
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 08 October 2018 10:10
To: McClue, Jonathan; Planning
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: 100 Avenue Road Application Ref 2018/4239/P

Dear Mr McClue

100 Avenue Road Application Ref [2018/4239/P](#)

I object to Essential Living's non material amendment of the original planning application because:

- 1) removing two fire exits from their development to make way for more retail space and to "improve landscaping" with a water feature compromises fire safety, particularly in the northern 24 storey block which would have only one fire exit with only one stairwell. This is materially different from the original planning application.
- 2) reducing the corridor widths throughout the development by approximately one third in order to increase dwelling unit size would compromise the safety of residents, particularly for those using wheel chairs and pushchairs whether in normal circumstances or in the event of an emergency. Measurements of the new widths need to be given before knowing whether or not they comply with building regulations. This is materially different from the original planning application.
- 3) reducing the basement footprint to allow the developers lorries to have more room turn around on site during demolition and construction is unacceptable and this change is materially different from the original planning application.

It is also unacceptable that in so doing -

- o approximately half the basement plant area would be removed
- o all the affordable bin store area would be removed
- o at least 8 of bins in the PRS bin store area would be inaccessible

These changes are clearly materially different from the original planning application.

While we have real concerns about the way these changes will affect waste management in this massive development, encouraging fly-tipping and reducing recycling rates, we are even more troubled about the implications for social justice.

We have always been critical of the way this development separates those in the private rental section from those in these called affordable units and offers the latter poorer facilities ("poor doors"). This removal of the bin store for residents of the affordable units is yet another new example of discrimination against those living there.

In addition all the corridors in the development have been made narrower to make the units bigger. Once again this would seem to be a retrograde step, particularly in an emergency or for wheelchair or buggy users.

London Fire Brigade do not appear to have commented on the safety of this measure particular in the 24-storey tower.

The new drawings show that the size of The Winch community space has also been reduced. We hope that The Winch trustees have been fully consulted about these changes.

the nature of the internal design has changed, fire safety and emergency access has been compromised, servicing requirements have not been met. Therefore the nature and quantum of the uses are being materially altered.

Whether or not that the previous application was withdrawn last year at the last minute because of the public outcry that such a deleterious proposal could be made in the light of the Grenfell Tower fire disaster, new plans in this particular regard appear to be the same as previously submitted and are still unacceptable for the same reasons. The only significant changes that have been made is the reduction of the basement size (due to “advancements in technology”) and the addition of the letter from The Winch, all of which have been addressed in this objection.

For this reason I believe all of the objections posted on the [2017/4036/P](#) ought be uploaded for this application. I would ask also that this application [2018/4239/P](#) automatically goes to Planning Committee as did the previous [2017/4036/P](#) application for the same reasons. It cannot be right or fair that the local community should be asked to keep commenting afresh each time the developer wants to withdraw or add to their application.

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. To wait for fire safety approval to be given after this application has been approved and after the development has been built is closing the stable door after the horse has bolted. **Camden cannot afford to risk the safety of it's residents and on this basis alone, the council must reject this application.**

Best Wishes

Janine Sachs
Chair, [SaveSwissCottage](#)

BE REALISTIC-PLAN FOR A MIRACLE

NO CONSTRUCTION LORRIES THROUGH SWISS COTTAGE OPEN SPACE

The information contained in this e-mail and any enclosures is intended solely for the person to whom it is addressed and may contain confidential material. You should not copy or disclose contents to anyone else or take any further action based upon it if it is not addressed to you personally. Please destroy and contact the sender as soon as possible if this e-mail has been received in error. To unsubscribe please send e-mail.