

Gentet, Matthias

From: Edie Raff [REDACTED]
Sent: 09 August 2017 14:34
To: McClue, Jonathan
Cc: Planning
Subject: APPLICATION no: 2017/4036/P NON-MATERIAL AMENDMENT

Further to my Earlier Objection to:

100 AVENUE ROAD, SWISS COTTAGE, NW3 3HF APPLICATION no: [2017/4036/P](#)
NON-MATERIAL AMENDMENT

Dear Jonathan McClue

With the Grenfell tragedy still at the forefront of our thoughts and in regard to the duty of care to the safety of not only tower blocks already built - but 24 story towers about to be built - it is surely all the more urgent to be vigilant with what is allowed and not allowed to proceed.

It was with a renewed sense of horror, therefore, that upon reading this application again, I noticed that Essential Living are cutting back on very obvious and crucial safety measures. What they are seeking permission for with this supposedly 'non-material' amendment is to cut back **four** of their originally planned **seven safety exits**. How can this not materially affect the safety of future tenants in the building?

Their proposals in this application to leave only **one** exit for the 24 storey tower! and only **one** exit for affordable housing tenants are inexcusable in this time of heightened safety awareness.

Can the Council, hand on heart (and not on bank balance) really be convinced, in the light of these new, material proposals, that all possible safety measures are in place for the proposed new build at 100 Avenue Road?

I ask that the Council recognizes how harmful these proposals are to the future safety of the tenants, that these proposals are recognized for the material amendments they are and that the Council therefore rejects this application outright.

Kind regards

Edie Raff

Gentet, Matthias

From: Sybil Everitt <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 09 August 2017 14:15
To: [REDACTED] Planning
Cc:
Subject: Fwd: Planning application no.2017/4036/P - "NON"-Material Amendments

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: [REDACTED]
Date: 9 August 2017 at 14:02:45 BST
To: [REDACTED], planning@camden.gov.uk
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Planning application no.2017/4036/P - "NON"-Material Amendments

Dear Sirs,

These Amendments are clearly VERY Material!

Have Camden Council Planning Department learned absolutely nothing from the Grenfell disaster - and those tragic deaths? Don't the lives of what will mostly be "foreign" people (the majority of the wealthy who could afford to buy property in such an place and such an area as London NW3) matter at all?

Why are you cutting out doors and exits? (To make more money from them of course ...)

Why are you reducing communal space on the landings ... again only to maximise profits.

How can these alterations be considered non-material amendments?

You completely disregard the present residents of Camden ... the public you are all supposed to represent and act for.

What about the wind tunnels created by tower blocks?

What about the already traffic congested neighbourhood and the footfall in this historic area on London?

Do you really want to make Swiss Cottage a new "New York" with access only possible by car. Have we the roads for this?

Didn't it register with you planners that there has been yet another tower block fire in Dubai.

Is maximising profit really the only 'relevant' criteria in your life - and the lives of the people of Camden - let alone your proposed tenants. How short sighted you all are in the pursuit of money.

Let the future go hang seems to be your maxim.

Yours sincerely,
Sybil Everitt
Flat 15 Taplow
Aadelaide Road
London NW33NY

Sent from my iPhone

Gentet, Matthias

From: Sybil Everitt <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 09 August 2017 14:03
To: [REDACTED] Planning
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Planning application no.2017/4036/P - "NON"-Material Amendments

Dear Sirs,

These Amendments are clearly VERY Material!

Have Camden Council Planning Department learned absolutely nothing from the Grenfell disaster - and those tragic deaths? Don't the lives of what will mostly be "foreign" people (the majority of the wealthy who could afford to buy property in such an place and such an area as London NW3) matter at all?

Why are you cutting out doors and exits? (To make more money from them of course ...)

Why are you reducing communal space on the landings ... again only to maximise profits.

How can these alterations be considered non-material amendments?

You completely disregard the present residents of Camden ... the public you are all supposed to represent and act for.

What about the wind tunnels created by tower blocks?

What about the already traffic congested neighbourhood and the footfall in this historic area on London?

Do you really want to make Swiss Cottage a new "New York" with access only possible by car. Have we the roads for this?

Didn't it register with you planners that there has been yet another tower block fire in Dubai.

Is maximising profit really the only 'relevant ' criteria in your life - and the lives of the people of Camden - let alone your proposed tenants. How short sighted you all are in the pursuit of money.

Let the future go hang seems to be your maxim.

Yours sincerely,
Sybil Everitt
Flat 15 Taplow
Adelaide Road
London NW33NY

Sent from my iPhone

Gentet, Matthias

From: Gillian Cook [REDACTED] on behalf of Gillian Cook
Sent: 09 August 2017 13:53
To: McClue, Jonathan
Cc: Planning
Subject: 100 AVENUE ROAD, NW3 3HF APPLICATION no: 2017/4036/P

Dear Jonathan McClue,

Further to my letter of 30.07.17

I wish to object to the following application: 100 AVENUE ROAD, SWISS COTTAGE, NW3 3HF
APPLICATION no: 2017/4036/P NON-MATERIAL AMENDMENT

The points below clearly constitute material amendments to the existing planning permission, therefore this application should be rejected.

The reasons given for these amendments are to “deliver an improved environment for future occupiers of both the residential and commercial uses...The changes to the internal layouts improve the quality and configuration of the apartments, utilising excess and oversized hallways to improve the unit sizes”

Removing four out of seven doorways, leaving only three out of the originally planned seven exits, and reducing hallway space to increase residential and commercial space will not “improve the environment”.

These are significant, material changes that will only serve to maximise profits and minimise safety and are consequently unacceptable.

yours sincerely,

Gillian Cook

Gentet, Matthias

From: Annelies Simeloff [REDACTED]
Sent: 09 August 2017 12:55
To: McClue, Jonathan
Cc: Planning
Subject: 100 AVENUE ROAD, NW3 3HF APPLICATION no: 2017/4036/P

I wish to object to the application 100 Avenue Road, Swiss Cottage, NW3 3HF application No. 2017/4036/P Non-material Amendment

!) Reduction in number of external doors.
"Removal of doors/access to the chamfered North West corner of the PRS lobby and hard landscaped area replaced with soft landscaping/water feature"

The above refers to one of two main entrances/exits of the tower facing Avenue Road. The proposed is unacceptable because it will reduce escape routes from the tower and this for the sake of a water feature?? This is a material change.

In addition the new drawings show that 2 further exits have also been entirely removed at the south aspect of the tower. This change is NOT mentioned in the covering letter. The change means that there is now only ONE EXIT FOR THE 24 STOREY TOWER instead of the THREE that were granted in the original planning permission. This again is a material change.

2) "Removal of a secondary residents access and removal entrance door."
(This refers to the "affordable entrance" at the eastern side of the horizontal "affordable" building.)
This change reduces exit options and therefore fire safety for the affordable residents. Reason given for this change is "regard to the needs of separate servicing and general pedestrian access and to improve THE ATTRACTIVENESS OF THE GROUND FLOOR COMMERCIAL UNITS."
This servicing plant area has not been mentioned before in this application; it is not mentioned in the Cover Letter; it is also not mentioned that this change will increase the commercial/retail space while taking the place of a much needed residential entrance hall that connects the east and west entrances as shown in the original plans.

The proposal leaves only ONE exit at Avenue Road instead of TWO as in the original application. It thus compromises fire safety for the affordable residents.
The other remaining third exit, for the whole development, is for the entirely separate DMR/intermediate section of the same building.
Prioritising commercial interests over people's safety is unacceptable. The removal of this exit constitutes a material amendment.

3)iii) "Changes to the internal layouts to improve the quality and configuration of the apartments (by utilising excess and oversized hallways to improve the unit sizes".
i.e. simply stated, a reduction of hallway size in order to enlarge unit sizes and maximise profits.
Reducing hall way space has the effect of compromising fire safety. Particularly now that there is only ONE exit door there will be problems in case of a need for evacuation.
Also prioritising commercial interests over people's safety constitutes a material change.

iv) A new stairwell is proposed that will come up from the basement where the PRS Bike Store (144 Bicycles) was originally planned.
Why is there no mention of this change in the Cover Letter and in addition what is the purpose of this change??

Lastly why are the revised drawings not dated? Drawings must be dated so records can be maintained. In the light of the Grenfell Tower disaster can the applicant show that fire safety issues arising have been catered for?

This application proposes "non-material" changes, however a number of material changes are listed in my objection.

Anneliese Simeloff
Flat 1, 86 Goldhurst Terrace, NW6 3HS

Gentet, Matthias

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 09 August 2017 13:05
To: McClue, Jonathan
Cc: Planning
Subject: 100 AVENUE ROAD, SWISS COTTAGE, NW3 3HF APPLICATION no: 2017/4036/P

9th August 2017. **This is an objection to the following application:**

**100 AVENUE ROAD, SWISS COTTAGE, NW3 3HF APPLICATION no: 2017/4036/P
NON-MATERIAL AMENDMENT**

The details outlined below indisputably constitute **material amendments** to the existing planning permission, therefore this application should be rejected.

The reasons given for these amendments are to "*deliver an improved environment for future occupiers of both the residential and commercial uses...The changes to the internal layouts improve the quality and configuration of the apartments, utilising excess and oversized hallways to improve the unit sizes*"

Removing four out of seven doorways, leaving **only three out of the originally planned seven exits**, and reducing hallway space to increase residential and commercial space **will not "improve the environment"**.

These are **significant, material changes** that will only serve to maximise profits and minimise safety and are consequently unacceptable.

Reduction in number of external doors

i) "Removal of doors / access to the chamfered North West corner of the PRS lobby and hard landscaped area replaced with soft landscaping / water feature".

i.e. one of the two main entrances of the tower facing Avenue Road.

- This is unacceptable because it will reduce escape options for the tower (for the sake of a water feature!) **This is a material change.**
- Furthermore, according to the new drawings and not mentioned in the Cover Letter, two further exits have also been entirely removed, at the south aspect of the tower. This means that there would **now only be ONE exit for the 24 storey tower**, instead of the three that were originally granted in the planning permission. **This is a material change.**

ii) "Removal of a secondary residents access and removal of entrance door".

i.e. 'the affordable entrance' at the eastern side of the horizontal, 'affordable' building.

- This reduces exit options and therefore fire safety for the affordable residences. The reason given for this amendment is because of "regard to the need to separate servicing and general pedestrian access and to improve the attractiveness of the ground floor commercial units".

- This servicing area is only just being introduced in this application, it should if needed have been part of the original plan, not brought in at this late stage. **It's an after thought and significantly a material change.** It will take the place of a much needed residential entrance hall that connects the east and west entrances, as shown in the original plans. **There is no mention of this significant, material change in the Cover Letter.** It is obviously prioritising commercial/retail space at the expense of the so called 'affordable' residential space. **It is a material change**
- The proposal leaves only one exit at Avenue Road, instead of the originally planned two for the 'affordable' building. The loss of this important exit will surely compromise fire safety and indisputably constitutes **a material change.**
- The other remaining third exit, for the whole development, is for the entirely separate DMR/intermediate section of the same building.
- Prioritising commercial interests over people's safety is unacceptable. The removal of this exit constitutes **a material change .**

Reduction in internal public space

iii) "Changes to the internal layouts to improve the quality and configuration of the apartments (by) utilising excess and oversized hallways to improve the unit sizes".
i.e. simply stated, a reduction of hallway size in order to enlarge unit sizes and maximise profits.

- This will have the effect of compromising fire safety, **particularly within a 24 storey tower designed with only one stairwell,** (since Grenfell, single stairwells are regarded as ill advised) Reducing the hall space still further **increases the problems of an evacuation. This is indeed a material change.**
- Prioritising commercial interests over people's safety is unacceptable and **not in the spirit of the new fire regulations** that will have to be rolled out post Grenfell.

Other Changes

iv) A new stairwell is proposed that will come up from the basement where the PRS Bike Store (144 Bicycles) was originally planned.

- Apart from there being **no reference to this change in the Cover Letter,** it is a mystery as to what this stairwell will serve as it will surface at the pathway near the green space. This will inevitably increase people traffic and around the green and limit the desired tranquility that the community hoped to maintain. It will therefore have a noticeable affect on the amenities. **This is a material change that needs explaining.**
- **Anomalies that need amending.**

The revised drawings must be dated and re-submitted to planning@camden.gov.uk

In the light of the Grenfell tower fire, one would have expected a responsible adjustment to the now disgraced fire regulations there is no evidence of this in these new material applications, in fact the contrary is the case!

This application claims to propose 'non-material' changes. It is evident that these changes are 'material', consequently this application must be rejected.

**Yours sincerely,
Elaine Chambers chair Winchester Road Residents Assoc(WRRA)**

Gentet, Matthias

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 09 August 2017 12:34
To: McClue, Jonathan
Cc: Planning
Subject: 100 AVENUE ROAD, SWISS COTTAGE, NW3 3HF APPLICATION no: 2017/4036/P - JB

Dear Sir

I wish to object to the following application: **100 AVENUE ROAD, SWISS COTTAGE, NW3 3HF APPLICATION no: [2017/4036/P](#) NON-MATERIAL AMENDMENT**

The points below clearly constitute material amendments to the existing planning permission, therefore this application should be rejected.

The reasons given for these amendments are to "deliver an improved environment for future occupiers of both the residential and commercial uses...The changes to the internal layouts improve the quality and configuration of the apartments, utilising excess and oversized hallways to improve the unit sizes"

Removing four out of seven doorways, leaving **only three out of the originally planned seven exits**, and reducing hallway space to increase residential and commercial space will not "improve the environment".

These are significant, material changes that will only serve to maximise profits and minimise safety and are consequently unacceptable.

Reduction in number of external doors

i) "Removal of doors / access to the chamfered North West corner of the PRS lobby and hard landscaped area replaced with soft landscaping / water feature".
i.e. one of the two main entrances of the tower facing Avenue Road.

- This is unacceptable because it will reduce escape options for the tower (for the sake of a water feature). This is a material change.
- Furthermore, according to the new drawings and not mentioned in the Cover Letter, two further exits have also been entirely removed, at the south aspect of the tower. This means that there would **now only be ONE exit for the 24 storey tower**, instead of the three that were originally granted in the planning permission. This is a material change.

ii) "Removal of a secondary residents access and removal of entrance door".
i.e. 'the affordable entrance' at the eastern side of the horizontal, 'affordable' building.

- This reduces exit options and therefore fire safety for the affordable residences. The reason given for this amendment is because of "regard to the need to separate

servicing and general pedestrian access and to improve the attractiveness of the ground floor commercial units”.

- Yet this servicing/plant area is only just now being introduced in this application. It will take the place of a much needed residential entrance hall that connects the east and west entrances, as shown in the original plans. There is no mention of this significant, material change in the Cover Letter. And it is also not acknowledged that this change will increase the commercial/retail space.
- The proposal only leaves one exit at Avenue Road, instead of the originally planned two for the affordable building. The loss of this important exit will surely compromise fire safety.
- The other remaining third exit, for the whole development, is for the entirely separate DMR/intermediate section of the same building.
- Prioritising commercial interests over people's safety is unacceptable. The removal of this exit constitutes a material amendment.

Reduction in internal public space

iii) “Changes to the internal layouts to improve the quality and configuration of the apartments (by) utilising excess and oversized hallways to improve the unit sizes”.
i.e. simply stated, a reduction of hallway size in order to enlarge unit sizes and maximise profits.

- This will have the effect of compromising fire safety, particularly within a 24 storey tower designed with only one stairwell. Reducing the hall space still further increases the problems of an evacuation. This is a material change.
- Prioritising commercial interests over people's safety is unacceptable.

Other Changes

iv) A new stairwell is proposed that will come up from the basement where the PRS Bike Store (144 Bicycles) was originally planned.

- Apart from there being no reference to this change in the Cover Letter, it is a mystery as to what this stairwell will serve as it will surface at the pathway near the green space. This is a material change that needs explaining.

Questions

- Why are the revised drawings not dated? They need to be resubmitted with dates.
- In the light of the Grenfell tower fire, can the applicants confirm that any fire safety issues now arising have been catered for?

This application proposes ‘non-material’ changes. Yet it is evident that these amendments are ‘material’, therefore this application must be rejected.

Yours sincerely
Jorinda Barnbrook

Gentet, Matthias

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 09 August 2017 17:12
To: McClue, Jonathan
Cc: Planning
Subject: 100 AVENUE ROAD, SWISS COTTAGE, NW3 3HF APPLICATION no: 2017/4036/P
NON-MATERIAL AMENDMENT

Dear Jonathan,

I am writing to make a strong objection again to the above application. Although it says non-material amendment, however, reducing the hall space as well as reducing number of doors could impact on fire safety as it would increase the problems of evacuation, surely this is a material change.

Kind regards,

Misako Ishii
4 Belsize Park
London NW3 4ET