

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.

21st April 2021.

Dear Mr Limbrick,

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

I refer to our recent telephone conversation of the 20th April 2021 and my letter dated 6th April 2021 setting out detailed objections to the above planning application submitted on behalf of my clients Mr and Mrs Fox who own and reside in adjoining property 18B Frogna! Gardens.

In addition to the objections set out in my previous letter dated 6th April 2021 I would request that you also take into consideration the objections set out in my letter dated 3rd December 2019. Whilst that letter set out detailed objections in response to the previous planning application 2019/5348/P, you will no doubt agree that the current proposals have not materially changed and therefore my previous objections are relevant in the consideration of the latest proposals.

In addition to the objections set out in my previous letters I would like to take this opportunity to reiterate two of the major concerns my clients have in relation to the proposed demolition and redevelopment proposals.

1. Daylighting.

On matters relating to Daylight, Sunlight and Shadowing, I note that the applicants have submitted a supporting letter dated 6th November 2020 from consultants Delva Patman Redler. This letter refers to modifications to the previous drawings highlighting the small reductions to the dimensions of the replacement building previously proposed under 2019/5348/P. On the basis that their previous report concluded that the original proposals were fully compliant with BRE Guidance Paper 209, the consultants submit that the latest proposals are considered acceptable.

Whilst my clients have not provided a full assessment on these potential impacts on 18B, they continue to believe that the replacement building will be both overbearing and unacceptably impact their adjoining property in terms of loss of daylight, sunlight and shadowing. Having lived at their property since it was built, their views are based on their on site assessment. In this regard, we are not aware that any of the planning officers have ever visited our clients property to properly assess these objections. The officers' draft report suggest that their view on these objections is reliant on the applicants' consultants' report. A site visit will seriously question this position.