

Gentet, Matthias

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 30 August 2017 10:09
To: McClue, Jonathan
Cc: Planning
Subject: objection: re: Application 2017/4036/P 100 Avenue Road:

30th Aug. 2017

Fire Safety and General Safety

It is necessary that this entire revised application should be to be resubmitted to include the proposed changes.

I wish to object to the revised floor plans and Cover Letter for this proposal, as posted on your website 21/08/2017 and 22/08/2017, and would like to add to my pervious objection re Application 2017/4036/P 100 Avenue Road:

From these revised plans it is evident that there will **still only be one fire escape in the tower**, as the doorways that have now been added to the corrected proposed floor plans are acknowledged as being insufficient fire escapes. This would still compromise fire safety. It is still unacceptable that the other fire escape that was granted in the original plan is to be removed for the sake of a water feature.

In addition this single fire exit would open out to a potential beaufort force 7 wind tunnel, i.e. near gales, in the gap between the two buildings at receptor 12 [RWD, Fig 7].

Safety in general will be compromised by removing the other fire exit from the tower, and in this context, doing so would be a material change.

It does not make sense to wait for fire safety approval to be given after the development has been built. In the light of Grenfell it cannot be acceptable to make any changes that may compromise fire safety in a 24 storey tower, whatever the current building regulations presently allow. I request that this application only go to the beifing panel *after* the repsonse from the London fire Brigade has been recieved.

Changes to the drawings that have NOT been noted or described in the proposed plans.

These changes are only apparent by comparing the original plans with the new ones.

The plant and store room on the ground floor of the affordable building, as shown in the proposed floor plans, is described in KEY E as being a "Relocation of plant and store room". But it has not been **relocated**, because it is evident that the same amount of plant and store room space is shown in both original and new plans, apart from the **plant and store room** described in KEY E. Therefore this is a **new Plant/Room Store** which has been **added**. It would take the

place of the original lobby which is to be removed with the exit facing the Green, **leaving only one fire escape for the affordable building**

The new basement staircase has not been noted anywhere in the proposed plans. Your saying that it comes up to *another basement level*, and not the pathway, has not been depicted or described anywhere in the proposed plans – these new levels should be shown in the proposed floor plans.

Increasing the **Flexible Ancillary Future LU Access Space** in the basement to almost double its original size has not been described to noted anywhere in the proposed plans and need to be.

Sincerely, Elaine Chambers, chair Winchester Rd Residents Assoc (WRRRA)