



REDINGTON FROGNAL ASSOCIATION
Umbrella body for residents groups in the Redington Froggnal Conservation Area

5 April, 2019

Dear Mr. Lawlor,

2019/0691/P 8 Froggnal - objection

Redington Froggnal Association wish to object to the introduction of a self-contained office and gym into the rear garden at 8 Froggnal.

Hard surface and food risk

The accompanying planning documents note that “No soil samples were taken, or trial pits were dug, therefore no risk assessment was carried out regarding subsidence (indirect damage). No parts of the drainage or service systems were inspected on site.”

Yet, this is a known flood risk zone and the site lies within an area recognised as having many springs and a large body of underground water, which is a known flood risk zone:

<http://www.redfrogforum.org/evidence-base/>

This is especially relevant in the light of Camden’s status as a “lead flood local authority”. In the event of extreme weather, flood water is likely to be directed to lower ground, with considerable implications for properties on lower ground in Froggnal and West Hampstead.

The introduction of additional hard surface is entirely inappropriate for such an area and water has already been diverted by the construction works into a neighbouring garden

Harm to trees

The arboricultural assessment submitted notes that the proposed office and gym is adjacent to several “currently unprotected but significant trees” and that “the trees collectively provide a contribution to the appearance and character of Froggnal and the surrounding area and soften the views from the road frontage.”

Recognising the value of the trees, the proposed scheme allows for “all the existing mature trees to be retained” with “no tree works/pruning required” and “no tree works envisaged”. Page 10 of the arboricultural assessment restates that, “There are no trees proposed for removal as part of this application. Consequently, there will be a minimal effect to their amenity value of the area.”





Notwithstanding this guarantee, it appears that a mature lime tree has already been felled and that a mature lime tree at no. 6 is threatened by encroachment within its root protection zone, contrary to policy A3 6.74 and 6.75 and D1 7.22.

To try to safeguard the remaining trees, it is requested that they are protected with TPOs.

Harm to biodiversity

The introduction of artificial light in a nature sensitive area is also of concern. Glazing on the sides will direct artificial light into the rear garden tree corridor and the adjacent Frogmal Court Wood SINC, with a harmful impact on biodiversity, including tawny owls and bats, and the amenity of neighbouring flats.

We also note the absence of any biodiversity enhancing measures (as required by policy A3 6.67 and 6.80) and suggest that trees and hedges should be required as mitigation to absorb additional runoff.

Yours sincerely,

A solid black rectangular box redacting the signature of the Secretary.

Secretary

A solid black rectangular box redacting a line of text at the bottom of the page.