Dear John

Thank you for your time on Tuesday and thank you for alerting us to the objection received courtesy of Planning Sense.

As explained, I am reluctant to respond directly to the objection letter on all points for two simple reasons; firstly, the objector is predisposed to counter every argument we put forward and there is clearly little prospect of him agreeing with our planning reasoning. Secondly, a rebuttal letter would serve only to elicit another objection letter which would escalate towards a tit-for-tat exchange of planning correspondence that would achieve nothing. Our planning reasoning is explained in the Planning Statement and we place our trust in due process and the skill of the planning officer(s) in weighing up both sides of the argument and arriving at a reasoned decision based on facts, policies and other material considerations. That said, if you want a response on all points I will be happy to oblige but I fear it would not be the end of the matter.

At your request we have investigated the alleged discrepancy in the floorspace figures. As you will be aware, planning is usually concerned with Gross Internal Areas (GIA) rather than Net Internal Areas (NIA). In contrast developers are primarily concerned with efficiencies (expressed as a percentage of Net to Gross area) and are keen to have high NIAs because this represents the floorspace upon which rental values are based. Planning, quite rightly, is rarely concerned with NIA. Indeed the *Development Policies* document is unequivocal that floorspace should be measured and reported as gross rather than net floorspace. For this reason alone, the comparison of existing and proposed NIA is a pointless exercise. However, we can explain where the discrepancies occur and the attached table shows how we have arrived at the floor area totals. The table should be viewed as correcting the areas quoted in the Design and Access Statement. The discrepancy between the NIA quoted in the in the Design and Access Statement and the NIA in the attached schedule is accounted for by the fact that the Design and Access Statement did not include Storage and Utilities.

As you will note from the attached measurements prepared by Studio Kyson, the NIA of St George's Mews has been calculated at 241.8 sqm. The VOA has measured the NIA at 246.78 sqm. We cannot vouch for the accuracy of the Valuation Office Agency's NIA figures, but we can state with authority that our NIA figures have been measured in accordance with the *RICS Code of Measuring Practice, 6th Edition*, which is the industry standard. The discrepancy between the applicant's figures and those of the VOA are commonplace. In this instance the discrepancy of 4.98 sqm between the Studio Kyson and VOA figures represents a 2% measuring error based on the VOA figures.

Crucially, the objector makes no mention of the GIA figures which are clearly the most important of those set out in the Design and Access Statement. We stand by those figures and assure you that they, too, were measured in accordance with the *RICS Code of Measuring Practice, 6th Edition* and are therefore accurate.

I trust this addresses your query but if you would like to discuss this further then I will be happy to speak with you.

Kind regards

Rob

Robert Winkley
MLPM (Hons) MA
Associate

Rolfe Judd

Architecture Planning Interiors
Rolfe Judd, Old Church Court, Claylands Road, London, SW8 1NZ
T +44 (0)20 7556 1500
www.rolfe-judd.co.uk   www.rolfe-judd.pl