

KAZ RYZNER ASSOCIATES

Chartered Town Planning Consultants

36 Woodlands Park,
Merrow, Guildford,
Surrey, GU1 2TJ.

Mr Richard Limbrick
Development Manager
Camden Town Hall
Judd Street
London
WC1H 9JE.

6th April 2021.

Dear Mr Limbrick,

Re. : Planning Application Ref: 2020/5214/P.
18A Frogna! Gardens, Hampstead
London
NW3 6XA

It has been informed that Mr Ben Farrant has left Camden Council and that you have now taken over the above planning application. I represent Mr and Mrs Fox, who own and occupy the immediately adjoining property 18B Frogna! Gardens, and have submitted detailed objections to this application by letter dated 16th December 2020. This latest planning application follows the withdrawal of the previous planning application 2019/5348/P to which detailed objections were set out in my letter dated 3rd December 2019.

I have had an opportunity to review the officer's report on this latest planning application which includes a draft recommendation dated 20th March 2021 to grant approval subject to 20 conditions and 6 Informatives.

Having read the report I am extremely disappointed with both the assessment and draft recommendation to grant approval. The views and objections submitted by and on behalf of the adjoining property owner, numerous local residents and local amenity groups appear to have been swept aside in favour of a replacement building that is clearly incongruous with the adjoining building 18B Frogna! Gardens and the existing street scene in this part of an important and well established Conservation Area.

The details of my objections on behalf of Mr and Mrs Fox are set out in my previous letter and are based on site visits and careful reviews of extant planning policies and do not need to be repeated at this stage. However, having read the officer's report I do believe that certain objections previously raised must be reiterated as the grounds of objection are clearly supported in the 3D Visuals provided in the officer's report.

In this regard I would refer to proposed 3D Visuals 6, 7, 8, 9 and Figure 2 provided in the officer's report. These quite clearly and emphatically illustrate the incongruity of the scale and design of the proposals with adjoining 18B. To suggest anything else is, in my view, quite astonishing and totally unjustified. In addition, the officer's report suggests that the colour of the proposed materials "*is not jarring with its context*". Whilst to a certain extent it is accepted that this is a matter regarded as a subjective judgement, again, this is not borne out in the submitted 3D Visuals.