

**Gentet, Matthias**

---

**From:** Edie Raff - [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 30 August 2017 10:18  
**To:** McClue, Jonathan; Planning  
**Subject:** Application 2017/4036/P 100 Avenue Road

Dear Jonathan

Sorry but I have to add to my earlier objections to Application 2017/4036/P 100 Avenue Road because new plans keep popping up and one must respond to them.

I refer now to the revised floor plans and Cover Letter for this proposal, as posted on Camden's website 21/08/2017 and 22/08/2017.

From these revised plans it is evident that there will still only be one fire escape in the tower; the doorways that have now been added to the corrected proposed floor plans are acknowledged to be insufficient fire escapes. And I still find it unacceptable that the original fire escape in the original plan is to be removed for the sake of a water feature.

In addition this single fire exit would open out into an inevitable wind tunnel in the gap between the two buildings.

Because safety in general will be compromised by removing the other fire exit from the tower, doing so should be considered a material change.

It is ludicrous 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 story tower, whatever the current building regulations presently allow. I therefore urge that this application only go to the briefing panel *after* the response from the London fire Brigade has been received.

There have also been changes to the drawings that have NOT been noted or described in the proposed plans and only become apparent by comparing the original plans with the new ones:

1) The new plant/store room that has been added will 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

2) The new basement staircase has not been noted anywhere in the proposed plans: 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.

3) Increasing the Flexible Ancillary Future LU Access Space in the basement to almost double its original size has not been described or

noted anywhere in the proposed plans and needs to be.

It is my strong belief that this entire application needs to be resubmitted to include these changes.

Regards

Edie Raff  
Chair, CHRA