The Society examines all Planning Applications relating to Hampstead, and assesses them for their impact on conservation and on the local environment.

## To London Borough of Camden, Development Control Team

Planning Ref: 2013/7242/P

Address: Athlone House, Hampstead Lane N6

Description: Demolition of existing house; new 8-bedroom house (REVISED)

Case Officer: Date 28 May 2014

We have considered the revised proposals recently submitted, and notified to us. These revisions seem to be limited to

a. a small reduction in the floor area of the proposed new basement, and

b. re-working of various comparative floor areas, existing and proposed.

The revisions, unsurprisingly, purport to indicate that the proposed building is, after all, little larger than the existing house, thus overcoming objections on the basis of Metropolitan Open Land policies.

We disagree.

The figures they quote, and their presentation, conflict massively both with those presented by us in our comment dated 17 December 2013, and with their own previous figures.

Crucially, the floor area presented by them as that of the existing house (described misleadingly as "the 2003(A) building without institutional extensions") of 2977 sq.m., compares with the total equivalent floor area **shown in their own application documents** of 1990 sq.m. We were careful to quote only their own figures in our comment.

Where has the 2977-1990 =997 sq.m. come from?

Perhaps it has been measured from drawings or schedule information at some intermediate stage between the demolition of the hospital extensions, and today's reality?

The present proposals have to be assessed by comparison with **what exists now**, not some hypothetical past remnant of the original buildings.

We repeat that the comparative figures given in our 17 December 2013 comment, revised only to take account of the floorspace reduction at basement level, said to be

63 sq.m. are those which should be used to assess the proposed floorspace increases over existing.

It also seems to have been said that previous floorspace calculations over-stated proposed areas in double-volume room spaces. We cannot agree that such recalculation is correct or reasonable: the upper voids can easily be infilled later (without Planning Permission), and such assumptions are not conventional or acceptable for this reason.

However, even taking these floorspace reductions into account, and thus, again, using the Applicants' own figures, the comparative calculations still show massive non-compliance with Metropolitan Open Land policies. Thus:

| Athlone House as existing                                  | 1990 sq.m.<br>3019 sq.m. |            |
|--|--------------------------|------------|
| Proposed new house as now revised and re-calculated, gross |                          |            |
| or<br>Ditto, net of basement area                          |                          | 2497 sq.m. |
| Excess floorspace, proposed over existing:                 | gross                    | 51.7%      |
|  | Net                      | 25.5%      |

All proposed areas are from Applicants' Planning Statement.

We repeat that the 2007 Garden House Judicial Review decision confirmed that basement development areas must be taken into account.

Thus, even assessed on what we regard as an incorrect assumption on void areas, the proposal remains **materially larger** than the existing building, by at least 25.5%; we say 51.7%; and thus is non-compliant with Metropolitan Open Land policies.

All of our other comments made on 17 December 2013 (Other Planning Issues) remain unchanged. Those relating to the impact of the proposals on Hampstead Heath have been supported by the statement made subsequently by English Heritage.

We confirm our request for Refusal