

SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA for DCC 31.7.14

Agenda Item 7(8)

Address: Athlone House Hampstead Lane N6

Reference Number: 2013/7242/P

1. Reason for refusal no.2 regarding inadequate Basement Impact Assessment-

1.1 Para 6.125 states that the applicants are currently revising the BIA to address criticisms made by the Council consultant's review of the BIA. Since the officers' report was written and finalised, the applicants have now provided an Addendum and Corrigendum to address the issues raised. The Council's consultant has further reviewed these documents and confirms that the BIA as revised and expanded is now acceptable and that it complies with policy DP27, provided that the drain is constructed as intended and that groundwater monitoring continues on site. These matters can be addressed by conditions on any future planning permission.

1.2 Accordingly it is recommended that the proposed 'reason for refusal' no.2 on inadequate BIA should be now withdrawn.

2. Drawing numbers-

2.1 The revised basement plan listed in the report does not have the correct drawing number and should read 103A. The following revised documents for the BIA study should also now be included- Basement Impact Assessment Addendum and Corrigendum by Price & Myers dated 17th July 2014.

3. Clarification-

3.1 As explained in the last sentence of para 4.1, the GLA have objected to the application and have stated that if the Council resolves to grant permission, it must consult the Mayor again so that he can decide whether to allow the draft decision to proceed or to direct a refusal. Officers wish to clarify that, for the avoidance of doubt, the GLA also stated in their letter that if the Council resolves to refuse permission, it need not consult the Mayor again and can proceed to determination without further reference to the GLA.

3.2 In response to a comment made at Chair's briefing regarding the distinction between impact on character and setting of open space and impact on openness of MOL (as discussed in para 6.78), this distinction was made by the Inspector in his appeal decision and is clarified earlier in para 6.57 of the report.

4. Further amendments to floorspace figures-

4.1 The applicant has now advised that previous measurements used for the existing basement of the House (which is the same as that of the 2005

approved scheme) were wrong; a fully measured survey has now taken place which confirms that the existing basement is 245m². In addition, the applicants have corrected their floorspace figures for the 1st and 2nd floors of the previous appeal scheme, so that they are somewhat larger than originally assumed. Floorspace totals and comparisons for all scenarios have now been recalculated accordingly.

4.2 The tables below update the figures in the report and demonstrate more clearly the new house compared to earlier scenarios, in terms of percent changes in floorspace and footprint. These figures, as previously explained in the report, include the proposed atrium and existing lightwells as effective floorspace.

HOUSE	2003 original	2005 pp	2010 existing	2011 appeal cf. 2010
Footprint	-25.6%	+8%	+21%	+46.8%
Total floorspace	+7%	+29.8%	+40.5%	+125%

WHOLE SITE	2003 original	2005 pp	2010 extg	2011 appeal cf. 2005
Footprint	-22%	+2%	+5%	+8%
Above-ground floorspace	+43%	+4%	+6.7%	+9.5%

4.3 In response to the officers' concern about the atrium space discussed in para 6.36 of the report, the applicants have suggested that a condition could be imposed to prevent the possibility of the atrium being infilled in the future to create more floorspace. However officers consider that internal alterations, such as creating new floors within a building, are not subject to planning control and therefore it would be unreasonable and unenforceable to impose such a condition.