



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 September 2025

by **John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 October 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/D/25/3370102**

**14 Greenaway Gardens, Camden, London, NW3 7DH**

- 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 Mr Danylo Knysh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
  - The application Ref is 2025/1967/P.
  - The development proposed is the erection of a brick front boundary wall with planted hedge and sliding metal gates.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a brick front boundary wall with planted hedge and sliding metal gates at 14 Greenaway Gardens, Camden, London, NW3 7DH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2025/1967/P, 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 approved plans: Site Location Plan at scale 1:1250@A4 dated 07 May 2025 and Drg Nos 0201 Rev A, (0942)3225\_PL01 and (0942)3226\_PL01.
  - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the brick wall and piers hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.
  - 4) No development shall commence until a full specification for the hedgerow planting has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The specification shall include the quantity, size, species, and positions or density of all trees/shrubs to be planted, how they will be planted and protected and the proposed time of planting. The tree/shrub planting shall be carried out in accordance with the approved specification. If, within a period of 5 years from the date of planting, the tree/shrub (or any tree/shrub planted in replacement for it) is removed, uprooted, destroyed or dies or becomes seriously damaged or defective, another tree/shrub of the same size and species as that originally planted shall be planted at the same place within the first planting season following the removal, uprooting, destruction or death of the original tree/shrub unless the local planning authority gives its written consent to any variation.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the Redington/Frogna Conservation Area.

## Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a two-storey, detached dwelling with accommodation within the roof on the east side of Greenaway Gardens, a gently curved and sloping residential road comprising predominantly large detached late 19<sup>th</sup> early 20<sup>th</sup> century homes set behind reasonably shallow frontages. The appeal site sits within the wider Redington/Frognal Conservation Area (CA). The Council's *Redington/Frognal Conservation Area Character Appraisal & Management Plan 2022* (CACAMP) identifies the area's historic origins and features of importance. It describes a primarily residential suburb of stylistically diverse residences which draw on Queen Anne Revival and Arts and Crafts influences with green and leafy streetscapes derived principally from avenues of trees and informal garden vegetation, including boundary hedge treatments. The appeal building is identified, amongst many others along Greenaway Gardens, as a positive contributor to the character and appearance of the CA.
4. The CACAMP describes the CA's traditional boundary treatments as comprising low brick walls, metal railings, and hedges, with some boundary walls incorporating lava bricks and flint. The CACAMP goes on to identify potential harms, including specifically along Greenaway Gardens. Amongst them it includes the loss of front boundaries for parking, or else the removal of low walls, railings or hedges and their replacement with higher timber fences or unsympathetic metal railings. It identifies particular harm caused by concrete post and timber board fences to street frontages.
5. The appeal site has a carriage-drive arrangement with an open vehicular point of access/egress to either side of its frontage and a previous white post-and-chain fence centrally between the two and in front of a semi-circular lawn. At the time of my visit the post-and-chain fence had been removed and the site's frontage was enclosed with a hoarding. The proposal is to erect a low brick wall in place of the former fence, with hedgerow above, together with taller brick piers either side marking a separate and new pedestrian access and retention of the existing vehicular points of access, each linked with black metal gates.
6. The Council argues that the former post-and-chain fence would have been the original design for the entire road. There is no substantive evidence to support this assertion. I have not been directed to any such references within the CACAMP. Neither does the significantly open nature of the former boundary reflect the traditional boundary treatments as they are described within the CACAMP, and which I saw to be dominant during my visit along Greenaway Gardens, where front boundaries are robustly demarcated with a mix of either low walls and taller brick piers, partial railings and gates, or a mixture of all, including often with hedgerow above or behind. As such, I do not accept the Council's argument that the street scene along Greenaway Gardens represents the antithesis of the CA's original design concept. This is not reflected either by my own observations or within the CACAMP where the character of, and potential harm to, Greenaway Gardens is described.
7. The proposed central low wall and hedge would run for a length approximately half the site's frontage width and would visually dominate to the forefront, and in a sympathetic manner with a soft and verdant focus overall that would contribute positively to the leafy character of the area. The railings and brick piers would be more subservient features to each side, reasonably enclosing the access and

egress points, and in my judgement would be neither excessive in height nor unsympathetic in appearance, allowing a degree of visual permeability to the front garden and beyond to the dwelling's façade, where its architectural style and detailing would remain open to clear sight and appreciation. In my view, the proposal would reasonably reflect the style of the traditional boundary treatments that are identified within the CACAMP and would assimilate itself into the street scene, where it would appear as a comfortable part of the established townscape character and surrounding context without seeming over defensive or hostile as a form of roadside enclosure.

8. Overall, for the reasons amplified above, I am satisfied that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the CA. As such, there would be no conflict with Policies D1 or D2 of the Camden Local Plan 2017, or with Policies SD2 and SD4 of the Redington Froggnal Neighbourhood Plan 2021 (NP). Between them, and amongst other things, these seek to ensure development displays a high quality of design that respects local context and character and preserves or enhances the character and appearance of conservation areas.
9. In addition, the introduction of trees/shrubs to create a new hedgerow would contribute to enhanced ecological and wildlife values at the site, which would be in accordance with NP Policy BGI 1. The introduction of a boundary hedge and wall would also comply with NP Policy SD1 parts vi and vii as far as they seek development to positively contribute to the character of an area. I note a suggestion from an interested third party that there would also be conflict with NP Policy SD6. This requires retention of original features, including front boundary walls, and that where removed their reinstatement should be encouraged. In the absence of evidence to confirm the former means of enclosure was original, I find no conflict with Policy SD6. In any event, given my findings overall, I am satisfied that the development would comply with the provisions of the development plan when considered as a whole.

### **Conditions**

10. In addition to the standard time limit and plans conditions, a condition is required to ensure that the brick wall is constructed in materials that would match those used on the existing dwelling. This is necessary in order to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.
11. The proposed hedgerow is an integral part of the proposal and its successful planting and upkeep is also key to maintaining the character and appearance of the area. I have therefore included a condition requiring details of a planting schedule and maintenance programme to be approved by the local planning authority and thereafter implemented.

### **Conclusion**

12. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

*John D Allan*

INSPECTOR