

REDINGTON FROGNAL NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM

9 June 2023

Dear Ms Ford,

Planning application 2023/1961/P – objection

The Redington Frognal Neighbourhood Forum strongly objects to the construction of an office building at 28 Redington Road, following clearance of the former woodland rear garden.

Gardens as a Local Ecological Network

The gardens of the Redington Frognal Neighbourhood Plan Area are, cumulatively, recognised as a local ecological network.

Mature trees and well vegetated gardens are central to the landscape character and special interest of the Redington Frognal Conservation Area and landscaping plans with trees and other planting are, therefore, a requirement of policy SD 4 vii.

Regrettably, it is likely that more than 30 trees have been felled in the context of the many recent planning applications concerning 28 Redington Road. These have included the felling of two trees with TPOs (as noted by Redington Frognal Association) for “frivolous reasons”: namely to facilitate then construction of a side boundary wall.

The need for all developments to incorporate tree planting is reinforced in policy BGI 2, yet the proposals fail to provide for the planting of trees (policy BGI 2). This is particularly important, as so many trees have been felled, and it would be helpful to identify the trees felled and to consider how their losses can be compensated.

The redevelopment of 28 Redington Road has entailed the creation of much new hard surface and, similarly, it would be useful to quantify the net amount of building footprint and hard surface added (including the current proposals) since 2020.

Garden losses

Conservatively, it is estimated by Ordnance Survey that 1 in 8 gardens have been lost since the buildings in Redington Frognal were originally constructed. These losses are due to garden buildings, building extensions and swimming pools etc.

The policies of the Redington Frognal Neighbourhood Plan are therefore intended to prevent a conurbation of garden buildings and to preserve gardens, trees, vegetation and natural soft surface.

The introduction of an office building with lighting is singularly inappropriate for a local ecological network, which supports bat foraging and roosting. Policy SD 4 xii is of particular relevance and sets out a requirement for “eaves and spaces for internal bat roosts, and the use of bird bricks and other features to support wildlife”.

Swimming pond

While the additional of a natural wildlife pond (without fish) would be desirable, and is in accordance with policy BGI 1 vii, the primary purpose of the planned pond appears to be that of a swimming pool. A wildlife pond requires gently shelving edges, so that wildlife can enter and exit. Confirmation that the pond is to incorporate gently shelving edges would be welcome.

If the primary purpose of the pond is for swimming, the Forum would have concerns about the considerable loss of amenity caused to close neighbours, including at 26 and 30 Redington Road and Redington Gardens. Noise mitigation measures, such a densely-planted rear and side boundaries, would be welcome.

Yours sincerely,

Nancy Mayo

Secretary

Redington Frogmal Neighbourhood Forum

<https://www.redfrogforum.org>

<https://twitter.com/RedfrogNE>

REDINGTON FROGNAL
NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM