

---

**From:** judith [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 26 July 2017 08:49  
**To:** McClue, Jonathan  
**Cc:** Planning  
**Subject:** 100 AVENUE ROAD, SWISS COTTAGE, NW3 3HF APPLICATION REF: 2017/4036/P  
S96A NON-MATERIAL AMENDMENT APPLICATION

Dear Jonathan McClue,

I wish to object in the strongest terms to the so-called "non-material amendment" application S96A. Far from being small details to be skipped over and accepted, the changes set out in this amendment application are, in fact, material, and deeply worrying. They introduce changes to layout and design, which are described as "improvements" but which would have the effect of reducing the safety of all residents, and of stigmatising residents of the affordable units.

Changes to the elevational treatment and to the glazing detail are not within the spirit of the existing planning permission. They do not, as the developer's allege in their covering letter, offer 'an improvement'. They change fundamental elements of the internal and external design. They impact differently upon adjoining occupiers and the surrounding environment. Most importantly they raise important safety concerns which have not been addressed in this application.

Let's start with safety. In a tower with a single stairwell, it's essential that there is sufficient space to allow safe evacuation in case of a fire. Reducing hallway space in the interest of increasing the size of individual units (probably not the affordable units?) runs counter to this vital point. Clearly the London Fire Brigade should have been consulted, yet there is no sign that this has been done - indeed, it seems highly unlikely that they would have approved of this change. Similarly, where are the assurances from the London Fire Brigade that changes to the glazing, the "means of opening windows" and the "positioning of the balconies" will not have an impact on fire safety in a tower designed with only one stairwell?

Would the main 100 Avenue Road planning application have been accepted if it had included "poor doors", separating residents of affordable homes from other residents? I think not. Yet this application proposes to do exactly that, through changes to the entrance arrangements for the affordable units. In the proposed changes, the developers say the entrance to the affordable units will be altered simply to provide, 'more attractive retail units'. Camden Council should not be permitting developers to change their planning permission in order to introduce 'poor doors'. Stigmatising any group through housing design is unacceptable.

Finally, the granted permission stated that the glazing on the tower would be kept well maintained. The current application offers no information about how the windows will be kept clean without this rooftop maintenance unit. This, too is a material change.

Thank you for your attention

With kind regards

Judith Gubbay  
20A Crossfield Road