

Dike, Darlene

From: vivien stern [REDACTED]
Sent: 17 August 2017 08:25
To: McClue, Jonathan; Planning
Subject: 2017/4036/P

100 Avenue Road, Swiss Cottage, NW3 3HF. Application 2017/4036/P, S 96A, Non-Material amendment application

I refer to my email to you of 30th July and confirm the various points I set out.

I have one further point to make in my objection to the "Non-material Amendment Application".

Removal of four of the seven exits from the original plan.

This is an invitation for another catastrophe, along the lines of the Grenfell Tower disaster. In the event of an emergency, people inside the building must be able to get out, and the emergency services be able to get in.

The fewer exits or entrances there are, the more difficult this is, especially in an emergency situation where civilians are anxious and panicking. The build-up of any bottlenecks resulting in delays in escape, will increase the panic they experience, thus compounding an already bad situation.

In the light of Grenfell Tower, this must surely be refused.

Dike, Darlene

From: Jean Manthorpe [REDACTED]
Sent: 17 August 2017 09:08
To: McClue, Jonathan; Planning
Cc: Tulip Siddiq
Subject: 100 Avenue Road, Swiss Cottage, NW3 3HF. Application 2017/4036/P, S 96A

Sirs,

I has been brought to my attention that at 100 The Avenue, the number of planned exits has been reduced.

I expect you realise the dangers of this, but I just want to get the fact in writing.

Also there will be high wind dangers and there has been a change of building materials.

Of course after years of protests and even time when Camden Council actually said they had turned down the application, it seems that you are intent on progressing. Maybe it is time to get different plans for the area. There is still time to build something lower and with assets to the area rather than just another opportunity for foreign investment.

Jean Manthorpe

Dike, Darlene

From: Judith Nasatyr [REDACTED]
Sent: 17 August 2017 11:58
To: McClue, Jonathan
Cc: Planning
Subject: 100 AVENUE ROAD NW3 3HF

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 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.

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.

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.

J Nasatyr

Dike, Darlene

From: Elizabeth Urban [REDACTED]
Sent: 17 August 2017 13:41
To: McClue, Jonathan
Cc: Planning
Subject: Objection to Planing Application 2017/4036/P

Dear Mr. McClure

**Re: 100 Avenue Road, Swiss Cottage, NW3 3HF
Application Ref: 2017/4036/P - S96A Non-Material Amendment Application**

I wish to object to this application. The amendments to the existing planning permission substantially change the application and should be rejected. To summarise my reasons:

Firstly, the developers propose to remove over half - four out of seven - exits from their new building, with only three out of the originally planned seven exits.

Secondly, the developers propose to reduce the hallway area so as to increase residential and commercial space. Given the present beauty of the protected space of the square this item is more likely aimed at increasing profits at the cost of the environment.

Thirdly, these amendments appear to compromise fire safety and would certainly not be in keeping with the original plan. There is a question whether the London Fire Brigade has confirmed that they have been consulted about these major changes.

I feel strongly that this application has not been turned down. If one were looking southwest from the second floor of the present building on June 15, one could see the smoke from the Grenfell Tower. What came very soon out of that pointed to applications like this one.

Yours sincerely,
Elizabeth Urban

Dike, Darlene

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 17 August 2017 13:47
To: McClue, Jonathan
Cc: Planning
Subject: re:100AveRd objections to Application 2017/4036/P

17thAug 2017.

Dear Mr Mc Clue, Here are my **personal objections and those of WRRRA** of which I am chair, to the claimed non-material changes which I regard as constituting a **material change** to the proposed 100Ave rd plans. The residents of WRRRA are those who will be closely affected by this proposed development and its material changes.

Noise: a material change. Here the new changes involving an **expansion** of the already deeply disturbing commercial plans will further greatly affect the very local residents. These proposed commercial outlets face into The Green. They will further increase the already disturbing effect on the very local residents who occupy the periphery of The Green. This will constitute:-

- 1.** A now greater **loss of privacy**, from these commercial outlets which are a mere 75m from Winchester Rd residential property.
- 2.** An increase in people noise, and, gawd forbid, possible incessant musac coming from these commercial outlets, cafes, restaurants which will be facing the rear, and therefore note, **facing the bedrooms of these properties at Winchester Rd.**

It must not be forgotten that this Victorian terraced row IS in the **Belsize Conservaton Area just a mere 75m from 100Ave.**

Then on a different set of points, my objections to Application 2017/4036/P goes on to point out that: **1.** the removal of two doors from the tower, fire safety will be compromised. **2.** the addition of a plant room store, the new stairwell coming up from the basement and opening out on the pathway close to the Green, consequently causing more people traffic on what we here **all** want to be kept as **a tranquil Green area.**

These changes are not only material, but it should also be noted **they have not been disclosed.** On this basis alone this application should be rejected.

Yours sincerely, Elaine Chambers