**REDINGTON FROGNAL**

NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM

28 November 2021

Dear Mr. Hope,

**Application 2021/4234/P: 4F Frognal - objection**

Thank you for obtaining a revised design and access statement acknowledging the existence of the Redington Frognal Neighbourhood Plan.

Many of the policies of the Neighbourhood Plan are relevant, but no landscaping proposals or mitigation measures have been offered to demonstrate compliance with the following policies; eg

SD 1, SD 2 , SD 4, SD 5

BGI 1, BGI 2, BGI 3

UD 1, UD 2.

To help demonstrate compliance, the application should quantify the areas of hard surface to be added and removed to ensure that there is no net loss of natural soft surface (SD 1 v, SD 4 vii, SD 5 iii, BGI 1 iii, BGI 2 i). Landscaping proposals will need to demonstrate the achievement of a net gain in biodiversity (SD 1 iii – vii, SD 4 viii, BGI 1 ii , BGI 2 i-v). Consideration should also be given to policies SD 4 xii and BGI 1 vii.

For UD 1, the areas of soil depth of 2 metres and 3 metres should also be measured, in order for the natural soft surface to support tree planting and to act as a carbon sink. The proximity of the Cannon Stream should be indicated and taken into account:

<https://www.redfrogforum.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/Figure-7-Results-Map-latest-version.pdf>

As the application stands, it is not compliant with the Neighbourhood Plan, although it is capable of conformity subject to the above modifications.

Yours sincerely,

Nancy Mayo

Secretary  
  
Redington Frognal Neighbourhood Forum  
[https://www.redfrogforum.org](https://www.redfrogforum.org/)

<https://twitter.com/RedfrogNF>
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