



## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 January 2026

by **M Cryan BA(Hons) DipTP MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 March 2026

**Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/D/25/3369350**

**20 Redington Road, London NW3 7RG**

- 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 Luff and Ms Milward against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
- The application reference is 2025/1477/P.
- The development proposed is the erection of vehicle entry gates and alterations to the front boundary.

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of vehicle entry gates and alterations to the front boundary at 20 Redington Road, London NW3 7RG in accordance with the terms of the application, reference 2025/1477/P, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three] years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans and documents:
    - Drawing D3\_001 – Location and Block Plan (21 February 2025)
    - Drawing D3\_G\_020 – Consented Elevation (21 February 2025)
    - Drawing D3\_G\_120 – Proposed New Vehicular Gate (21 February 2025)
    - Planning Statement, Planning Insight Ltd (28 March 2025)
  - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed to match those specified in planning permission
  - 4) Notwithstanding condition 2, no development above ground level shall take place until details at 1:10 of the new gates have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

### Main Issues

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the Redington/Frogna Conservation Area (“the RFCA”).

### Reasons

3. The appeal relates to an early 20th century detached dwelling on the north-eastern side of Redington Road. The site is within the RFCA, and I therefore have a statutory duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Area. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that they should be

conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance (paragraph 202). It goes on to advise that any harm or loss requires clear and convincing justification (paragraph 213) and that any harm that is less than substantial must be weighed against the public benefit of the proposal (paragraph 215).

4. The RFCA is largely residential in character, consisting mainly of large detached and semi-detached houses in a verdant setting on the slopes west and south-west of the historic centre of Hampstead Village. The 2022 RFCA Character Appraisal & Management Plan (“the CAMP”) identifies three principal elements of the area’s special interest: the landscape of smaller front gardens and extensive rear gardens, with many mature private and street trees; the townscape of residential buildings in that setting; and the architecture, with common features drawing on Queen Anne Revival and Arts and Crafts influences. The Redington Frognal Neighbourhood Plan (“the RFNP”), which was “made” and became part of the development plan in 2021, highlights the area’s fine architecture. I consider that the significance of the RFCA, insofar as it relates to this appeal, is derived from its status as a well-preserved prosperous Victorian and Edwardian garden suburb.
5. No 20 Redington Road is identified in the CAMP as being among a group of buildings which make a positive contribution to the RFCA. The house itself is raised above the level of, and set back from, Redington Road, with a front garden sloping down towards the street. At street level, a large garage with a shallow paved forecourt is set into the slope of the hillside. Planning permission has been granted separately for a scheme including alterations to the front boundary, with a new retaining wall, metal pedestrian gate and railings<sup>1</sup>, the works for which were being carried out at the time of my site visit. The appeal proposal is the installation of metal vehicle entry gates, approximately 2m high, across the entrance to the garage forecourt.
6. The CAMP describes low brick walls, metal railings and hedges to front and side boundaries as traditional boundary treatments within the RFCA, and I saw that this gives many streets in the area a rather open and spacious character. The CAMP goes on to say that the removal of hedging and its replacement with metal gates or raisings can create hard urban frontages, causing considerable harm to the verdant character of the area. I note also the observations of the Redington Frognal Neighbourhood Forum about the RFCA becoming “blighted” by what it described as “the contagion of metal gates and railings”.
7. Walking around the area during my visit it was evident that many properties retain the low wall and hedgerow front boundaries and open driveways characteristic of the wider RFCA. Where higher walls have been installed, with or without gates and railings, they have often led to a loss of openness and a harshening of the streetscene. Broadly speaking, I am not therefore unsympathetic to the view put forward by the neighbourhood forum.
8. In my view, however, the part of Redington Road in front of the appeal property has a character quite distinct from that found throughout much of the rest of the RFCA. The plots on which No 20 and its neighbours on either side sit rise steeply from Redington Road such that, although the houses can still be seen from the street, the immediate interface with the street is characterised by very shallow forecourts, garages set into the hillside, and retaining walls topped with dense vegetation.

---

<sup>1</sup> LPA ref: 2024/2871/P, with amendments approved by planning permission ref: 2025/0932/P.

They therefore do not have the same degree of openness, including relatively extensive views into and across front gardens, which is characteristic of the wider RFCA.

9. While the proposed gates would close off the forecourt in front of the appeal property's garage, that is a very shallow "cut out" in the hillside which makes a very limited contribution to either the visual or physical openness which generally prevails across the RFCA. The form of the gates would be in keeping with the appearance of the other boundary works to No 20 already approved, and broadly consistent with the street frontages on either side.
10. The Council pointed out that the boundary treatment already approved at the appeal property (and described above) was to replace similar railings which previously existed at the site, while the railings and gates at No 22 pre-dated the making of the RFNP and the preparation of the CAMP. Nevertheless, these are features which form the immediate context of the appeal site, and in my view they are not an inappropriate response to the distinctive topography of this very short part of Redington Road. Had the proposal come forward for a site elsewhere in the RFCA – even within some of the 250m or so of Redington Road closest to the appeal site which the appellant suggested I should take into account – it is quite possible that I would have reached a different conclusion. However, for the reasons which I have set out in the preceding two paragraphs, I consider that the proposed development would not harm the character or appearance of the area.
11. In reaching my decision, I have had regard to the appeal decision in respect of a proposal for various works including boundary treatments and gates at No 10 Ferncroft Avenue to which the Council drew my attention<sup>2</sup>. As I saw during my visit, during which I walked along Ferncroft Avenue, boundary treatments there mostly follow the low wall and hedge pattern characteristic of the wider RFCA. However, and as I have just set out, I consider that the immediate context of the appeal site is such that a different decision is justified in this case.
12. Accordingly, I conclude that the character and appearance of the RFCA would be preserved, and its significance as a designated heritage asset would not be harmed. As such, the proposed development would comply with Policies D1 and D2 of the 2017 Camden Local Plan which, among other things, seek to secure high quality design which respects local context and character, and to preserve and enhance designated heritage assets including conservation areas. There would also be no conflict with Policies SD2 and SD4 of the 2021 Redington Froggnal Neighbourhood Plan, which seek to preserve or enhance the green garden suburb character of the RFCA, and to reinforce its established townscape character.
13. The proposal would also comply with the requirements of the Framework relating to conserving and enhancing the historic environment. As I do not find that the proposal has caused harm to or loss of heritage assets, it is not necessary to apply the public benefit test set out in Paragraph 215 of the Framework.

## Conditions

14. In addition to the standard time limit condition (1), I have specified the approved plans so as to provide certainty (2). In order to protect the character and appearance of the area I have also included conditions requiring materials to match

---

<sup>2</sup> PINS Ref: APP/X5210/D/21/3289001

those of the existing boundary treatments (3), and large-scale details of new gates to be submitted to the Council for approval (4), though in the interests of effectiveness I have used a slightly different wording from that suggested by the Council.

### **Conclusion**

15. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

*M Cryan*

Inspector