

Meeting:	100 Avenue Road CWG – Meeting Minutes		
Date:	2 February 2026		
Venue:	Swiss Cottage Community Centre, 19 Winchester Rd, London NW3 3NR		
Attendees:			
	Sarah Wardle (Chair)	SW	Cavendish
	Joseph Baker-Roberts	JBR	Cavendish
	Steve Harrington	SH	Arada London
	Simon Bram	SB	Arada London
	Cllr Anna Burrage	AB	Camden Council
	Cllr Matthew Kirk	MK	Camden Council
	Elizabeth Beaumont	EB	Camden Council
	Roger Evans	RE	Local Resident
	Dan Corby	DC	Local Resident
	Alan Selwyn	AS	Local Resident
	Sulleiman Osman	SO	Local Resident
	Alan Mason	AM	Local Resident
	Janine Sachs	JS	Local Resident
	Edie Raff	ER	Local Resident
	Kitty Balint	KB	Local Resident
	Elaine Chambers	EC	Local Resident
	David Thomas	DT	Local Resident
	Swiss Cottage Surgery	SC	Local Resident
	Nick Wicks	NW	Local Resident
	Francoise Findlay	FF	Local Resident
	Rashid Iqbal	RI	Local Resident
	Lauren Keiles	LK	Local Resident

Item		Action
	Actions	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Investigate the rental rates for the social housing properties. Review the arrangements for small deliveries using the Winchester Road access. Investigate whether it is possible to display the monitoring information on the hoardings. Review whether the CMP references access for lorries via Winchester Road. Review the feasibility of closing the pavement between the north entrance and the library. Confirm the impact of the construction on Swiss Cottage Special School. Share answers to questions on the website and in future meetings once confirmed. Confirm the list of additional contacts for outreach. 	
1.0	Administrative Matters	
1.1	The meeting began with introductions.	
	Noted	

1.2	Several additional attendees arrived after the commencement of the meeting and have henceforth been referred to as Attendee	Noted
1.3	It was confirmed that SW would act as Chair of the meeting.	Noted
1.4	The frequency of meetings was established, with an expectation of one meeting per month for the foreseeable future, with the next meeting taking place virtually.	Noted
1.5	It was agreed that personal recordings of the meeting could take place.	Noted
2.0	Presentation	
2.1	SH began by outlining the change from Regal to Arada, noting that this is solely a change of name and not of staff.	Noted
2.2	SH proceeded to give an update on the current status of the proposals, advising that Arada were still working through pre-start planning obligations.	Noted
2.3	SH also confirmed that The Winch decided that taking space in the development would not be suitable for their operation, and that an alternate solution was being sought with The Winch for funding. RI from The Winch was invited to comment.	Noted
2.4	RI stated that this was the decision of The Winch, not Arada, relating to practicalities of the space. They also clarified that there was no ill feeling between The Winch and Arada over this decision.	Noted
2.5	ER stated their frustration at this decision, noting that the provision of space for The Winch was one of the primary reasons for the approval of the site.	Noted
2.6	SH replied stating that this decision has been flagged and discussed with Camden Council and both Arada and The Winch are satisfied with the outcome.	Noted
2.7	SH informed attendees that Arada has submitted two additional applications to Camden Council in order to provide additional affordable housing as fully social housing, noting that this will be managed by Clarion Housing Group.	Noted
2.8	JS asked if these flats would be fully social rented housing with a 40% market rate.	Noted
2.9	SH confirmed that this would be fully socially rented housing but noted that the team would investigate the rate of rent for these properties.	Action
2.10	SH reminded attendees that this does not prevent work on site under the permission that was previously secured.	Noted
2.11	SH confirmed discussions taking place with Camden around a formal payment to The Winch, in lieu of their occupancy of the 100 Avenue Road building.	Noted

2.12	Attendee asked for confirmation that Arada would be progressing with the construction regardless of what Camden have to say about the aforementioned applications.	Noted
2.13	SH noted that the building already has planning approval from Camden Council and that Arada are committed to start the construction process from late March.	Noted
2.14	ER asked where the construction lorries will travel from, noting the issues with the previous Essential Living lorries travelling down Winchester Road and Eton Avenue.	Noted
2.15	SH replied that a Construction Management Plan (CMP) has been submitted to the Council that follows on from the draft CMP that was discussed at the planning committee.	Noted
2.16	JS noted the confusion of three CMPs, with two on the consultation website and one posted by Camden, which are all slightly different.	Noted
2.17	JS followed up that the provided draft CMPs were missing appendices, notably Appendix F, which detailed vehicle movements and asked that the Arada CMP to be added to the Camden portal.	Noted
2.18	EC noted that the proposed site entry differs from the Essential Living entry point, which was situated nearer to the library.	Noted
2.19	Attendee asked if works at the site have been impacted by HS2.	Noted
2.20	Attendee asked if the works have been impacted the Central School of Speech and Drama	Noted
2.21	SB confirmed that the access point is further north than Essential Living's.	Noted
2.22	Attendee noted that this was currently occupied by HS2, which SB confirmed.	Noted
2.23	Attendee asked if HS2 would be leaving this area before construction.	Noted
2.24	SB confirmed that this was the intention.	Noted
2.25	Attendee noted that the HS2 timetable proposed a break between February and April, before recommencing work between April and August.	Noted
2.26	SB replied confirming that Arada are coordinating with HS2 and noted that the HS2 programme has suffered delays.	Noted
2.27	SB confirmed the intention to commence in March, allowing the construction of the haul road to allow access from Avenue Road.	Noted
2.28	DT asked for confirmation as to whether Winchester Road will be used for construction access.	Noted

2.29	SB replied that Winchester Road and Eton Avenue would only be used for small deliveries.	Noted
2.30	EC asked for the frequency of these deliveries.	Noted
2.31	SB noted that this would be a last resort option and only in exceptional circumstances, likely one delivery every couple of months.	Noted
2.32	EC noted the existing traffic on Winchester Road and that this had a negative impact on the health and wellbeing of residents and expressed concern that this would add to these issues.	Noted
2.33	SW asked SB to clarify that these vehicle movements would be infrequent and only used as a last resort.	Noted
2.34	SB confirmed this.	Noted
2.35	Attendee asked why smaller lorries require a different access route to larger lorries.	Noted
2.36	SB replied that this was solely as a contingency plan that would not be frequently used.	Noted
2.37	SB suggested that this could be removed if this was an issue.	Action
2.38	AB noted that it would be best to avoid Winchester Road.	Noted
2.39	SW instructed SB to talk through the prepared presentation slides.	Noted
2.40	SB progressed through the presentation.	Noted
2.41	EC asked if this will be recorded and accessible for residents.	Noted
2.42	SB confirmed that these will be reported monthly.	Noted
2.43	SH added that both Arada and Camden will be monitoring the site and stated that if residents raise queries with Camden Council.	Noted
2.44	EC noted that Essential Living shared a monitor with residents and requested a meter on the hoardings which outlined noise levels.	Noted
2.45	SW confirmed that this is something to look into but noted that future meetings will display meter readings.	Action
2.46	NW noted the complexity of noise readings and that these would be reviewed by Camden Council regularly.	Noted
2.47	ER contested this, noting Camden's policy of noise level aggregation, devaluing periods of noise level breaching the permitted levels.	Noted

2.48	EB confirmed that this is a standard way of calculating noise levels and noted that Camden are currently reviewing the CMP.	Noted
2.49	EB also reminded the attendees that Camden will take note of the comments expressed in this meeting.	Noted
2.50	EB also confirmed that it expects the site to relay the readings at regular intervals and to explain any spikes or changes to the readings.	Noted
2.51	SW noted that Arada are their own contractors, removing the need to reach out to sub-contractors which may elongate the complaints process.	Noted
2.52	SW also referred attendees to the contact information available on the website, noting that complaints will be passed on and escalated through these channels.	Noted
2.53	SB progressed through the presentation, clarifying that the site has two access points, the north access point being near the traffic island where HS2 is currently operating.	Noted
2.54	ER asked how many movements are expected each day.	Noted
2.55	SB confirmed that he will clarify this.	Noted
2.56	SB further noted that the aim was for the Pitt Lane not to be used for the duration of the project, as vehicles can be held on site. However, this option will be reserved for busier periods in order to help with traffic flow, but noted that this would require an approval process further down the line.	Noted
2.57	JS noted an approximate projection of a lorry moving in or out of the site every seven minutes. They also noted that lorries would be required to circle the site if the site was overcrowded, meaning Winchester Avenue and Eton Road would be used if required.	Noted
2.58	SH confirmed that lorries would always access via Avenue Road. Only small deliveries would use Winchester Road.	Noted
2.59	JS replied that they believe there is a specific mention of lorries using Winchester Road and Eton Avenue.	Noted
2.60	SH confirmed that they will look at this and SB will provide a response on this.	Action
2.61	Attendee asked what the safety provisions were for crossing Finchley Road and Avenue Road	Noted
2.62	SB pointed to the presence of two traffic marshals, as well as a pedestrian signal and barriers that can be moved to temporarily halt the flow of pedestrians.	Noted
2.63	SH clarified that the pavement would remain open, and that this refers to the access points on Avenue Road.	Noted

2.64	Attendee requested clarity as to whether the pedestrians will be halted when vehicles are moving in and out of the site.	Noted
2.65	SH confirmed that this would be the case.	Noted
2.66	Attendee asked what the process would be if there was an accident	Noted
2.67	SH replied stating that work on the site would cease immediately and an investigation would launched. However, he noted the safety measures in place to reduce the risk of accidents happening.	Noted
2.68	MK asked what the Winchester Road delivery contingency plan is used for, asking what would activate this option being taken.	Noted
2.69	MK also asked whether this plan was actually needed and whether it could be amended.	Noted
2.70	SB confirmed that this is something that will be reviewed.	Action
2.71	MK noted that this would be popular. SB agreed.	Noted
2.72	MK asked again what was meant by the term 'contingency' in this scenario.	Noted
2.73	SH replied that the idea behind the move was to keep the site moving and efficient, but that this was not an essential part of the CMP.	Noted
2.74	SH reiterated that this aspect of the CMP will be reviewed.	Action
2.75	AB noted the presence of two local schools and asked for the mitigations for the increase in pedestrian footfall around school opening and closing.	Noted
2.76	Attendee also asked whether the closure of the pavement between the north entrance and the library had been considered.	Noted
2.77	SH confirmed that this was a TfL issue and that this is something that can be reviewed.	Action
2.78	AB asked whether the arrival of children at Swiss Cottage Special School will be impeded by the presence of large vehicle traffic nearby.	Noted
2.79	SH noted that they will take this away and confirm this.	Action
2.80	SW confirmed that questions that are not answered directly in this session will be shared on the website, and that these will be covered off in future meetings.	Action
2.81	RI also reminded attendees of the walking bus that arrives at The Winch from the Holy Trinity School and stated they were happy to discuss this further with the project team.	Noted

2.82	ER asked how deliveries will operate post construction.	Noted
2.83	SW reminded the residents that this discussion is about the construction phase, rather than post construction.	Noted
2.84	SH stated that the process for deliveries post construction is being worked on as the construction progresses, but that finite details are not currently present.	Noted
2.85	ER noted their concern that the development could be built without this thought in mind.	Noted
2.86	SH stated that they are working out the details throughout the process.	Noted
2.87	ER contested that this is greater than a finite detail and should be given thought prior to construction.	Noted
2.88	SH confirmed the specifics will be brought forward through the relevant planning conditions at the appropriate time.	Noted
2.89	JS asked whether it would be better to have this thought out prior to construction.	Noted
2.90	SH noted the plans and draft plans that were brought forward as part of the planning application process, and that once the development progresses, these details can be finalised in advance of the site being occupied.	Noted
2.91	JS asked whether this would include getting rid of the market.	Noted
2.92	SH refuted this question.	Noted
2.93	SW stated that no further answers on this topic can be given at this stage.	Noted
2.94	EC responded to a previous point from AB around the closure of the pavement, questioning the necessity of this as children typically move through the green, rather than the pavement.	Noted
2.95	AB referenced organisations that could not attend, including the Chalcots Project and HS2, questioning whether there had been outreach with the Chalcots Project.	Noted
2.96	AB also asked for the proposed engagement plan with the following local institutions: UCL Academy Swiss Cottage Special School Hampstead Theatre Royal Central School of Speech and Drama Swiss Cottage Leisure Centre Swiss Cottage Community Centre The Winch	Noted

2.97	<p>SW noted that these organisations were engaged during the pre-application phase, as well as part of the CMP consultation but that the project team are happy to continue to engage with these institutions.</p>	Noted
2.98	<p>SH asked whether AB could help confirm a list of contacts to reach out to and that this could result in a further session with AB and these organisations</p>	Action
2.99	<p>EC replied to AB noting that the lack of representation of these organisations represents a lack of interest on their part.</p>	Noted
2.100	<p>AB clarified that this was not a lack of interest but a lack of awareness of the upcoming work.</p>	Noted
2.101	<p>SW requested that any further comments be shared with the project team via the contact details listed on the website.</p>	Noted
2.102	<p>KB asked how these rules would be enforced.</p>	Noted
2.103	<p>EB replied that there is a dedicated CMP Site Inspector to check for compliance every couple of months. In addition to this, unannounced visits and a dedicated CMP Enforcement Officer who will investigate and take action against any breaches.</p>	Noted
2.104	<p>EB asked whether there will be a bond on the site from which fines will be taken.</p>	Noted
2.105	<p>SH confirmed this was the case.</p>	Noted
2.106	<p>KB asked for clarity on this term.</p>	Noted
2.107	<p>EB stated that the bond acts as a deposit that gets fined and extracted from if there are breaches, but noted this would only be for continual issues. They also confirmed that Camden have the power to stop construction, but noted that this is extremely rare.</p>	Noted
2.108	<p>MK asked if the construction bond was in place.</p>	Noted
2.109	<p>SH confirmed this was the case.</p>	Noted
2.110	<p>JS expressed concerns around the changes to the CMP that were not consulted on and asked that future changes will be consulted on.</p>	Noted
2.111	<p>SW replied that attendees will be made aware of any changes.</p>	Noted
2.112	<p>JS asked whether this will be a prefabricated development.</p>	Noted
2.113	<p>SB stated that this was not the case.</p>	Noted
2.114	<p>EC asked what the overall need for the development was.</p>	Noted

2.115	SW replied that this was too broad a question to answer in this meeting and that the minutes would be shared with attendees and the broader distribution list.	Noted
2.116	JS offered a copy of the recording of the meeting by reaching out to saveswisscottage@icloud.com	Noted
2.117	The meeting ended.	Noted
3.0	Post Script	
3.1	N/A	Noted