

Gentet, Matthias

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 07 August 2017 22:13
To: McClue, Jonathan
Cc: Planning
Subject: [REDACTED]



Dear Mr McClue,

I wish to object to the following application:

**100 AVENUE ROAD, SWISS COTTAGE, NW3 3HF APPLICATION
REF: 2014/1617/P[SEP]S96A NON-MATERIAL AMENDMENT
APPLICATION**

The details included in this application clearly constitute material amendments to the existing planning permission and should be rejected.

Changes to the entrance arrangements, particularly the 'poor doors' arrangement for the affordable units, changes to the internal layouts, relocation of the rooftop plant, 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 cover 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.

1. Changes to the internal floor-plans appear to use ~~excess~~ hallways to increase unit size. This results in a dangerous reduction in hallway space, particularly within the tower. **It appears that London Fire Brigade have not been consulted on this change.** I have particular concerns that, in a tower designed with only one stairwell, reducing the hall space still further increases the problems of an evacuation. I have concerns that these changes could impact on fire safety. This is a material change.

2. Changes to the glazing, the ~~means of opening windows~~ and the ~~positioning of the balconies~~. Without assurances from London Fire Brigade on the new window opening arrangements and their impact on fire safety in a tower designed with only one stairwell, I have concerns that these changes could impact on fire safety. This is a material change.

3. ~~Changes to the affordable entrance doors~~. These changes are material in that they exacerbate the effect of the ~~poor doors~~ policy in this part of the development and raise safety concerns for the residents in 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~~. The change consists of reducing the number of exits to the so called affordable block to just one exit on Avenue Road. The exit along the East side has disappeared. This change raises safety concerns for residents of the so-called ~~affordable~~ block who now only have one exit. **Once again London fire brigade do not appear to have been consulted.**

As Councillor Phil Jones, the cabinet member for planning said in 2015: ~~Stigmatising any group through housing design is unacceptable. We want development in Camden to be tenure blind...!~~ (28/7/2015 Ham and High). There can be no greater stigmatisation than to reduce the number of safe exits for less wealthy residents. This is a material change.

4. The application makes material changes to the nature of the design externally as well as internally, particularly the impact on Swiss Cottage Green Space. The changes introduce new stairs in the basement of the development which would surface on the pathway near the Swiss Cottage Green Space. This creates new disturbances on the Green

space. As a result, the impact on the Green Space will be substantially worse than in the original planning application. Given that the Inspector reached an on balance decision on the basis of the material presented, these new changes constitute a material change.

5. The application makes material changes to the visual impact of the development. The developers accept in the cover letter that the North Tower core overrun increases the height of the tower. The developers say that the parapet will only largely obscure it from external view. On the face of it, this additional height will cause substantial harm to the Belsize Conservation area. The developer has previously argued that the reason the tower was 24 storeys and not higher was because that was the limit to prevent causing substantial harm. The visual impact report presented as part of the original application stated that 24 storeys was the limit. This a material change.

6. Removal of the rooftop maintenance unit in the tower due to changes in window cleaning strategy. This is a material amendment to the granted permission which 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 a material change.

In conclusion, this application should be rejected as it constitutes material changes to the proposed development.

Yours sincerely,

Sarah Gottlieb