

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>	<b>14/02/2025</b>
		N/A		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	<b>26/01/2025</b>
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>		
Lauren Ford			2024/5715/P		
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>		
29 A Frognal London NW3 6AR			See decision notice		
<b>PO 3/4</b>	<b>Area Team Signature</b>	<b>C&amp;UD</b>	<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>		
<b>Proposal(s)</b>					
Outbuilding with green roof and changes to front boundary treatment, including installation of fencing and gates.					
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Refuse Planning Permission			
<b>Application Type:</b>		Householder Application			
<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>		Refer to Draft Decision Notice			
<b>Informatives:</b>					
<b>Consultations</b>					
		No. of responses	<b>01</b>	No. of objections	<b>01</b>
<b>Consultation</b>		<p>Site notices were displayed on 24/12/2024 and expired on 17/01/2025.</p> <p>An advert was displayed in the local press on 02/01/2025 and expired on 26/01/2025.</p> <p>An objection was received from the Redington Frognal Neighbourhood Forum, which can be summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Metal fences and gates are not a traditional feature. Their introduction will create a hostile street scene and cause significant harm to the conservation area.</li> <li>• The harm caused by metal gates and closed-boarded fences is noted in the conservation area statement, and metal gates are contrary to the policies of the Neighbourhood Plan. Such policies have been reinforced by several appeals, which have been dismissed.</li> <li>• The planting of three new trees is greatly welcomed and will help to mitigate the loss of natural soft surface water runoff.</li> </ul>			

## Site Description

The application site comprises a two-story, end-of-terrace property located on the western side of Frognal, at a prominent crossroads between Frognal and Arkwright Road.

The site is within the Redington Frognal Conservation Area. The Redington Frognal Conservation Area Character Appraisal & Management Plan states that the two-storey yellow brick houses with pan-tile roofs detract from the character and appearance of the area. No listed buildings are close to the site.

## Relevant History

Relevant planning records at the application site:

**2010/2456/P:** *Erection of a new residential dwelling (class C3), following the demolition of existing.* **Refused**, 01/07/2010.

**2010/2457/C:** *Demolition of residential dwelling (class C3).* **Refused**, 01/07/2010.

**2023/4302/P:** *Erection of single storey extensions at ground floor to front and rear, replacement and enlargement of existing ground floor side extension, and installation of rear dormer and rooflights. Various external works including erection of refuse store and cycle storage, installation of green wall, and landscaping to garden area.* **Granted**, 06/02/2024.

Neighbouring sites:

**2004/1234/P (63 Frognal):** *Demolition of existing front boundary dwarf brick wall and steps and erection of new 3.22m high front boundary wall with gates.* **Refused**, 28/07/2004.

**2021/0188/P (10 Ferncroft Avenue):** *Installation of sliding metal gates, railings, brick piers and replacement brick wall to front boundary; replacement of front entrance door and steps and side gate; erection of pergola to rear garden and various hard and soft landscaping works to front and rear gardens.* **Refused**, 21/11/2021. **Appeal dismissed**, 20/07/2022.

**2020/0942/P (12 Oakhill Avenue):** *New metal gates and fencing to the existing front boundary low wall.* **Refused**, 10/08/2020. **Appeal dismissed**, 24/11/2020.

## Relevant Policies

### National Planning Policy Framework (2024)

### London Plan (2021)

### Camden Local Plan (2017)

Policy A1 – Managing the impact of development

Policy A1 – Biodiversity

Policy D1 – Design

Policy D2 – Heritage

### Redington Frognal Neighbourhood Plan (2021)

SD1 – Refurbishment of existing building stock

SD2 – Redington Frognal Conservation Area

SD4 – Redington Frognal character

SD5 – Dwellings: Extensions and garden development

BGI 1 – Gardens and ecology

BGI2 – Tree planting and preservation

## Redington Frognal Conservation Area Character Appraisal & Management Plan (2022)

### Camden Supplementary Planning Guidance (2021)

CGP - Design

CPG - Amenity

CPG – Home Improvements

## Assessment

### 1. Proposal

1.1. Planning permission is sought for the following:

- Outbuilding with green roof: The outbuilding would be positioned in the northern corner of the site, against the boundary with Frognal. It would have dimensions of 2.5m (height), 4.5m (width), and 3.5 m (depth). The proposed materials include black aluminium doors and board cladding.
- Changes to front boundary treatment, including installation of fencing and gates: The proposed pedestrian and vehicle gates would be timber panels to a maximum height of 1.7m and brick piers ranging from 1.8m to 2m.

### 2. Planning Considerations

2.1. The material considerations in the determination of this application are as follows:

- Design and heritage
- Neighbouring amenity
- Trees and landscape

### 3. Design and Heritage

3.1. The Council's design policies aim to achieve the highest design standard in all developments. The following considerations contained within policy D1 are relevant to the application: development should respect local context and character; comprise details and materials that are of high quality and complement the local character; and respond to natural features. Policy D2 'Heritage' states that in order to maintain the character of Camden's conservation areas, the Council will not permit development within a conservation area that fails to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of that conservation area.

#### Outbuilding

3.2. The CPG (Home Improvements) states that outbuildings should:

- *Ensure the sitting, location, scale and design has a minimal visual impact on and is visually subordinate within, the host garden*
- *The works should preserve or enhance the existing qualities and context of the site, and character of the Conservation Area*
- *No detract from neighbouring gardens' open character and garden amenity and the wider surrounding area.*

3.3. The Redington Frognal Conservation Area Character Appraisal & Management Plan (2022), chapter 6 'Development Principles', Landscape Character principle 6.1b states:

*"Development, including garden buildings, should not encroach significantly onto existing rear garden areas or harm the landscape character created by the amalgam of rear gardens. This is especially important for gardens adjacent to street frontages."*

3.4. Given its awkward positioning on a prominent corner site on sloping land, the proposed outbuilding would be visible from the eastern section of Arkwright Road and the upper section of

Frognal. It is noted that the proposed site plan and the side elevation 2 (drawing number GA 03) show the outbuilding in different locations concerning the boundary treatment. Assuming the location shown on the proposed site plan, it would negatively impact the urban grain and the openness of this section of the site. The openness character would be eroded through a visible development over the boundary, harming the character and appearance of the Redington Frognal Conservation Area.

3.1. The prominent location of the garden in question, being on a corner site on sloping land, combined with the awkward positioning of the proposed outbuilding in this location, means that the proposed outbuilding would be visible from parts of both Arkwright Gardens and Frognal. It is noted that the proposed site plan and side elevation 2 (drawing number GA 03) show the outbuilding in different locations concerning the boundary treatment. Assuming the location shown on the proposed site plan, the location of the outbuilding would negatively impact the urban grain. It would also result in a perceived loss of openness in this section of the site, as the outbuilding would take up a significant proportion of the garden and result in the removal of greenery (including shrubs and low-value trees), which would not be replaced in the vicinity of the proposed outbuilding, and which the addition of a green roof would only partially compensate. The current openness of this section of the site contributes to the character and appearance of the Redington Frognal Conservation Area.

3.2. For the reasons detailed above, the proposed outbuilding would negatively affect the character and appearance of the Redington Frognal Conservation Area. It would also be contrary to policies D1 and D2 of the Local Plan and policies SD2, SD4, and SD5 of the Neighbourhood Plan and is considered unacceptable on this basis.

#### Boundary treatment

3.3. The Redington Frognal Conservation Area Statement states the following concerning boundary treatments:

- *Boundary treatments should complement the existing streetscape character and be informed by historic fencing adjacent. Concrete or timber panel fences would not be in character.*
- *Particular harm has been caused by concrete post and timber board fences to street frontages, which are at odds with the character of the area.*
- *Traditional boundary treatments include low brick walls, metal railings and hedges.*

3.4. The Redington Frognal Neighbourhood Plan states: *use of hedges as front, side and rear garden boundaries is encouraged, to enhance amenity, biodiversity and streetscapes.*

3.5. The CPG (Home Improvements) states the following concerning boundary treatments:

- *We would expect that its dimensions, proportions, detailing and design respect the existing character of the street and is subordinate to the host building*
- *Materials used should relate and complement the host building.*

3.6. While some timber fencing is present along the site's eastern boundary, this is not in character with the surrounding environment. No other properties along Frognal contain high timber fencing and gates such as those proposed through this application. The boundary treatments within this area predominantly comprise low brick walls, metal railings, and hedges (as supported by the conservation area statement). Timber fencing would, therefore, be an alien feature that does not keep with the existing materials and design while also creating a defensive and blank boundary treatment.

3.7. The proposed boundary treatment, including high boarded fencing, gates, and high brick piers, is contrary to the Neighbourhood Plan, Conservation Area Statement and CPG (Home Improvements). The Conservation Area Statement specifically states that timber panel fences

(as proposed) are at odds with the area's character. The proposed boundary treatment would deaden the street frontage due to its excessive height for form and would be out of character with the lower front boundary treatments present within the surrounding area.

- 3.8. Due to its height and materials, the proposed boundary treatment would be contrary to policies D1 and D2 of the Local Plan and policies SD1, SD2, and SD4 of the Neighbourhood Plan. It is also contrary to the conservation area statement and CPG (Home Improvements).

#### **4. Neighbouring Amenity**

- 4.1. Local Plan Policy A1 seeks to protect the amenity of Camden's residents by ensuring the impact of development on their amenity is fully considered. It seeks to ensure that development protects the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission for development that would not harm the amenity of neighbouring residents. Relevant to the application are overlooking, privacy, sunlight, daylight, overshadowing and outlook consideration.
- 4.2. Given the scale, nature, and location of the works, the proposal would not result in any unacceptable amenity-related effect.
- 4.3. Therefore, the proposal complies with policy A1 of the Camden Local Plan 2017.

#### **5. Trees and Landscape**

- 5.1. The conservation area statement states that the *loss of garden trees and hedges should be avoided, and all trees which contribute to the character of the Area should be retained and protected. Where removal of a tree is unavoidable, there should be a replacement tree of similar species in close proximity.*
- 5.2. A tree schedule and tree drawings have been submitted with the application. The proposal involves the removal of T3, T4 and T6 from the front garden of the application site. These three trees are category U (poor quality) and are either decayed or dead. Replacement planting is proposed; however, full details have not been submitted. It is also noted that the proposed site plan does not match the proposed tree protection plan, which does not include the proposed outbuilding. Notwithstanding this, the Council's Tree and Landscape Officer considers that as T3 and T4 are proposed for removal, the unassessed tree impact of the outbuilding is inconsequential in this instance. Revised tree protection details could be secured via condition on a granted application.
- 5.3. The neighbourhood plan states that extension into garden space, including outbuildings, should involve no significant reduction in the overall area of natural soft surface and have no significant adverse impact on the amenity, biodiversity and ecological value within the site.
- 5.4. Whilst a green roof is proposed on the outbuilding, this only partially mitigates the loss of garden space with informal trees and shrubs that the garden currently provides.
- 5.5. Given the above, whilst there is considered to be some conflict with policy SD5 of the Neighbourhood Plan in terms of the loss of open garden space, the proposal would not result in any unacceptable impact on trees and is consistent with policy A3 of the Camden Local Plan 2017 and policies BGI1 and BGI2 of the Redington Froggnal Neighbourhood Plan.

#### **6. Recommendation**

- 6.1. Refuse planning permission for the following reasons:

1. The proposed outbuilding, given its positioning and associated visibility, would result in loss of openness and erosion of the landscape character afforded by the garden to the streetscene in this location thereby failing to preserve the character and appearance of the Redington Frognal Conservation Area, contrary to policies D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) of the Camden Local Plan 2017 and policies SD2 (Redington Frognal Conservation Area), SD4 (Redington Frognal Character) and SD5 (Dwellings: Extensions and garden development) of the Redington Frognal Neighbourhood Plan 2021.
2. The proposed boundary treatment, including timber panel fencing and gates and brick piers with stone coping, by reason of its excessive height, design and materials, would be out of character with the lower front boundary treatments present within the surrounding area, and harm the appearance of the conservation area, contrary to policies D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) of the Camden Local Plan 2017, and policies SD1 (Refurbishment of existing building stock), SD2 (Redington Frognal conservation area) and SD4 (Redington Frognal character) of the Redington Frognal Neighbourhood Plan 2021.