocking this key emergency access route with permanent planters, granite slabs and tall trees of up to 6 metres high would have.

I demand that this approval is sought before allowing this application

(2) The measures proposed WILL NOT WORK:

RWDI admits that, as a result of the development, the area adjacent to the proposed buildings and Hampstead Theatre would have winds so strong they could "impede walking" at certain times in the year. They cannot give a clear assurance that the mitigation measures proposed will even create acceptable conditions.

The proposal does not meet the requirement to provide mitigation to pedestrians for the following reasons:

a) The trees being proposed do not match the brief given in RWDI's letter. Inevitably, in winter they will not have "dense branches" and so will have NO EFFECT on mitigating wind speeds for half the year! In any case, they take up to 20 years to reach maturity and some are highly susceptible to disease.

b) RDWI's report concludes that despite the mitigation, "it is likely that strong winds in excess of Beaufort Force 6 may occur for more than one hour per year..." Despite RDW's assertion I believe that winds of this magnitude would cause significant nuisance to pedestrians using these essential thoroughfares. Beaufort force 6 is defined as having wind speeds up to 49 kmph where pedestrians "would have difficulty opening umbrellas".

(3) Wrong trees chosen!

The planning committee must ensure that in complying with microclimate conditions, developers choose appropriate trees. None of the trees or plantings detailed in the detailed plan are suitable because either they take too long to reach maturity, they require different growing conditions, are susceptible to disease, or they would create their own danger with fallen fruits. Some of the suggested low-level plantings are highly toxic which is unsuitable for an area used by so many children and animals.

Printed on: 25/07/2017 09:10:02

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
-----------------	------------------	------------------	-----------	----------	-----------

(4) Mitigation at other sites not detailed.

For all of the above reasons, we call on Camden to REJECT THIS APPLICATION.

David Reed  
Save Swiss Cottage Action Group

---