



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 April 2025

by **D Cleary MTCP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/W/24/3354558

61 Redington Road, Camden, London NW3 7RP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Miss Ella Payne against the decision of the London Borough of Camden Council.
 - The application Ref is 2024/1158/P.
 - The development proposed is described as the installation of new boundary treatment comprising of metal gates with brick piers, a new boundary wall and the demolition of existing boundary wall with associated landscape works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the installation of new boundary treatment comprising of metal gates with brick piers, a new boundary wall and the demolition of existing boundary wall with associated landscape works at 61 Redington Road, Camden, London NW3 7RP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2024/1158/P, and subject to the following conditions:

1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.

2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan referenced:

CR388_PA01 - Front Garden Existing Layout Plan

CR388_PA02 Rev 3 - Front Garden Proposed Layout Plan

CR388_PA03 - Front Garden Existing Elevation

CR388_PA04 Rev 2 - Front Garden Proposed Elevation

CR388_PA06 Rev 2 - Front Garden Existing and Proposed Elevation

CR388_PA07 Rev 3 - Front Garden Planting Plan

CR388_PA08 Rev 2 - Front Garden Materials Plan

552/22/FUL/PL10.01 - Proposed Boundary Wall Plan and Elevation

552/22/FUL/PL10.02 Rev A – Existing Contextual Street Scene

552/22/FUL/PL10.03 – Proposed Contextual Street Scene

552/22/FUL/PL10.04 - Proposed Bin Enclosure

552/22/FUL/PL1000 - Site Location Plan

552/22/FUL/PL1001 Rev A - Proposed Site Plan

552/22/FUL/PL1002 – Proposed Site Plan

3) Before the use of any external facing material of the boundary wall, railings and gates hereby approved, details / samples of the materials to be used shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details / samples.

4) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the recommendations detailed within the Arboricultural Impact Assessment, dated 21 March 2024 (Ref: HGH/61RDR/AIA/02a).

Preliminary Matters

2. The Government published a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) on 12 December 2024. Those parts of the Framework most relevant to this appeal have not been amended. As a result, I have not sought submissions on the revised Framework, and I am satisfied that no party's interests have been prejudiced by taking this approach.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Redington Frognal Conservation Area (the RFCA).

Reasons

4. The appeal site relates to a large two-storey detached building, with accommodation in its roof space. The building is set within a large plot with off street parking and landscaping to the front with private garden located to the rear. It is understood that planning permission has been granted to convert the building to flats and, at the time of my site visit, construction works were being carried out at the property with the site fenced off.
5. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character with this part of Redington Road generally comprising large detached buildings set within generous plots. Buildings along this part of Redington Road have a varied mix of front boundaries, including hedges, brick or stone walls, railings or a mix of railings and brick wall. These roadside boundaries are generally varied in height. The roadside boundary to the front of No.59 Redington Road (No.59), which lies adjacent to the site, includes full height metal railings and gates positioned between brickwork pillars. On the other side of the appeal site, the roadside boundary to the front of No.63 Redington Road (No.63) includes a relatively low brick wall and pillars.
6. The site lies within the RFCA. The statutory requirement¹ requires that special attention be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area. The Redington/Frognal Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Plan 2022 (the CACAMP) provides a good understanding of the RFCA, its historic origins and the features of importance that it

¹ Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

possesses. Insofar as is relevant to this appeal the significance of the RFCA derives from the historic origins and development of the area, the architectural quality and variety of buildings, and the spacious front gardens set behind traditional roadside boundaries.

7. The CACAMP² identifies the RFCA to have traditional boundary treatments which include low brick walls, metal railings and hedges, with some boundary walls incorporating lava bricks and flint. The CACAMP identifies that harm has been caused by the replacement of these traditional boundaries with higher timber fences or unsympathetic metal railings³. With specific regard to Redington Road, the CACAMP identifies that boundary treatments include hedges and brick walls, and that harm is caused by the use of metal gates and railings. At the appeal site, it is understood that the traditional front boundary wall has been removed. Nonetheless, the design of the building, along with the spacious frontage ensures that the site provides a positive contribution to the overall character and appearance of the RFCA.
8. The proposed front boundary (excluding gates) would predominantly be constructed from brickwork with a shallow depth of railings topping the wall. These railings would be provided as infill between taller brickwork pillars. The extent of railings compared to brickwork is relatively limited. The overall height of the front boundary would not be significant, and the predominant use of brickwork would ensure that the boundary would appear as a traditional and, therefore, sympathetic front boundary within the RFCA.
9. The proposed metal gates would occupy part of the boundary. However, the brick wall/railing would occupy a larger proportion of the overall boundary width. As such, the solid brickwork of the wall would appear visually more pronounced on the boundary next to the visually permeable gates. Further, the height and design of the gates would be set lower than the brickwork pillars and appearing visually subservient. Taken together, therefore, the gates would not appear as an unduly prominent or incongruous element of the frontage.
10. Importantly, the mixed brickwork and railing design would provide a visual transition between the brick wall fronting No.63 and the more extensive railings provided to the front of No.59. Therefore, the boundary would visually assimilate with both neighbours, creating a sense of visual continuity and an overall consolidation of the street boundaries. Therefore, the frontage would not appear prominent or out of context with its neighbours. Furthermore, to an extent, the visual transition created by the development would also help to reduce the overall prominence of the railings at No.59 which, at present, have a degree of visual isolation.
11. The modest height of the wall, along with the railing infill and gates, would allow for views to be retained over the spacious front garden area and towards the front façade of the building. Therefore, the development would not erode these other important features of the site or the RFCA in general. For similar reasons, the boundary would not appear overly defensive or create a hostile roadside boundary.
12. I acknowledge that the CACAMP identifies that the introduction of unsympathetic railings along Redington Road can be a harmful addition to the street. I also

² At page 19

³ At page 21

acknowledge the policies of the Redington Froggnal Neighbourhood Plan 2021 (the NP) which identify that boundaries which make a positive contribution should be preserved. While the previous original boundary, which I understand has now been removed, was a traditional feature, I have found that the proposed replacement boundary by reason of its design and, importantly its context with neighbouring boundaries, to be an acceptable addition which would not be harmful to the overall character or appearance of the RFCA. Therefore, in this context, I do not consider that the proposed boundary would appear as an incongruous feature along the street.

13. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development would preserve the character and appearance of the RFCA. Therefore, the development complies with Policies D1 and D2 Camden Local Plan 2017, and Policy SD2 the NP. Together, amongst other things these seek to ensure that development preserves or enhances the character or appearance of Conservation Areas.
14. There would be some conflict with the wording of Policy SD1 of the NP, insofar as the development would not reinstate the previous traditional front boundary. However, I note that the list of criteria set out in Policy SD1 are “considerations”. In this instance, I have found that the proposed boundary would preserve the overall character and appearance of the RFCA and that the development would accord with the provisions of the development plan when considered as a whole. Therefore, identified conflict with SD1 in this instance would not lead me to another conclusion.

Conditions

15. I have imposed standard conditions relating to the commencement of development, and to require compliance with the submitted plans for certainty.
16. The appellant has suggested a condition requiring more detailed design information to be provided. However, as I find the submitted design to be acceptable I do not consider such a condition to be necessary. The Council have suggested a materials to match condition. Given the location of the site within the RFCA I consider a more detailed condition is necessary to ensure that the Council retain final control of the appearance of the brickwork, coping stones, railings and gates. This is in the interests of the character and appearance of the RFCA.
17. Due to the presence of trees on site, the application has been supported by an Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA). While not suggested by the Council, it would be necessary to impose a condition ensuring that the development complies with the mitigation measures and recommendations of the AIA. This would be to ensure that trees are appropriately considered and protected during construction, in the interest of the character and appearance of the area, and the RFCA.

Conclusion

18. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

D Cleary

INSPECTOR