

Gentet, Matthias

From: Marion Howard [REDACTED]
Sent: 10 August 2017 19:00
To: Planning
Subject: Objection: 100 AVENUE ROAD, SWISS COTTAGE, NW3 3HF APPLICATION REF: 2014/1617/P
S96A NON-MATERIAL AMENDMENT APPLICATION

Marion Howard
[REDACTED]

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

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

My objection is based on the following factors:

1) Fire safety for future residents given

- a. 'Removal of a secondary residents access and removal of entrance door' i.e. one of 'the affordable entrances' along the eastern side of the 10-storey building
- i. This poses a danger to safety as it reduces exit options. **There appears to be no letter from London Fire Brigade confirming that they have been consulted about this major change. At a minimum, I would ask that the planning committee request an expert report on these arrangements from the London Fire Brigade.**
 - ii. The developers allege that this amendment is because of "... 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 now being introduced in this application. It will take the place of a 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 also not acknowledged that this change will increase the commercial/retail space.
 - iii. There are now NO EXITS along the length of the eastern length of the 10-

storey building. The proposal is now for only one exit instead of two for the 10-storey building. The only other exit is for the entirely separate DMR/intermediate section of the building. The loss of this important exit compromises fire safety and, without assurances from London Fire brigade that this is safe, the planning committee should reject this application. The removal of this exit constitutes a material amendment.

b) 'Removal of doors / access to the chamfered North West corner of the PRS lobby and hard landscaped area replaced with soft landscaping / water feature' [G]

- i. This is unacceptable because, once again it raises issues of fire safety in that it will reduce escape options for the tower - ~~for~~ for the sake of a water feature.
- ii. Furthermore, and crucially, according to the new drawings (but not mentioned in the Cover Letter) two further exits have also been entirely removed, along the south of the tower. This means that now there would 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.

c) Reduction in internal public space

'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. This, simply stated, is 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. **London Fire Brigade have not been consulted on the implications of this change for the fire safety of the tower.** This is a material change.

2) Other Changes

i.) 'Changes to 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, is a material change.

ii) 'Removal of the rooftop maintenance unit in the tower due to 'changes in window cleaning strategy' is a material amendment to the granted permission because it is stated that the glazing on the tower would be kept well maintained. No information has been offered as to how the windows will be kept clean without this rooftop maintenance unit. This a material change.

iii) 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 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. This creates new disturbances on the Green space. Given that the Inspector reached an [on balance decision] on the basis of the material presented, these new changes constitute a material change.

Thank you for ensuring that these objections reach the Planning Committee. I would also be grateful if you could let me know when this application is discussed at committee so that I can be present and make representations.

Marion Howard