

Jack & Judy Fox
18B Frognal Gardens, London, NW3 6XA

20 April 2021

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

Dear Mr Limbrick

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

We are Jack and Judy Fox the owners of 18B Frognal Gardens. We built the property 18B Frognal Gardens in the early 1960's. 18A had already been built and we purchased the land adjoining it. Our brief was to build a house using similar brick work and sand text in order to meld in with 18A and the immediate area. All undertaken in order to abide with the covenants on the land as structured by the beneficial owners of 18 Frognal Gardens. Architects representing both owners, 18A and 18B attended many meetings, working with the advice received from Camden's Planning Officer, we eventually came up with the design and built it into the present-day house. There were many favourable comments from the local residents. Indeed, a half page article was published in the Ham and High which concluded saying we had been successful, especially with the difficulties presented.

We have lived here ever since. Towards the end of 2019 we learnt that 18A was to be demolished. Initially disappointed we became very much more so when we saw and understood the proposals contained in the current Planning Application. No attempt has been made to take into account the local area vernacular but the very opposite; instead, a huge green block of flats (claimed to be one house) designed more for Disneyworld. 18A was purchased by the current owner, Nadine Majaro, from her parents in the mid-90s. The property has since been rented for many many years and we are very surprised she says that they intends to live in it because she has been interested only in renting the property. What is proposed could well be divided into very expensive flats.

We object most strongly to this building, its appearance, scale and massing. We are familiar with good modern architecture whether it be when we were younger with friends/acquainted with designers who were highly regarded as part of the Post Modern or even the Brutalist Schools.

The comments made by David Hare and Nicol Farhi may appear on first view as being super intelligent sarcasm, but their criticism of the design is fundamentally correct and ought to be taken seriously and their letter read out to the committee. Another well-known modern architect reacted saying that if he had got a letter like that he might "throw in the towel". The design is, to many followers of modern architecture, a joke.

This Architect has produced a terrible solution. The design review panel had doubts but as with the emperors' clothes were swept along with the perceived view of what this Architect can produce and concluding it must be there somewhere and therefore it must be good, even though they couldn't see it. This happens sometimes with modern painting/art and music. If you don't fully understand what it should be doing its very easy to be supportive of rubbish.

Again, the Planning Officer's report, all 42 pages of it, do not address the objections but merely responds by saying the grounds for objections have been overcome. Whether or not a Judicial Review will be necessary depends upon the Planning Committee's ability to look at this scheme sensibly and take into account the forty odd objectors views. Their objections are well formed, clear and better presented than is often the case

No members from your Committee have visited to consider the overlooking.

No members from your Committee have visited to consider the loss of daylight.

No members have visited to see how the existing property can be demolished and a new one built without access onto the adjoining lane and within the confines of the red line which shows the extent of this current application.

Finally, this house cannot be built, and the tiles hung without access to the east of the red line. In these circumstances if the existing house were demolished it would be to the detriment of the conservation area an eyesore without a solution. The application as detailed is not a proper solution. Whether or not further action will be required will be known only when the Planning Committee's precise views on this application are known.

Yours sincerely

A solid black rectangular box redacting the signature of Jack & Judy Fox.

Jack & Judy Fox