

**Subject:** 2018/5694/P: 36 Redington Road

**Date:** Tuesday, 5 March 2019 at 09:06:44 Greenwich Mean Time

**From:** John Malet-Bates

**To:** 'Peres Da Costa, David'

**CC:** 'Andrew Dutton-Parrish', Carolina Aivars >, David Milne, 'Esi Cakmakcioglu', John Malet-Bates, John Malet-Bates, John Weston, 'Mark Nevard', 'Martin Humphery', 'Mojgan Green', 'Nancy Mayo', 'Patricia Orwell'

Dear David,

HCAAC has reconsidered its view on this application and wishes to comment on the proposal to ensure maximum compatibility with the materials and tone of the locality.

The proposed site plan is sketchy, no accurate information on trees nor on other landscaping. This should be remedied with a fuller submission.

The current proposal is an improvement on the scheme consented in 2017 under 2015/3004/P which was to an additionally over-developed new south building with strange pitched and mansard roofs. The pre-existing south side building was a natural small house design maintaining the forms of that immediate locality with the same roof ridge height.

No.36 original new building stands as an example of what the locality should not permit in development – excessive building mass, lack of landscaping, over-provision of hardstanding. The design statement's south building rear garden photo shows exactly what might not have been permitted with the taller buildings seriously dominating the smaller, out of scale and unsympathetic, offering a sheer industrialised envelope.

All elements seen in that photo underline people's understandably visceral objection to much new development. It shows the danger of allowing architects to follow the fashion of their fellows in over-dramatising the likely outcome of their clients' briefs. It also shows the unfortunate consequence of over-emphasis in conservation area appraisals of only the street view.

The 2017 consent threatened excessive massing relative to no. 7 Redington Gardens. There is some relief in that the current proposal, even with the additional storey, is a slightly lesser profile compared with the consented scheme. The new height and setbacks should be retained as the maximum allowable.

The lightweight top floor cladding is referred to as 'rainscreen' then as polycarbonate cladding. We caution the use of polycarbonate – Lexan FR should be the minimum standard. P/c has reportedly nil flame-spread rating but it is said that that can be compromised if any heat/fire source is applied to the sheeting.' notwithstanding that the sheeting is stated elsewhere as not in itself to propagate flame.

In planning terms, polycarbonate might not be regarded as a permanent material, but it is held to be superior to glass particularly as to impact resistance and even clarity. The focus on this scheme would appear to be on the proposed structural framing. More detail should be offered and the previous S106A be modified to ensure exact definition of the materials to be used.

The tone/colour of the proposed cladding should be neither too light nor too dark and the cladding should be designed to avoid excessive sunlight reflection to neighbouring properties.

Best regards,

John

John Malet-Bates  
For Hampstead CAAC  
c/o Flat 6, 4 Ferncroft Avenue, NW3 7PH  
07947 744 203

[John.jmba@talktalk.net](mailto:John.jmba@talktalk.net) also  
[jmalet-bates@blenheims.co.uk](mailto:jmalet-bates@blenheims.co.uk)