

Application No:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2013/7242/P	08/12/2013 17:55:21	OBJ	<p>I object to the proposed application.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A basic principle is at stake. When planning permission was granted for the flats in the grounds of Athlone House this was on the basis of a requirement on the developers to maintain and restore Athlone House within three and a half years. They have signally failed even to attempt to fulfil this commitment. The previous developer was allowed to get away with his negligence and sell the unrestored property. The new developer of the site must have been aware of this obligation at the time of purchase. It is no good the developer now saying that Athlone House cannot be restored. If the new owner is allowed to evade the original obligation it will run a coach and horses through planning principles - if you want to evade your responsibilities, sell the property to another developer. If this application is successful why should anyone have any confidence in the planning system. In the unlikely event that the building is really unrestorable (the developers assert this with no justification: ask the Landmark Trust what is feasible) the developer should be compelled to demolish it and landscape the site, not develop it in order to benefit from flouting his obligation. The developers assert that the proposal is substantially smaller than the existing one. But they admit that the footprint is 5% over the 2005 consent even excluding the basement. Despite the lawyers' casuistic arguments that this excess is acceptable it is still huge relative to the original building, and will encourage building more monster buildings which will destroy the unique character of the area. DP24 of Camden's Development Policies states that development should consider the character setting context of what is proposed. We have seen how the developers evade their undertakings at Witanhurst. The same will happen on this site if it is allowed to go ahead.
2013/7242/P	26/11/2013 17:26:30	OBJ	<p>As the building development in the grounds of Athlone House was subject to a 106 agreement to restore the house, this requirement should be enforced. The demolition of a beautiful Victorian house, situated in the Highgate conservation area and which is an integral part of the attractive view from the Kenwood Estate and the Heath, is simply not acceptable.</p>
2013/7242/P	26/11/2013 16:31:51	OBJ	<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>Athlone House is a historic building, which is deeply valued by neighboring residents and the users of Hampstead Heath. A modern single dwelling house would significantly detract from the character of the area, and be an inappropriate use of such a prominent site.</p> <p>Regards.</p>
2013/7242/P	03/12/2013 20:30:58	OBJ	<p>I am very opposed to this proposal to demolish the current Victorian building which forms an important and continuing feature of the edge of the Heath.</p> <p>The developers must refurbish the house as required by the section 106 agreement made eight years ago as past of the previous planning consent.</p>

Application No:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2013/7242/P	01/12/2013 17:52:53	OBJ	<p>The site of Athlone House is such an important one for users of Hampstead Heath that the prospect of the view being dominated by a concrete building is appalling. It would be totally out of sympathy with the surroundings and a blot on the landscape.</p> <p>The site was sold with the condition that the house was saved and renovated. This should be enforced before it is too late.</p>
2013/7242/P	02/12/2013 18:40:13	OBJ	<p>I very much hope Camden will find the strength to oppose this unpleasant proposal with the same energy you have used to turn down many similar applications for the site in the last few years. Athlone House is a much loved feature of the Heath and most of us would love to see it converted into flats according to the conditions of the permission for building of new flats on the site. A monster mansion in this prominent position would be a horrible feature of the Heath.</p>
2013/7242/P	28/11/2013 16:25:06	OBJ	<p>I am writing to object strongly to this latest application to pull down Athlone ouse, a well loved and historic house on the skyline of Hampstead Heath and a familiar and reassuring sight currently visible from huge distances.</p> <p>This attractive house has, as we all know, been seriously neglected by the current owners, presumably deliberately in the hope that it will disappear and so allow them to erect an ugly travesty of a plutocratic 'mansion' to house some millionaire, one assumes neither a British resident or tax payer, with his or her servants, underground cinema and so forth.</p> <p>Camden must have a continued duty to preserve our heritage and we have been very much reassured in the past by your having very sensibly turned down previous planning applications for this site involving the irretreable destruction of part of the cherished history of this area.</p> <p>I very much expect you to keep a steady nerve and once more reject this application.</p>
2013/7242/P	28/11/2013 16:22:12	OBJ	<p>Athlone House is (or should be) protected from demolition by virtue of the undertaking to restore made by the owners in order to gain approval some years ago for flats to be built in the grounds. It is frankly unacceptable to have new owners claim ignorance of the obligations they acquired when they bought the property or to suggest that a restoration might be unaffordable due to neglect. Restoration needs to be properly costed and investigated (at sensible, not inflated, rates). ONLY if a truly independent inquiry were to show that for some reason restoration was unfeasible (as opposed to a bit expensive) should alternatives be looked at. As things stand this application must be rejected.</p>

Application No:

2013/7242/P

Received:

26/11/2013 17:01:55

Comment: Response:

OBJ Dear Sir / Madam

I am amazed to see yet again another application for this beautiful and historic building to be demolished and replaced with a new building.

– Hampstead Heath is a wild, vast, expanse of woods, hills, meadows and ponds and the proposed new building would be completely out of place.

– Much like the other houses in neighbouring streets, such as Bishops Avenue, the new house is unlikely to be really lived in, except by security guards and cleaners.

– The very wealthy should not be able to ride roughshod over planning procedures.

– It has been claimed that it would cost £20m to restore Athlone House (supposedly too much for any owner), however, the proposed new building would cost £80m.

Furthermore, I believe the original agreement to restore the building should be enforced.

I am sure there will be many objections and I hope that the application will be rejected.

Yours Faithfully

2013/7242/P

26/11/2013 16:03:08

COMMNT

Towards the very end of the list to related docs there are North and East Elevations and south and west elevations, which don't appear to have scanned - when opened they are showing error messages. As these are some of the key docs I wonder if this could be remedied? I tried to find the alternative way of viewing these but this link did not work either.

2013/7242/P

03/12/2013 18:41:45

COMMNT

Dear Camden

Please, please, please do not allow the demolition of Athlone House - a beautiful, prominent building on the London skyline. It is a gem to be enjoyed from the Kenwood Viewpoint.

In doing so you will also up-hold the Section 106 agreement, otherwise what is the point of this piece of legislation existing.

Application No:

2013/7242/P

Received:

02/12/2013 14:44:03

Comment: Response:

COMMNT The Council has a duty to the Camden ratepayers to enforce the original agreement about the renovation of Athlone House, in return for permission to redevelop other parts of the site. The application has not upheld their part of the agreement, even though the redevelopment has taken place.

No applications other than one to renovate Athlone House should be considered by the Council. Applications such as this one should be rejected out of hand, until such time as the applicant has complied with the original agreement.
