

26th August 2021



Aaron Kang
The Planning Inspectorate
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol
BS1 6PN

DP9 Ltd
100 Pall Mall
London SW1Y 5NQ

Registered No. 05092507

telephone 020 7004 1700
facsimile 020 7004 1790

www.dp9.co.uk

Dear Aaron,

**4B HAMPSTEAD HILL GARDENS, CAMDEN, NW3 2PL
APPEAL REFERENCE: APP/X5210/W/21/3272103**

On behalf of our client the appellant, Mr and Mrs Brearley, we write in response to the appeal questionnaire issued by the London Borough of Camden on the 25th of August 2021. Within the questionnaire in relation to the choice of appeal process Camden have indicated that they believe a hearing to be the most appropriate method upon which to determine the appeal. We disagree with this statement, and maintain that written representations are the most appropriate method for the appeal to be determined. The appeal start letter received from the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) dated 18th August 2021 also confirms that PINS consider written representations to be the most appropriate method through which to determine the appeal.

There has been no material change in circumstances since the appeal was submitted and the decision made by the Inspectorate that this appeal should be by way of written representations. There is therefore no reason why a change in appeal process should be made

Annexe K of the 'Procedural Guide: Planning appeals – England' document outlines the criteria that are to be considered when determining the most appropriate appeal route for planning appeals. The criteria included within Annexe K are outlined below in italics, with our associated responses next to each criterion.

Written representations - *written representations would be appropriate if:*

- *the planning issues raised or, in an enforcement appeal, the grounds of appeal, can be clearly understood from the appeal documents and a site inspection (if required - a small number of appeals do not require a site visit and can be dealt with solely on the basis of the appeal documents); or*

Response: The planning issues raised and referenced within the reasons for refusal associated with planning application 2019/5835/P and now the subject of the appeal can be clearly understood from the appeal documents and a site inspection.

- *the issues are not complex and the Inspector is not likely to need to test the evidence by questioning or to clarify any other matters; or*

Response: The issues concerned with the appeal are not complex and are addressed adequately and succinctly within the appeal Statement of Case and supporting appeal documents. There is no requirement to test this evidence through questioning, nor do any of the issues raised require clarification.



- *in an enforcement appeal the alleged breach, and the requirements of the notice, are clear.*

Response: This criterion is irrelevant in relation to appeal APP/X5210/W/21/3272103.

We trust that the above is clear and that the appeal format will remain as written representations. The appeal involves the demolition of a singular dwelling and the construction of a singular dwelling on the Site; any procedure beyond written representations is unnecessary and an inefficient use of time. Should you have any queries, or require any further information, please contact either Jonathan Marginson or Nathan Hall of this office.

Yours faithfully,

DP9 Ltd

Enc.