
From: Ruth Blair [REDACTED]
Sent: 26 July 2017 15:18
To: McClue, Jonathan
Cc: Planning
Subject: 100 AVENUE ROAD, SWISS COTTAGE, NW3 3HF APPLICATION REF: 2017/4036/P S96A NON-MATERIAL AMENDMENT APPLICATION

Dear Mr McClue,

I am writing to OBJECT, in the strongest possible terms, to the following application:

100 AVENUE ROAD, SWISS COTTAGE, NW3 3HF APPLICATION REF: [2017/4036/P](#) S96A NON-MATERIAL AMENDMENT APPLICATION

Clearly, this application constitutes MATERIAL AMENDMENTS to the existing planning permission. On these grounds, Camden must reject this application.

1. Essential Living are now proposing changes to the entrance arrangements, including the arrangement for the affordable units (aka the 'poor doors'), plus the internal layouts, changes to the elevational treatment and to the glazing detail. None of these proposals are within the spirit of the existing planning permission. Despite Essential Living's wishful thinking in their cover letter, these proposals DO NOT offer 'an improvement'. On the contrary, these proposals change fundamental elements of the internal and external design, and impact differently upon adjoining occupiers and the surrounding environment.

Most importantly, the proposed changes raise important safety concerns which, despite the multiple deaths and injuries and loss of property at the Grenfell Towers disaster and the costly and hugely disruptive steps taken by Camden to prevent a similar disaster at the Chalcots Estate, have not been addressed in this application.

2. It appears that in order to increase the 'unit size' i.e. sq. footage of each 'luxury apartment' the applicant proposes using 'excess' hallway space. Such a reduction in hallway space, particularly within the tower, would be dangerous in the event of a fire or other emergency.
It appears that London Fire Brigade have not been consulted on this change.

This £100m, 24-storey residential tower block is designed with only ONE stairwell - NOT TWO, as was recommended by the coroner after the 2009 high rise Lakanal House fire that killed six people.
By reducing the hallway space Essential Living would put people at further risk during an evacuation.
This would be a material change.

3. The applicant proposes changes to the glazing i.e. the 'means of opening windows' and the 'positioning of the balconies'. Yet again, London Fire Brigade's approval must be sought. With only one stairwell in this £100m development how would these

changes on the 'means of opening windows' and 'positioning of balconies' impact on fire safety?

This is a material change.

4. The applicant now proposes 'Changes to the affordable entrance doors'. In other words, 'poor doors' that would physically divide those in the 'affordable units' from those in Essential Living's 'luxury rental' apartments. Such changes are **material** in that they introduce 'poor doors' to this part of the development. 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 must not permit developers to change their planning permission in order to stigmatise any group through housing design. This is a material change.

5. The applicant proposes removal of the rooftop maintenance unit in the tower due to 'changes in window cleaning strategy'. The granted permission states that the glazing on the tower will be kept well-maintained. Therefore, this is another material amendment. The current application provides no information re. HOW the windows would be kept clean without this rooftop maintenance unit. This a material change.

Kind regards

R Blair

ps Is this the same Essential Living whose 'affordable living' apartments in Archway (ironically in former DWP/HMRC offices) are being marketed via exclusive high-end real estate agents Hamptons and John D. Wood?