



Planning Insight Ltd  
12 – 18 Theobalds Road  
London  
WC1X 8SL

London Borough of Camden  
2nd Floor, 5 Pancras Square  
c/o Town Hall, Judd Street  
London  
WC1H 9JE

28 March 2025

Dear Planning,

**PROPOSED INNER RETAINING WALL: 20 REDINGTON ROAD, NW3 7RG**

This Covering Letter relates to the accompanying planning application which seeks permission for a proposed new inner retaining wall at 20 Redington Road. For clarity, the proposals align with and would be in addition to the approved boundary treatment and other works at the application site, granted on 21 October 2024 under reference 2024/2871/P, as amended by 2025/0932/P.

**Fallback Position**

As mentioned above, a number of alterations to the existing boundary treatment, alongside other proposed elements, have already been approved under reference 2024/2871/P, namely:

- Replacement frontage brick wall with brick piers and steel railings above;
- New pedestrian gate;
- Recladding the garage and adjacent retaining wall in brick slips, with new railing above; and
- Removal of 10 trees.



It is therefore appropriate to assess only any net impacts associated with the proposed inner retaining wall. The removal of trees in order to deliver the proposed development has already been approved as part of the fallback position, and the impacts of this therefore do not require further consideration.

## Design and Heritage

### Existing Character and Local Precedent

The Redington/ Frognal Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Plan ('the CAMP') and the Redington Frognal Neighbourhood Plan ('the NP') both provide commentary on the character of the wider Conservation Area ('CA')/ NP area, including boundary treatments.

Para 3.4 of the CAMP provides general commentary on the townscape and landscape character, of which the following points are relevant to the subject site:

- An important characteristic is the range of mature trees.
- Hedges as boundary treatments are another landscape characteristic.
- Green and leafy character, with properties sometimes partly screened from view.
- Buildings are set-back behind front gardens or grassed and landscaped strips. This creates a green character... [but] also creates a clear enclosure and definition of those streets by the set-back building frontages and front boundary treatments.

Of Redington Road (para 4.21), it states:

- Boundary treatments include hedges and brick walls. Street and garden trees create a green character.
- Harm includes.... use of metal gates and railings.

The use of metal gates and railings has already been approved under the fallback position and does not form part of the subject application.

It is acknowledged that hedges and brick walls are part of the character of the area, and these features are retained and enhanced through the subject proposals in comparison to the fallback position.



## Impact of the Proposed Development

The proposed inner retaining wall, topped with hedge, will both be of extremely limited visibility from the road, due to retained thick vegetation at the frontage, and will be more in keeping with the characteristics of the area highlighted in the CAMP at para 3.4, than the fallback position:

- *Hedges as boundary treatments.* The proposals secure a new hedge, whereas the fallback position does not include hedge.
- *Green and leafy character.* The proposed hedge will enhance this character.
- *Set-back, enclosure and boundary treatments.* The visual perception of the dwelling set-back and a landscaped, green frontage with well-defined boundary treatments will be enhanced by the proposed inner retaining wall topped with hedge.

Likewise, the CAMP states of Redington Road, at para 4.21, that boundary treatments include hedges and brick walls. The proposals are in keeping with this, and will enhance the green character of the area in comparison with the fallback position.

## Policy Compliance

Policy D1 (Design) of the Camden Local Plan sets out some development requirements which are relevant to a consideration of the subject proposals:

- (a) *Respects local context and character* – key characteristics of the local context are assessed above, and as set out, the proposed development respects these.
- (b) *Preserves or enhances the historic environment in accordance with Policy D2* – as discussed below.
- (e) *High quality details and materials that complement the local area* – again as discussed above, the proposed details and materials, incorporating more elements which are found in the immediate area and which are noted in the CAMP, are more complementary to the local area than the fallback position.

Policy D2 (Heritage) requires development to preserve and, where possible, enhance the character or appearance of Conservation Areas.



Neighbourhood Plan Policy SD2 (Redington Frogna Conservation Area) similarly requires new development to preserve or enhance the 'green garden suburb character and appearance of the Conservation Area. This includes retention of features [including]... well-vegetated front, side and rear gardens.'

The proposed development retains and enhances the vegetated front garden and overall visual permeability (as per the fallback position), and enhances the visually green nature of the site, in compliance with policies D2 and SD2.

Policy SD5 (Dwellings: Extensions and Garden Development), at part (vii), sets out that hedges and front boundary walls which contribute to the character and appearance of the CA, should be retained. The proposed development does not include any removal of boundary treatments or hedge, and indeed additional hedge is proposed. There is therefore no conflict with this policy.

SD6 (Retention of Architectural details in Existing Buildings) sets out that front boundary walls which contribute positively to the character and appearance of the area, should be retained. As above, there is no conflict with this policy.

The specific advice on boundaries at para 6.5 of the CAMP states:

*Boundary treatments should complement existing streetscape character and be informed by historic fencing adjacent. Concrete or timber panel fences would not be in character.*

Concrete or timber panel fences do not form part of the proposed development. This letter has detailed how the proposed boundary treatment complements the existing streetscape character and is informed by the key characteristics found in the vicinity. There are no examples of historic fencing adjacent to the subject site. The proposals therefore accord with the CAMP guidance on boundaries.

## **Conclusions on Design and Heritage**

In applying the NPPF and the relevant development plan policies to the subject proposals, it is important to stress that the subject building itself is not a designated or non-designated heritage asset, and neither are the immediately adjacent or opposite buildings with which it shares a visual relationship. The proposed development should therefore be assessed with



an understanding of the character of the part of the CA which forms the site setting, as well as those existing features of the subject site which contribute to that character.

The setback of properties from the road, with overgrown and vegetated frontages, is noted as a characteristic of the area. The Officer's Report for the fallback referred to retaining the green character of the site frontage as a key aspect of the approved development. The proposals do not include the removal of any trees/ vegetation, other than that already approved under the fallback position, thereby retaining this key characteristic. In addition, the proposed inner retaining wall will both be screened by existing and retained frontage vegetation and will further enhance the green character of the property, through new hedge.

The proposed pedestrian gate within the inner retaining wall sits behind the approved pedestrian gate at the site frontage, in a matching scale and complementary traditional railing design, as approved under 2025/0932/P. It will be an unobtrusive element, well set back from the road behind thick vegetation. Notwithstanding its limited visibility from the road, this element is in keeping with the materiality and design detail already approved at the application site.

### Trees, Landscaping and Biodiversity

The removal of trees required to deliver the proposed inner wall has already been assessed and approved under the fallback position, which this development will add to rather than superseding. Any associated impacts have already been assessed and approved, subject to the discharge of conditions. Compliance with policies regarding trees, landscaping and biodiversity is therefore established.

### Amenity

The Officer's Report, in assessing the fallback position, confirmed it to be acceptable in terms of amenity impacts, in compliance with Policy A1 (Managing the Impact of Development.) The limited nature of the proposed work likewise ensure acceptable impacts, including during the construction phase.

### Conclusion

This letter has assessed the key characteristics of the streetscape surrounding the subject site, as they relate to the proposed development. As detailed above, the proposed development



is sensitive to these characteristics and will have a net enhancing impact in comparison to the fallback position, through the incorporation of a hedge to the inner retaining wall, further enhancing the green characteristics of the site. The proposals therefore preserve and enhance the CA in accordance with the relevant policies. There are no planning reasons in respect of landscaping, trees, biodiversity or amenity to preclude development – these have already been assessed and approved under the fallback position.

The proposals are therefore in accordance with the development plan.

Yours sincerely,

Philippa Baruch MRTPI  
Associate  
**Planning Insight**