Dike, Darlene

From: Sent: To: Subject:	Luca Crenna - 27 August 2016 18:41 Planning 28 Redington Road - Objection to Current	Development Plan
Dear Madam/Sir,	20 Realington Road Objection to Current	Development Hair
I write to strongly object to the	e plan to demolish n. 28 in Redington Ro	vad.
I have been living in Hampstea	nd for many years and currently at n. 12	in Redington Road.
	r neighbours, have been attracted to this coundings and feel strongly that this shou	
down is against the principles of	building in Redington Road and need ce of our Council and Conservation area. T nore than one reasons including style, sizen space.	The development plan is totally
the park (n. 36) which has com	hat happened with a new development of upleted changed the feeling of that part of corever to the benefit of few developers.	
had an offer accepted for a flat	e living at n. 30 had not expressed alread there. We then decided not to proceed a th I suppose could potentially be even fu	as the house has serious subsidence
In summary, any development opposite.	project should enhance the living standa	ard of our neighbourhood, not the
Thanks for the consideration ar	nd kind regards,	

Luca Crenna

Akiko Shimada

Leo Crenna

12 Redington Road – Flat 3

Luca Crenna

Dike, Darlene

From: feodor

Sent: 28 August 2016 19:39

To: Planning

Subject: Planning App 2016/2997/p 28 Redington Road, London NW3

To London Borough of Camden, Development Control Team

Planning Ref: 2016/2997/P

Address; 28, Redington Road, NW3

Description: Demolition of House, New 5-story block of flats, parking basement, destruction of trees

Case Officer: David Peres Da Costa

Dear Sir.

We oppose this application because it is in a Conservation Area and would appear to contradict Council policy.

The following are the main reasons of concern:

- 1) The building should not be destroyed since it is in keeping with the adjacent building and renovation and conversion to flats should be considered.
- 2) To build a car parking basement involving an 8 12 metre deep excavation in unacceptable and unnecessary as this may affect the water basin and damage other trees. Parking in front of the house and nearby parking in the streets should suffice.
- 3) To remove 7 trees for the development and possibly damage the roots of others during the building is not acceptable in a Conservation Area. As residents of Oak Hill Lodge, we note from our rear garden that the footprint of the proposed development borders on the rear garden of 28, Redington Road. Therefore we are concerned that the proposed future developments concerning the masses of trees will blight us as well as Oak hill House and the property in Redington Gardens. Destruction of trees and building would put Camden's policy on conservation at risk and serve as an undesirable precedent.

We endorse the views of The Heath & Hampstead Society.

Yours sincerely, Dr. F. Scheinmann,

Oak Hill Lodge, Hampstead, NW3 7LN

Dike, Darlene

From: David Conway

Sent: 29 August 2016 08:44

To: Planning

Subject: Planning App 2016/2997/P 28 Redington Road NW3 OBJECTION to the

Proposed Plan

Dear Sir/Madam

I am writing to object to the plans submitted for the demolition and redevelopment of 28 Redington Road. I urge Camden to reject this plan in full. My reasons are as follows:

- 1. This building should not be demolished at all. Although coloured in yellow paint, the building is a lovely Arts & Crafts original from the early 1900's. It has many fine and distinctive features that add to the character of our road and area. It could easily be restored to its former glory. To demolish it simply to create a larger, completely new building would be an injustice, particularly when this is being done simply for a developer's profit.
- 2. The building is noted in the local conservation plan as making a positive contribution to the area. This conservation plan is supposed to afford protection. To permit this building to be demolished would set a very bad precedent. How many of our local buildings would be at risk of demolition if even "positive contributors" are not protected?
- 3. I object to the plans to extend the footprint of this house at the cost of our important green spaces, and to felling a number of trees. Green spaces are one of the special characteristics of our area. They must be protected.
- 4. I object to the egregious plan to dig down so considerably from the current ground level. This house is on a hill and that is part of its charm. To lower it to the level of the road, and then dig a large basement under that lowered level, is tantamount to creating a two-level basement in terms of earth-moving. This can upset the stability of the land under and around the house, and have significant consequences for underground water flow.
- 5. I object to the loss of amenity that would be caused by increased traffic and noise associated with the net addition of seven dwellings (a single family home converted to eight flats), each of which would have rights to underground car parking.

Please refuse this plan in full and urge the new owners of 28 Redington Road, if they wish to make alterations to the building, confine them to those that would essentially preserve its current appearance and structure, as well as the integrity of the site on which it is situated.

Yours sincerely

David Conway MA (Cantab), PhD. (London) resident of: Flat 3, 43 Redington Road London NW3 7RA