



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 November 2025

by **H Jones BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/W/25/3363058

1 Redington Road, Camden, London NW3 7QX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a grant of planning permission subject to conditions.
- The appeal is made by Johanna Ehrnrooth against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
- The application Ref 2024/4778/P was approved on 23 January 2025 and planning permission was granted subject to conditions.
- The development permitted is alterations to fenestration on front (Frognal) and rear elevations including replacement and addition of windows, a skylight and doors, and works to rear courtyard including erection of a garden shed and pergola and replacement of existing garage door on Redington Road elevation.
- The condition in dispute is No 4 which states that:
Notwithstanding any indication given on the approved plans, the windows and doors specified in the application, with reference to plans (D054.1; D054.02-B; D054-12-C; D54-11-B; D054-13 -A) of the development hereby permitted shall be finished in timber.
- The reason given for the condition is:
To safeguard the appearance of the premises and the character of the immediate area in accordance with the requirements of policies D1 and D2 of the Camden Local Plan 2017.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and the planning permission Ref 2024/4778/P for alterations to fenestration on front (Frognal) and rear elevations including replacement and addition of windows, a skylight and doors, and works to rear courtyard including erection of a garden shed and pergola and replacement of existing garage door on Redington Road elevation at 1 Redington Road, Camden, London NW3 7QX granted on 23 January 2025 by the Council of the London Borough of Camden is varied by deleting condition 4 and substituting it with the following condition:
 - 4) Notwithstanding any indication given on the approved plans, the replacement garage door hereby permitted shall be constructed of aluminium and coloured jet black, and the other replacement windows and doors hereby permitted shall be constructed of aluminium and coloured anthracite grey.

Preliminary Matters

2. On site, development works are being undertaken. I noted that windows and doors proposed for replacement through planning permission Ref 2024/4778/P had already been removed. However, their replacements had not been installed. For the avoidance of doubt, I have determined the appeal on the basis that the development permitted is proposed, and this is reflected in my use of tense.

3. Since the appeal has been submitted, the Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan 2025-2040 (the NP) has been adopted, replacing the Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan 2018-2033. As necessary, I refer to the NP elsewhere in my decision.
4. A new local plan for Camden is also emerging (the Emerging Plan). I have quite limited information before me in relation to the precise stage the Emerging Plan is at and the level of unresolved objection that there may be to it. However, on the basis of what is before me, it seems to me that the Emerging Plan remains at a stage where its content could very well be the subject of change. I note that the Council set out in its statement that the Emerging Plan is a matter of limited weight and, given all that is before me, I agree.
5. The appeal site is situated within a conservation area, and listed buildings are located nearby. As a result, in making my decision, I have had special regard to sections 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Main Issue

6. The main issue is the effect removing the disputed condition would have on the character and appearance of the host property, the Hampstead Conservation Area and the Redington/Frogna Conservation Area.

Reasons

7. The appeal site is situated within the Hampstead Conservation Area (the Hampstead CA). Principal factors which contribute to the Hampstead CA's significance include the diversity of architectural styles and the high design quality exhibited by its buildings, its undulating topography and fine-grain street pattern, and its verdant character arising from its open spaces, mature gardens and mature trees. For these reasons, much of the Hampstead CA's significance stems from its architectural interest. Owing to the evidence which it provides of the development of suburban London and of notable figures, including the work of renowned architects, its historic interest also contributes to its significance.
8. The appeal site is not within, but it is adjacent to, the Redington/Frogna Conservation Area (the Redington/Frogna CA). The significance of this conservation area is also partly derived from the diversity and quality of its architecture. Its significance is further enhanced by a distinctive landscape of small front gardens and larger rear gardens, often with mature trees, along with townscape features such as varied building scales and a notable pattern of residential buildings set back behind enclosed front plots. Therefore, the significance of the Redington/Frogna CA is largely derived from its architectural interest, but its evidence of planned residential development and its association with notable figures, including members of the Maryon Wilson family, provides it with historic interest as well.
9. The host property, 1 Redington Road (No 1), is a traditionally designed residential property that, despite some alterations and non-original elements, displays distinctive and ornate architectural detailing. It reflects the architecture and the high-quality design characteristics of the Hampstead CA, and it makes a positive contribution to the significance of this conservation area as a result. In addition, in forming part of a group of properties within the setting of the Redington/Frogna CA that are sympathetic to its character and appearance, No 1 positively assists with

the appreciation of the Redington/Frognaal CA's significance as well. Submissions before me refer to No 1 as a non-designated heritage asset and, given its character, appearance and contribution to the area, I have no reason to disagree.

10. The planning condition in dispute relates solely to the material specification of the proposed windows and doors. It does not exert control over other aspects of their design or appearance. In granting planning permission, the Council has accepted the replacement of the existing windows and doors. The judgement on whether it is acceptable for the condition in dispute to be removed must be made in this context and with regard to the whole of the development which has been permitted.
11. On completion of the permitted development, the existing garage door would be replaced with one with multi-paned windows and a similar aesthetic to the adjoining garage door. Multi-paned windows are characteristic of No 1 and many of the properties in the area. Therefore, this aspect of the development permitted would enhance symmetry with the neighbouring property, reflect fenestration detailing typical of the local area and be a positive change.
12. On No 1's east elevation, the kitchen window and set of French doors proposed for replacement are not distinctively designed: they do not have the multi-paned design or widespread use of glazing bars which are a feature of many other windows in the property. The replacement triple sliding screens would be largely glazed, and the plans show a surrounding frame with an unobtrusive, slimline profile. The replacement of the windows and doors proposed to the kitchen and dining room on the western elevation would take place within a very well enclosed part of the site and would not be widely visible.
13. Furthermore, although No 1 contains timber windows, the evidence before me and my own observations on site strongly indicate to me that several of the windows and doors proposed for replacement are not made of timber.
14. Overall, the development permitted would not result in the loss of many original timber windows or doors. For the most part, the development permitted would result in the loss of windows and doors which do not contribute to No 1's significance as a non-designated heritage asset or the reasons why the building makes a positive contribution within the Hampstead CA and within the setting of the Redington/Frognaal CA. I have referred to positive facets of the proposal's design, and why the proposed change to the garage would be an enhancement. Furthermore, certain aspects of the development permitted would affect well-screened parts of the property and thereby be inconspicuous – and development proposed within a conservation area must be judged according to its effect on that conservation area as a whole.
15. For all these reasons, I find that it is not necessary for the proposed windows and doors to be made of timber. Without this requirement, the development permitted could be completed without causing harm to the significance of No. 1 or to that of the Hampstead CA and the Redington/Frognaal CA.
16. That said, the submitted plans lack clarity, and they do not identify the precise material finish of the proposed windows or doors. It is clear from the evidence before me that the appellant seeks an aluminium garage door finished in jet black and for the other proposed windows and doors to be aluminium but in anthracite grey. A condition exerting control over this is needed as, otherwise, there would be

nothing to prevent any material finish being implemented. Given that heritage assets are irreplaceable resources which should be conserved and since planning permissions should be clear about the detailed design and material finish of developments, such uncertainty would be unacceptable.

17. Therefore, although it is acceptable for the condition in dispute to be removed an alternative condition which defines the materials to be used is nevertheless necessary. With this alternative condition imposed, the character and appearance of the host property, the Hampstead Conservation Area and the Redington/Frognaal Conservation Area would each be preserved, their significance unharmed and the permitted development in its varied form complies with Policies D1 and D2 of the Camden Local Plan 2017 and Policy DH2 of the NP as a result. Together, and in summary and amongst other matters, Policies D1 and D2 seek to preserve the character or appearance of conservation areas, protect non-designated heritage assets and secure development of high quality which respects and complements local context and character, including through their use of materials. Policy DH2 seeks to protect buildings and features that make a positive contribution to conservation areas whilst setting out that development proposals should have regard to guidelines within relevant conservation area appraisals and management strategies.

Other Matters

18. Nos 2 and 4 Redington Road (Nos 2 and 4) is a grade II* listed building. The principal significance of this listed building is derived from its design and architecture, and the evidence it provides of the work of the prominent architect Philip Webb. Redington Road's streetscape of other impressive residential properties contributes positively to the listed building's setting. No 1 and Nos 2 and 4 are located on opposite sides of Redington Road. Consequently, it would be the proposed development's replacement garage door which would principally be seen in conjunction with Nos 2 and 4, an element I have identified to be well-designed. No harm to the listed building's special features of interest or setting would therefore result.
19. Nos 88 and 88A and Attached Railings, Frognaal (Nos 88 and 88A) is a grade II listed building. It consists of a pair of traditional and distinctively designed semi-detached cottages with ornate attached railings. For this reason, its significance principally stems from its architectural interest. In its surroundings are other different, yet distinctively designed properties, and this context of varied properties contributes to the setting of Nos 88 and 88A. There would be some intervisibility between the listed building and the proposed development's alterations to No 1's northern and eastern elevations but, overall, these would constitute modest alterations to the street scene which would not harm the listed building's special features of interest or setting.
20. The Old Mansion and Attached Wall, Railings and Lamp Holder at 94 and 94a Frognaal is a third listed building within the vicinity of the appeal site (grade II*). Its central portions date from around 1700, and it exhibits ornate design detailing. Therefore, its architecture and considerable age provide most of its significance. The listed building is located in a prominent position beside a bend on Frognaal and close to junctions. This allows for its architecture to be appreciated in approaches to it - this setting contributes to its significance. Overall, given the proposed

development's design, scale and proximity, again, no harm to this listed building would arise.

21. The Council contend that the appellant's agent agreed to the disputed condition during the planning application's determination. Even if that were the case, it carries little weight in assessing the planning merits, which form the basis of my decision.

Conclusion

22. For the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed and the planning permission be varied to remove the disputed condition No 4, substituting it with the condition listed in my decision above.

H Jones

INSPECTOR