



The Heath & Hampstead Society

P.O. BOX 38214 LONDON NW3 1XD

The Society examines all Planning Applications relating to Hampstead, and assesses them for their impact on conservation and on the local environment.

To London Borough of Camden, Development Control Team

Planning Ref: 2015/3200/P

Address: 25 and 26 Redington Gardens, NW3

Description: Demolition: 2 new houses.

Case Officer: [REDACTED]

Date 18 June 2015

We do not oppose the demolition of the existing houses on this site although, despite their lack of architectural merit, they are unobtrusively in scale with the character of the neighbourhood.

We raise objections, however, to the new houses, on these grounds:

1. Overall size and scale of development.

The new houses are much larger, in width, depth and height, than the existing, and would alter the character of Redington Gardens detrimentally.

We object particularly to the ground floor rear extension, which would extend some 6 metres into the rear garden, harming the aspects of both houses on each side (Nos 24 and 27). The fact that the houses are semi-detached increases their overall impact, so that from the road they appear as one very large over-scaled house.

This considerable and obtrusive enlargement is unjustified.

2. Basements

The very large area of the basements, extending no less than 18 metres into the back garden, and 8 metres under the front garden up the site boundary, leaving inadequate spaces at side boundaries for landscape and planting, is not in conformity with the guidelines or the spirit of Policy DP27 or CPG4. Moreover, its depth, average 5 metres, with substantial parts of it at 7 metres, is grossly excessive.

You will be aware that the Draft Local Plan, now at consultation stage, would make such a basement completely unacceptable in principle. We do not believe that the Basement Development section of this is controversial, and is most unlikely to be modified. There are precedents for Planning decisions to be taken on the basis of Draft Plans in such circumstances, where substantial harm would otherwise be done. This is a prime example of such circumstances, and we urge you to take this step.

The BIA is not convincing, where it relates to potential damage to adjoining properties. It refers to the need for further work to examine such damage, making its assessment of possible harm to be at Burland Level 2 questionable. Both adjoining

houses are close to their boundaries. We call for independent verification of this. The location of the site very close to the interface of Bagshott sands and Claygate member makes it vulnerable to subsoil movement.

3. Architecture

We follow the logic expounded in the Design/Access Statement that a fully modernist style house on this site might be inappropriate, and that the architects did not favour a “pastiche”. They have nevertheless ended up with neither the one thing nor the other, an uncomfortable compromise. The use of the almost universal local materials: red bricks and tiled pitched roofs is right, but the proportions and scale of the design and detail are unattractive.

We also object to the complete change of architectural style at basement level, garden side. The huge areas of glass are incongruous.

Our Conservation Area deserves better

4. Trees

Three trees are shown as having to be felled “to permit the development”. This is one way of saying that the building footprint is too large. No trees should be lost when one house (or pair of houses) replaces another.

Please refuse.