

Gentet, Matthias

From: jane johnson [REDACTED]
Sent: 09 August 2017 18:40
To: McClue, Jonathan
Cc: Planning
Subject: 100 Avenue Rd NW3 3HF/4036/P

This constitutes a material alteration to the original plan and therefore should not be allowed.
Overall the original 7 exits have now been reduced to 3, and the 24 storey tower now has one exit only instead of 3.
These changes must compromise fire safety, and in the light of the Grenfell disaster, are outrageous.
Yours
Jane Johnson
27 Adamson Rd
NW3 3HT

Gentet, Matthias

From: Susan Zur-Szpiro [REDACTED]
Sent: 09 August 2017 20:56
To: McClue, Jonathan; Planning
Subject: 100 Avenue Road, SWISS COTTAGE, NW3 3HF APPLICATION no: 2017/4036/P

Dear Mr McClue and other planning officers

I am writing further to my recent email objecting to other aspects of this building application.

The reason I wish to object further, is that the latest changes being made to the plans by Essential Living constitute *material changes*, which would make the building even less safe than it already is planned to be. In light of the recent horrific lethal fire at Grenfell Tower, and the huge catalogue of fire safety errors and omissions, it is shocking that EL are seeking to reduce the number of doorways from 7 to 3 has nothing to do with safety and residents' comfort, and everything to do with trying to reduce costs.

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.

with thanks

Susan Zur-Szpiro
231 Goldhurst Terrace,
London,
NW6 3EP