

49 Elsworthy Road  
London NW3 3BS

Dear Mr McClue,

31<sup>st</sup> July 2017

**RE: 100 Avenue Road, Swiss Cottage, London NW3 3HF**  
**Application Ref 2017/4036/P**  
**996A Non-Material Amendment Application**

I am writing to object to the above Non-Material Amendment application.

The amendments proposed by the developers are described by them as “non-material” changes. It is my considered view that all the points made below describe material changes, with the first two raising serious fire hazard concerns.

**1. Hallway Space and Fire Hazard**

The apparent reduction in hallway space, especially in the tower, as a means to increase the floor space of residential units (presumably to render them more valuable) creates dangers. How can reducing space in a structure with only one stairwell not be a fire hazard? This needs little elaboration in the light of the Grenfell situation. Why has the London Fire Brigade not been involved to rule on this obvious material change? Have they certified their approval of this change? To repeat, how can reducing hallway space and increasing fire hazards be a “non-material amendment”?

**2. Windows and Fire Hazard**

The changed proposed window opening and balcony arrangements raise fire hazard questions, already a cause for concern given the above single stairwell issue. Again, Grenfell comes to mind. Has the London Fire Brigade been contacted and certified its approval of this change? How can this – or any change with fire implications – be a “non-material amendment”?

**3. Window Cleaning**

What are the “changes in window cleaning strategy” now that the changed plans exclude rooftop maintenance equipment? Since the permission granted assumed that windows would be well-maintained, how is the change resulting in the removal of the facilities for good maintenance be handled? How can any change which will have an impact on window cleaning a heavily glazed modern building be a “non-material amendment”?

#### **4. General Entrance Arrangements**

The developers claim they offer an improvement. There is no improvement. The changes proposed

- a.) have a negative impact on the surrounding environment and the adjoining occupiers;
- b.) do not address safety issues;
- c.) present radical differences in the internal and external designs from previous suggestions, producing poor outcomes;
- d.) radically alter internal layouts, changed elevational treatment and glazing details, all producing an interior outcome to what was originally proposed.

All this – and other details which could be cited – are not in keeping with the spirit of the planning permission which has been granted. And they certainly do not represent “non-material amendments”.

#### **5. Affordable Entrance Doors**

The changes in the entrance arrangements for the affordable units produce a kind of “poor people’s entrance”. The very idea of this is offensive. The developers’ claim that this represents an opportunity to create “more attractive retail units” is bogus in the extreme. It is an attempt to disguise a material change intended to segregate the affordable units and their tenants from the rest of the building. How can a change which stigmatizes one class of occupiers from another be regarded as a “non-material amendment”?

I trust you and your colleagues will consider these points when reviewing the claimed non-materiality of the developers proposed amendments.

Yours sincerely,

  
Iradj Bagherzade