Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Printed on: 04/05/2017 09:10:03 Response:
Application No: 2017/1230/P	Consultees Name: Simon Kemper	Consultees Addr: 32 Reachview Close Baynes Street NW1 0TY NW1 0TY	Received: 03/05/2017 20:05:03	Comment: OBJ	Response: The proposal seems totally inadequate with regard to fire safety, particularly in the case of the Northern building that can only be accessed from the courtyard. It is clear that due to the constriction of the courtyard entrance by gates, as shown in page 38 of the Design and Access statement This negates the claim that the gate/tunnel will provide views from the street to the canal, but more critically, no fire appliance can be got into the courtyard. P 71 of the D & A, Appendix 5 states "The scheme has been designed to provide safe access for fire fighters." But evidently NOT their vital (literally, in the event of a serious fire) appliances" "Consultation took place with London Fire Brigade prior to the previous application"
					But a critical, safety-compromising change has been made between the 2 applications - the first application showed that fire appliances COULD enter the courtyard. "advice has been
					provided by an independent Fire Consultant"
					I can find no evidence of the existence of this advice in the submitted documents. So we only have the bare assertion from 1 Housing that it exists, or that if it does exist, it is from a suitable expert and justifies the proposed new arrangements.
					"Each of the three residential building cores will be fitted with dry risers in case of fire and the northern building will be fitted with sprinklers, if necessary, due to the distance from the roadway."
					Sprinklers "if necessary??? But no access for either water pumping fire engines, nor turntable ladders to rescue trapped persons if the fire is on one of the lower floors and they are on the upper.
					This does NOT seem like adequate fire-safety arrangements for a 6 storey residential building, to be so completely isolated from rescue and to depend entirely on dry risers and POSSIBLE fire extinguishers.

					Printed on:	04/05/2017	09:10:03	
Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:			
2017/1230/P	Simon Kemper	32 Reachview Close	03/05/2017 20:09:22	OBJ	Re previous comment, for the avoidance of doubt, this should have said :			
		Baynes Street NW1 0TY NW1 0TY			"it seems clear from the graphics, dimensions and words in the design and access statement that in the second application, fire appliances will NOT be able to access the courtyard. This negates the advice received for the previous application from the Fire Brigade, as the situation has materially changed in a very important way. This proposal does NOT seem to make adequate fire-safety provision for the Northern building"			