



SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING HERITAGE DESIGN AND ACCESS STATEMENT

ADDRESSING RELEVANT POLICIES OF REDINGTON FROGNAL NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN (RFNP)

Page | 1

INTRODUCTION

The initial PHDAS set out a detailed assessment of the proposed development in the context of the Relevant Planning Policies of the adopted Local Plan (LP).

Prior to submitting the application, we engaged in a Pre-Application Consultation. The Pre-App response (21/06/2021) received from Planning (generally favourable) made no reference to the Policies in the Redington/Frognal Neighbourhood Plan (RFNP). The reason may have been the NP had not been adopted at that stage though reference to it would have been helpful.

Our application was submitted on 01/09/2021 and research has now revealed the NP was not adopted by the Council until 19/09/2021.

We refer to the above as an explanation for the omission of an assessment of the relevant policies in the PHDAS submitted with the application.

It would be fair to say there is significant overlap between the LP and NP Policies and we do not propose to repeat matters already dealt with. Having reviewed the NP we set out below what we consider to be the Relevant Policies and comment on these, as necessary.

REDINGTON FROGNAL NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN (RFNP)

The Plan's Vision and six Objectives and Aims are set out, in page 6, as follows:

- 1. to preserve and enhance the Redington Frognal characteristics as a picturesque garden suburb, supporting a diverse population;*
- 2. protecting and improving green space and biodiversity;*
- 3. the enhancement of the environment of Finchley Road;*
- 4. identifying areas for growth of new homes, with community facilities to support home working;*
- 5. maintaining and promoting the area as a Centre for Tertiary Education the Arts and Culture;*
- 6. ensuring that basement development does not impact local hydrology or cause damage to neighbouring properties.*



Relevant Policies

SD2 REDINGTON FROGNAL CONSERVATION AREA

Page | 2

New developments must preserve or enhance the green garden suburb character and appearance of the Conservation Area. This includes retention of buildings or features that contribute to that special interest, including gaps between buildings, trees, hedges and the open garden suburb character created by well-vegetated front, side and rear gardens.

For the reasons already set out in our original PHDAS we submit that the proposed extensions will comply with Policy SD2 above

SD5 DWELLINGS: EXTENSIONS AND GARDEN DEVELOPMENT

Policy SD5, a criteria-based policy, requires Extensions to existing buildings, including outbuildings and swimming pools, to be designed to complement the character of the original building and context.

It states proposals should use either matching materials and roof-form of the existing building, including use of authentic traditional materials, or contrasting materials, forms and construction, where this would help to maintain the original composition of the building.

Our proposal follows this advice and the Pre-App response received confirmed the Planning Section was in broad agreement.

Several of the listed criteria are of relevance as follows:

ii. The massing, scale and set-back of the extension should ensure that it is subordinate to the main building.

The proposed side extension replaces an existing garage. The proposal is recessed from the prominent building facade and remains subservient in height to the existing ground floor roof level. The design is contemporary in nature differentiating itself from the existing building. It is a light construction with proposed glazing to enable sunlight into the lower ground floor.

iii. Extension into garden space, including outbuildings, should involve no significant reduction in the overall area of natural soft surface and have no significant adverse impact on the amenity, biodiversity and ecological value within the site.

The proposed rear extension sits on an existing patio. It is contemporary in contrast to the existing building. A small terrace on the ground floor is set back within the flat roof extension. The front and rear extensions relate to one another in materiality and aesthetic.

UD 1 UNDERGROUND DEVELOPMENT

Page | 3

- i. *Residential basements and other underground development, including car parking and swimming pools, should have no significant adverse impact on:*
 - a. *the viability of garden spaces. This requires maintaining 3 metres of depth for roots of large trees and 2 metres of depth for roots of medium trees. Large and medium trees are defined as:*
 - *large trees (ultimate height of 15m+): a minimum of 30 m3*
 - *medium trees (ultimate height of 8 -15m): a minimum of 20 m3;*
 - b. *the character and verdant amenity of garden spaces, including through the impact of light wells, car lifts and other surface features;*
 - c. *the viability of trees with ecological or amenity value and potential for future tree planting. This requires maintaining 3-metres of depth for roots of large trees and 2-metres of depth for roots of medium trees;*
 - d. *underground streams or spring lines, including through cumulative impact, and*
 - e. *neighbouring properties, though impacts, and cumulative impacts, on ground water and land stability.*
- ii. *Development proposals that include new water features to manage drainage, including daylighting of underground rivers, will be encouraged;*
- iii. *Development proposals should be accompanied by sufficient information to allow proper assessment of impacts, including how they:*
 - a. *will not cause cumulative erosion of garden space; and*
 - b. *will not contribute to localised groundwater flooding.*

The application is supported by a comprehensive Basement Impact Assessment (which incorporates a Flood Risk Assessment and SUDS) which concludes as follows:

8.0 Basement impact assessment

8.1.1 A Conceptual Site Model (CSM) is presented in Appendix D.

8.2 Land Stability/Slope Stability

8.2.1 The site investigation has identified the London Clay formation to be the founding stratum.

8.2.2 The risk of movement and damage to this development due to shrink and swell of the London Clay is manageable with the design of a new substructure sufficiently stiff to withstand the actions of the heave.

8.2.3 A Ground Movement Assessment has concluded that the Damage Impact to surrounding structures within the zone of influence will be within Category 0 in accordance with the Burland Scale.

8.2.4 The BIA has concluded that there will be no risks or stability impacts to the development and/or adjacent sites due to slope.

8.3 Hydrogeology and Groundwater Flooding

8.3.1 The BIA has concluded there is a low risk of groundwater flooding.

8.3.2 The BIA has concluded there are no impacts to the wider hydrogeological environment.

8.4 Hydrology, Surface Water Flooding and Sewer Flooding

8.4.1 The BIA has concluded there is low risk of flooding from sewers and surface water.

8.4.2 The BIA has concluded there are no impacts to the wider hydrological environment.

CONCLUSION

This Supplementary PHDAS has reviewed the relevant Policies of the RGNP and it is concluded that the proposed extension are broadly compliant with the criteria set out.

SJP/20/10/21