Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3004/P	Irving Yass	5a Templewood Avenue NW3 7UY NW3 7UY NW3 7UY	30/07/2015 12:48:34	OBJ	

My main objection is that the proposed design looks awful and inappropriate. Pairs of semi-detached houses are usually symmetrical, as is the case with nos 53 and 55 Redington Road, opposite the application site. However the applicants seem to have accepted that a twin to no 38 would create a massive and over-bearing structure and have tried to reduce the impact of the proposed new house. The new design is a bit less bulky, but it is incongruous beside no 38, while still creating a massive total development. Most of the other houses in Redington Road, while being substantial three storey buildings, are lightened by fully pitched roofs above the first floor level, with dormer windows on the second floor set well back in the roof. They also have much more variation – bay windows, decorative brickwork, recessed front doors etc. However nos 36 and 38 together would stand out like ugly sisters. While the existing house at no 36 is of no great distinction, it does have the merit of being modest in scale and well set back. If it is to be replaced the only satisfactory design solution would be a similarly modest, detached house.

The extension of the basement forward of the building line is unacceptable. Policy DP27 of the Development Framework states that In determining applications for lightwells, the Council will consider whether… the development results in the loss of more than 50% of the front garden or amenity area. However the moving forward of the building line, together with the car lift and light well will mean the loss of almost the whole of the existing front garden. One of the major features of the Redfrog conservation area is the extent of private gardens. This will be undermined in this part of the conservation area by the loss of the front garden of no 36, following the loss of the front garden of no 38. The effect will also be to increase surface water run-off. The storm drain at the corner of Redington Road and Redington Gardens gets blocked when there is heavy rain, causing the road to flood. This would happen more often with the increased run-off.

The construction method statement is totally unacceptable. It has clearly simply been copied and pasted from another application – see the references to Edgware Road. It does not deal at all with the specific issues created by building such a big house on such a tight site. The only access is from the Redington Road frontage, with the amount of working and storage space in front limited by the extended basement forward of the building line. This would inevitably lead to plant and materials blocking the road. Once the basement is dug out the only access to the rear of the building would be via the 1.3m footpath at the side. The tree report makes detailed recommendations about the need for careful working methods to prevent damage to the trees on the boundary with 7 Redington Gardens. But there is no indication in the construction method statement how this might be achieved – or indeed if it is possible. The most likely outcome is that in practice the trees would be seriously damaged.