**Application Ref: 2017/6638/P CMP 100 Avenue Road**

January 26, 2018

Dear Jonathan

Further to my letters of objection of January 9 and January 21 2018, I am writing to object to the fact that Essential Living have again been economical with the truth: this time when they, apparently, instructed their barrister that pre-commencement CMP stipulations had been satisfied and indeed discharged:

“T*he Permission was accompanied by a section 106 agreement dated 24 August 2015. Both the Permission and the section 106 contain* ***pre-commencement stipulations****.* ***I am instructed that these have now been satisfied,*** *insofar as they would have precluded a lawful start on site by demolition."* [3]

***“Due to the discharge of pre-commencement conditions…*** *I consider that the demolition would lawfully commence the Permission.”* [5]

[Rupert Warren: camdocs.camden.gov.uk/HPRMWebDrawer/Record/6956016]

The fact is that **Camden has not yet approved of the ‘submitted’ CMP** and there are **numerous outstanding CMP issues that have yet to be resolved:**

1. No evidence of permission applied for or granted for use of the Restrictive Covenant area for construction vehicles passing through the park

2. No resolution of the number 1 community request for all demolition/construction Access to be limited to the A41 instead of through the pedestrian area of Eton Avenue.

3. Lack of evidence of consultation with Swiss Cottage and farmer’s markets stallholders

4. Lack of evidence of consultation with residents and Management at Mora Burnet House

5. Dispute over the adequacy of the CMP consultation which fell far short of Camden’s statutory requirements

6. Evidence that HS2 has confirmed their understanding that EL changed the wording from ‘**before demolition’** to ‘**after demolition’** in regard to the discharge of HS2’s conditions as stated in the original 2014/1617/P planning application.

7. Evidence that HS2 has confirmed that they agree that their conditions can now be discharged **after demolition’** and not **before** it.

8. Acknowledgement that EL changed HS2’s original wording from “**none** of the development hereby permitted shall be commenced until…” to “works **below ground level** shall not start until…” and evidence that HS2 realizes this.

9. Clarification of the ‘vice versa’ assurances offered re HS2 works adversely affecting the proposed build. Term vice-versa is not a good enough answer for such a potentially damaging situation.

10. Residents have yet to see written confirmation from HS2 that HS2 will not adversely Impact the 100 Avenue Road development – irrespectively of condition 17.

11. Unapproved plans [ref 2017/4036/P] which are not based on the original plans approved by the secretary of state, but on EL’s proposed plans for the removal of two fire exits and reduced hallways.

12. Still no planning permissions to vary condition 21: i.e. the original planning application for the removal of cherry trees.

13. Solution to widening of public path along the hoardings without taking away public space, i.e. the hedges.

14. Proof of EL’s Access agreements with TfL in regard to all vehicle movements via the A41

16. Proof of EL’s Access agreements with TfL in regard to the CS11.

17. EL’s threats to rescind the community benefits they had promised if CMP not approved.

18. Resubmission of shambolic frequency charts and graphs in a format whereby comparisons can be made [EL said they would do this]

19. Discrepancies in vehicle movement charts and graphs and still in the submitted CMP.

20. Concerns over safety of cyclists when vehicles come out of access 2 on to the A41.

21. Concerns that traffic banksmen will not be able to keep pedestrians safe in the busy pedestrian area.

22. Tight squeeze for construction vehicles and cement mixers passing through cramped and displaced market stalls.

23. Loss of footfall to the thriving markets which could lead to their disappearance from the site.

24. Proof of agreement with nearby building sites undergoing extensive re-cladding works on Winchester Road.

25. Proof that CS11 traffic diversions onto Winchester Road will not cause unacceptable congestion on Winchester Road.

26. Proof that the combination of CS11 traffic diversions onto Winchester Road and the CMP construction vehicles on Winchester Road will not cause unacceptable congestion on Winchester Road.

Kind Regards,

Edie Raff

Chair CHRA

Former Chair, SSC