

From: Tulip Siddiq [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 October 2018 17:40
To: McClue, Jonathan [REDACTED]
Cc: 100avenueroadCMP [REDACTED]
Subject: 2017/6638/CMP100 Avenue Road - Tulip

Dear Mr McClue,

I am writing on behalf of constituents who have expressed concerns over Essential Living's (EL) Construction Management Plan (CMP). The 100 Avenue Road skyscraper remains a controversial project, and residents have raised a number of practical objections to which I hope the Council can respond.

Before I turn to the practical objections to the plan itself, I first want to address the perception that the discussion surrounding 100 Avenue Road is being fought on uneven terms; my constituents tell me EL have been approaching councillors directly, lobbying them on the plans, while residents' comments are not being posted on the Council website. They feel this critical undermines the transparency of the process, leaving residents without a meaningful say.

It's vital that those responsible for the process encourage confidence that the developer is playing by the same rules as local residents. I regret to say that, having spoken to many constituents about the plans throughout EL's consultation, this does not seem to be the case at present.

Residents are asking for a fresh review and consultation of the CMP, since there has been a considerable amendment to the plans which render them significantly different than the plans consulted on. As you're aware, developers have to consult the local community on a CMP before submission and I know that this has already taken place – however, since the original submission my residents inform me that EL have altered the plan to include a 600% increase in HGV traffic using Swiss Cottage Green Space.

My constituents have noted – fairly, in my view – that the Council's offer that people should write in, and that their comments will be summarised at the next planning committee, are insufficient. Given the change being proposed, and the potential for a substantial increase in disruption, I feel the Council should take steps to show residents that they are being heard. Instead, I understand that the Council has as yet declined to make the developer submit to another public consultation. I would appreciate if you could explain why this is, especially given that such a significant alteration has been made to the plans on which the developers previously consulted.

Turning to the demands that residents are making of the CMP, residents would like to see four key assurances:

1. The plan accounts for TfL's published policy directives, which include; "construction traffic must avoid sensitive receptors such as schools, pedestrian areas, markets, as well as pollution effects of reduced air quality".

2. The CMP relocates existing proposals to the A41 highway. This will safeguard the open space, currently under threat from construction traffic.

3. Relocation of A41 bus stop(s) to be distanced from the site to ease the flow of construction and assist making all site service access practical.

4. A reinforced northern access point so that the blocks are developed concurrently.

As I said at the outset 100 Avenue Road is a controversial project and, with it now going ahead, our priority should be to ensure that residents' voices are heard throughout the planning process. The requests made by my constituents seem worth consideration and I ask that the Council address each of the above points.

Please can you outline how the Council intends to include residents in the remainder of the process, and how their concerns will be considered before the proposed CMP is undertaken.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Best wishes,

Tulip Siddiq

Office of Tulip Siddiq MP
Member of Parliament for Hampstead and Kilburn

