

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b> 29/05/2025	
		N/A		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b> 11/05/2025	
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>		
Brendan Versluys			2025/1478/P		
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>		
20 Redington Road London NW3 7RG			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>					
Erection of retaining wall and pedestrian gate within the front garden.					
<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>					
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>		<b>No. of responses</b>		0	<b>No. of objections</b>
				0	
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>		<p>A site notice was displayed on 09/04/2025 which expired on 03/05/2025, and a press notice was published on 20/06/2024, expiring on 11/05/2025.</p> <p>No responses were received.</p>			
<b>Redington Frogna Neighbourhood Forum</b>		<p>The Redington Frogna Neighbourhood Forum responded to object to the application, along with the other proposals at the same site. With respect to this specific application, their concerns can be summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The demolition of the existing brick wall and replacement with a new retaining wall would entail the removal of trees and vegetation, which conflicts with Neighbourhood Plan policies;</li> <li>The replacement of the wall and proposed materials including concrete wall and brick slips, would fail to comply with policy SD 6 of the Neighbourhood Plan, which requires that front boundary walls which contribute positively are retained.</li> </ul> <p><i>Officer response: It is noted that the removal of trees and vegetation has already been consented (see 'Relevant History' and section 1). For concerns relating to design and heritage, please see section 3.</i></p>			

## Site Description

The application site principally comprises an early 20th century detached dwelling, comprised of two storeys plus loft with three dormers at first floor level which project through a hanging tiled roof through the frontage.

At street level, a large, metal garage (set into an embankment) is set back from the pavement and serves as the frontage to the street. The external face of the garage is constructed in stone, with black painted metal balustrades surrounding its parapet. The pedestrian garden gate is set perpendicular to the street within this paved vehicular zone, meaning that the only street-facing threshold is for the cars stored in the garage. The frontage is otherwise comprised of a low brick wall with trees and hedges planted atop.

The site is located in the Redington Frogna Conservation Area and the host building is described as making a positive contribution to the conservation area.

## Relevant History

Application site:

**2025/1477/P** - Erection of vehicle entry gates. **Awaiting determination.**

**2025/0932/P** - Amendment to typology of metal pedestrian gate and railings as approved under planning permission 2024/2871/P dated 21/10/2024, for 'Alterations to front boundary treatment including new gates and replacement of retaining wall and railings; existing garage refaced with brickwork; removal of 10 x trees'. **Planning permission granted 13/03/2025**

**2024/2871/P** - Alterations to front boundary treatment including new gates and replacement of retaining wall and railings; existing garage refaced with brickwork; removal of 10 x trees. **Planning permission granted 21/10/2024.**

## Relevant Policies

**National Planning Policy Framework (2024)**

**The London Plan (2021)**

**Camden Local Plan (2017)**

- A1 Managing the impact of development
- A3 Biodiversity
- D1 Design
- D2 Heritage
- DM1 Delivery and monitoring

**Camden Planning Guidance:**

- CPG Amenity (2021)
- CPG Design (2021)
- CPG Home Improvements (2021)

**Redington Frogna Neighbourhood Plan (2021)**

- SD 2 Redington Frogna Conservation Area
- SD 4 Redington Frogna character
- SD 5 Dwellings: Extensions and garden development
- BGI 2 Tree planting and preservation

**Redington Frogna Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (2022)**

## Draft Camden Local Plan

A [Submission Draft Camden Local Plan](#) (updated to take account of consultation responses) was reported to Cabinet on 2 April 2025 and the Council on 7 April 2025. The Council resolved to agree the Submission Draft Local Plan for publication and submission to the government for examination (following a further period of consultation). The Submission Draft is a significant material consideration in the determination of planning applications but still has limited weight at this stage.

## Assessment

### 1. Proposal

- 1.1 Planning permission is sought for the erection of a new inner retaining wall within the front garden.
- 1.2 The proposals align with and would be in addition to the approved boundary treatment and other works at the application site, under planning permission 2024/2871/P (dated 21/10/2024), as amended by 2025/0932/P (dated 13/03/2025). The approved works to the front boundary treatment and front garden, as approved under 2024/2871/P, include:
- 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.

### 2. Assessment

- 2.1. The principal considerations material to the determination of this application are as follows:
- Design and Heritage
  - Amenity
  - Trees and Biodiversity

#### Assessment of proposals

### 3. Design and Heritage

- 3.1. The Council's design policies are aimed at achieving the highest standard of design in all developments. The following considerations contained within policies D1 and D2 are relevant to the application: development should respect local context and character; preserve or enhance the historic environment and heritage assets; comprise details and materials that are of high quality and complement the local character; and respond to natural features. In addition, Policy SD 2 Redington Frogna Conservation Area of the Redington Frogna Neighbourhood Plan, requires new developments to preserve or enhance the green garden suburb character of the Conservation Area, by maintaining gaps between buildings, and including trees, hedges, and maintaining an open garden suburb character created by well-vegetated front, side and rear gardens.
- 3.2. The existing garage is understood to date from the 1990s and it is likely that the front garden inner and front boundary retaining walls were constructed at the same time. Whilst the existing front boundary wall is not original, its height and transparency through the upper railings allow the greenery of the garden to be read from the street. The extant permission (ref. 2024/2871/P dated 21/10/2024, as amended by 2025/0932/P dated 13/03/2025) for the new front boundary

wall is of a similar height to the existing wall and also maintains this visual transparency through the upper railings into the front garden.

- 3.3. The existing garden level slopes down from the main house towards the road, except where the garage is. This is an important feature which promotes a more informal landscape which sit harmoniously with the natural topography.
- 3.4. Under these proposals, the existing sloped, rock retaining wall would be replaced with a brick retaining wall which would be extended all the way across the frontage and also incorporate a secondary pedestrian gate. The new wall would be up to 1.6 metres high, but would be elevated approximately 3.2 to 3.9 metres above pavement level.
- 3.5. In contrast to the muted stonework of the garage and existing retaining wall, the use of brickwork would appear much more prominent in the streetscene. Combined with the removal of a number of trees (already approved under the previous permission) and the flattening of the topography, this would create a very formal, defensive, and hard urban frontage which is out of character with the more informal and green frontages which contribute to the conservation area's character and appearance.
- 3.6. It is noted that similar boundary treatments exist at 22 and 18 Redington Road. The boundary treatment at 22 was approved in 2006 (2006/4172/P) and the works at number 18 in 2011 (2011/4665/P). Both of these significantly pre-date both the Neighbourhood Plan and Conservation Area Appraisal so are not precedents.

#### Summary

- 3.7. Paragraph 215 of the NPPF requires that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
- 3.8. In this instance, the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the otherwise positive contribution which the host building makes to the character and appearance of the conservation area and subsequently would result in less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of the Redington and Frogna Conservation Area.
- 3.9. The Applicant has not demonstrated that there would be any public benefits arising from the proposal that would outweigh this less than substantial harm. As such, this constitutes a reason for refusal.

#### **4. Residential Amenity**

- 4.1. Policy A1 seeks to protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission for development that would not harm the amenity of residents. This includes factors such as privacy, outlook, implications to natural light, artificial light spill, as well as impacts caused from the construction phase of development.
- 4.2. Given the nature of the works relating to the front of the site only and not affecting the outlook or privacy from any habitable room or outdoor living space of any adjoining property, the proposal would result in acceptable amenity effects.
- 4.3. Policy A1 on Amenity states in para 6.12 that 'Disturbance from development can occur during the construction phase. Measures required to reduce the impact of demolition, excavation and construction works must be outlined in a Construction Management Plan.' In this case, the requirement for a CMP is not necessary, namely due to the limited scope of works.

4.4. In summary, the proposal would result in acceptable amenity effects.

## **5. Trees and Biodiversity**

4.1 Policy A3 of the Local Plan seeks to protect and enhance biodiversity and resists the loss of trees wherever possible.

4.2 The removal of trees required to deliver the proposed inner wall has already been assessed and approved under the extant permission 2024/2871/P. Any associated impacts have already been assessed and approved, subject to the discharge of conditions attached to the extant permission.

4.3 Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) requirements came into effect for small sites on 02 April 2024, however, there are statutory exemptions and transitional arrangements which mean that the biodiversity gain condition does not always apply. Based on the information provided, were this application to be approved, this proposal would not require the approval of a Biodiversity Gain Plan before development is begun because it is a Householder Application.

## **6. Planning Balance and Conclusion**

6.1. Considerable importance and weight has been attached to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Redington and Frognal Conservation Area, in accordance with the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended).

6.2. Local Plan Policies D1 and D2, and Chapter 16 (Conserving and enhancing the historic environment) of the NPPF 2024, seek to preserve and enhance designated heritage assets. The NPPF states at Paragraph 215 that *'Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use'*.

6.3. As discussed above, there are no public benefits of a nature adequate to outweigh the harm caused by the proposed works.

6.4. Therefore, on balance, the proposed development does not accord with Chapter 16 of the NPPF which seeks to preserve and enhance heritage assets. The proposal is also contrary to Policies D1 and D2 of the Local Plan.

6.5. Overall, the proposed development would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host property, street scene, and Redington and Frognal Conservation area, and therefore refusal is recommended.

## **7. Recommendation**

### **Refuse Planning Permission for the following reasons:**

1. The proposed development, by reason of the scale and materiality of the retaining wall, would result in an overly defensive and dominant addition to the front garden, causing harm to the character and appearance of the front garden, street scene, and the Redington and Frognal Conservation Area, contrary to policies D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017 and policies SD 2 (Redington Frognal Conservation Area) and SD 4 (Redington Frognal Character) of the Redington Frognal Neighbourhood Plan

2021.