



Dear Sir/Madam,

I have the following comments on the Impact Assessment of HS2 Tunnel on piles and superstructure of the 100 Avenue Rd development (by Robert Bird Group), and on the developer's consequent request to discharge Condition 17 of Planning Permission 2014/1617/P, which I believe should not yet be granted.

1) Why has there been a change of wording to the HS2 condition submitted in response to the original Planning Application ref 2014/1617/P?

This condition was requested by HS2 to protect their own infrastructure. It needs to be clarified how and why the wording of the original Condition from HS2 (as submitted to Camden Council on 8th April 2014), was changed by the developers and agreed by Camden Council in their Statement of Common Ground, April 2015, from the following (the changed section is underlined) to the modified version shown below that:

“(i) None of the development hereby permitted shall be commenced on those parts of the site shown on the site as shown as falling within the ‘Limits of Land Subject to the Safeguarding Direction’ until detailed design and construction method statements for all of the ground floor structures, foundations and basements and for any structures below ground level, including piling (temporary and permanent) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority which: / (These shall:)

- *Accommodate the proposed location of the HS2 structures and tunnels.*
- *Accommodate ground movement and associated effects arising from the construction thereof, and;*
- *Mitigate the effects of noise and vibration arising from the operation of the HS2 railway within the tunnels, ventilation shaft and associated below and above ground structures.*

(ii) *The design and construction method statements to be submitted under part (i) shall include arrangements to secure that, during any period when concurrent construction is taking place of both the development hereby permitted and of the HS2 structures and tunnels in or adjacent to the site of that development, the construction of the HS2 structures and tunnels is not impeded. The development shall be carried out in all respects in accordance with the approved design and method statement and all structures and works comprised within the development hereby permitted which are required by the approved design statements in order to procure the matters mentioned in part (i) shall be completed, in their entirety, before any part of the building(s) hereby permitted is/are occupied.*

(iii) *No works below ground level comprised within the development hereby permitted shall be carried out at any time when a tunnel boring machine used for the purposes of boring tunnels for the HS2 Ltd railway is within 100 metres of the land on which the development hereby permitted is situated”*

was changed to:

“(i) Works below ground level shall not start until detailed design and construction method statements etc.... (then as previously....)

This has had the effect of changing the meaning of the condition such that its requirements do not now have to be met in full, to enable it to be discharged, until after demolition of the existing building at 100 Avenue Rd, rather than before demolition.

It seems that HS2 were not informed of this change of wording prior to, or during, the Inspector's Inquiry which established "condition 17" (Ref. FOI17-1846).

It is important that HS2 publicly give their written consent to acknowledge that EL and Camden Council have changed the wording of their original condition as submitted to the council on 8th April 2014.

2) According to this report, the three specific requirements of Condition 17 of Planning Permission 2014/1617/P dated 18 Feb. 2016 have not yet been met

• “Accommodate the proposed location of the HS2 structures and tunnels.”

-HS2 acknowledge that the locations have not yet been precisely specified.

• “Accommodate ground movement and associated effects arising from the construction thereof,

-‘Pile downdrag’ which affects ground movement, has not yet been assessed, and ‘Damage Category’ figures seem to have been conflated. See the following paragraph from the Robert Bird Group Report regarding ‘Pile downdrag’:

“However the report did not consider the effects of **pile downdrag**, which is the additional settlement of the piles relative to the soil due to the local ground movement near the tunnels. AECOM acknowledged that greater settlement would occur as a result of this downdrag, and they recommended that the effects of pile downdrag be considered in the next stage of assessment.”

• Mitigate the effects of noise and vibration arising from the operation of the HS2 railway within the tunnels, ventilation shaft and associated below & above ground structures.

-Site specific noise and vibration data from HS2 has not yet been provided.

Without the above information, according to condition 17, this application by the developer to discharge condition 17 should not be approved.

Thank you in advance for consideration of these points and suggestions.

Best regards,

Eric Peel

Resident of Swiss Cottage Ward

