



From: peter symonds [REDACTED]
Sent: 15 August 2017 12:11
To: McClue, Jonathan [REDACTED]
Subject: Planning Application Ref: 2017/4036/P 100 Avenue Road NW3 3HF



PLANNING APPLICATION 2017/4036/P 100 AVENUE ROAD NW3 3HF

This association wishes to object in the strongest possible terms to the above application. The developer's proposal to remove four out of seven exits from the new building constitutes material amendments to the existing planning permission and should be rejected.

Such changes compromise fire safety and were not part of the original application, which was refused by Camden and only approved after appeal to the Planning Inspectorate and the Secretary of State. In light of the tragic events at Grenfell Tower, fire safety should now be at the heart of this application yet there is no evidence of London Fire Brigade having been consulted about such major changes. Camden must surely demand, at the very least, that an independent expert report is commissioned before this application can be considered.

The developers claim this change is required because of *"the need to separate servicing and general pedestrian access and to improve the attractiveness of the ground floor commercial units"*. How is it that this requirement was not a part of the original application? And why is there no mention of such a significant, material change in the accompanying letter? Could it be because the developers are unwilling to admit that such a change will increase the commercial/retail space and, as a result, their profits?.

'Removal of a secondary residents access and removal of entrance door', that is to say, one of 'the affordable entrances' along the eastern side of the building, will reduce exit options and pose a real danger to safety. If such changes are permitted, there will now be no exits along the eastern length of the 7 and 5 storey buildings. The proposal will leave only one exit on Avenue Road, instead of the originally planned two for the affordable building. The loss of this important exit would compromise fire safety and so constitutes a further material amendment. Without assurances from London Fire Brigade that this is safe, the planning committee should reject this application.

Furthermore, and crucially, according to the new drawings - but once again deliberately not mentioned in the accompanying letter - two further exits along the south of the tower have also

been entirely removed. There will, if the application is approved, now be only one exit for the 24-storey tower, instead of the four originally granted in the planning permission. All told, four out of the seven planned exits will have been removed leaving only three out of those originally approved. This is, yet another, serious and material change.

CRASH has further objections to proposed changes to the 'means of opening windows', the 'positioning of the balconies' and 'changes to the window cleaning strategy. We have serious misgivings that, without the required assurances from the London Fire Brigade that these are all likely to have an impact on fire safety. Furthermore no information has been provided on how the windows will be kept clean and maintained now that the rooftop maintenance unit is to be removed. Yet again these all constitutes material changes to the original approval and should not be allowed.

CRASH respectfully requests that this application is refused.

Peter Symonds
Chair

***The Combined Residents' Associations of South Hampstead
48 Canfield Gardens
NW6 3EB***



Subject heading: 100 AVENUE ROAD, NW3 3HF APPLICATION no: [2017/4036/P](#)