

<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			2025/1477/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 vehicle entry gates and alterations to front boundary					
<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 Frognal Neighbourhood Forum</b>		<p>The Redington Frognal Neighbourhood Forum objected 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 Conservation Area is becoming blighted by the contagion of metal gates and railings. Such boundary treatments are not only inconsistent with an Edwardian Arts and Crafts conservation area but, in a recent Planning Inspectorate decision (APP/X5210/D/21/3289001), were noted as being alien to the street scene, harmful to the verdant, garden suburb character and to the open nature of the Redington Frognal street scene.</li> </ul> <p>Furthermore, metal railings and gates are in conflict with Camden Local Plan Policy C5 and are noted as a key cause of harm to the Conservation Area (section 3.6 of the Redington Frognal</p>			

## Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Plan)

### Officer response:

*Design and heritage effects are assessed in section 3 of this report.*

### 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 Frognal Conservation Area and the host building is described as making a positive contribution to the conservation area. It is also location within the Redington Frognal Neighbourhood Plan Area.

### Relevant History

#### Application site:

**2025/1478/P** - Erection of retaining wall and pedestrian gate within the front garden. **Planning permission refused 13/05/2025**

**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.**

#### 10 Ferncroft Avenue:

**2021/0188/P** - 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 - 23/11/2021. Appeal APP/X5210/D/21/3289001 Dismissed – 20/07/2022**

#### **Reasons for refusal:**

*The proposed front boundary treatment, by reason of its size, design and materials, would be a discordant and hostile addition to the street scene, causing harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the Redington Frognal Conservation Area, and to the sense of safety in the public realm, contrary to policies D1 (Design), D2 (Heritage) and C5 (Safety and Security) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan and policies SD1 (Refurbishment of existing building stock), SD 5 (Dwellings: extensions and garden development) and SD6 (Retention of architectural details in existing buildings) of the Redington Frognal Neighbourhood Plan.*

## 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

### Redington Frognal Neighbourhood Plan (2021)

- SD 2 Redington Frognal Conservation Area
- SD 4 Redington Frognal character
- SD 5 Dwellings: Extensions and garden development

### Camden Planning Guidance:

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

### Redington Frognal 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 new metal gates at the site boundary to the applicant's driveway and the vehicle crossover in the highway.

1.2 The gates would stand at a height of approximately 2m above ground level.

1.3 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.

1.4 The proposed vehicle gates would be positioned in between the two brick piers which form part of the proposed front boundary treatment approved under 2025/0932/P.

## **2. Assessment**

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

- Design and Heritage
- Amenity

### 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 Frognal Conservation Area of the Redington Frognal 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. Paragraph 3.6 of the conservation area statement says that metal gates create hard urban frontages, causing considerable harm to the verdant character of the area. Para 4.21 says, in relation to Redington Road, that harm along the road includes unsympathetic garages, loss of front gardens to hard surfaced parking areas, and use of metal gates and railings.

3.2. Whilst railings have been approved at this property under a separate application, this was purely on the grounds that they replaced a similar set of railings, and therefore were no worse than the existing.

3.3. The traditional form of boundary treatments in the conservation area, as shown in the Neighbourhood Plan, are either hedges or wooden fences. Where driveways existed they were either left open at the pavement edge, or low, timber gates were used.

3.4. In contrast the proposed metal gates represent an incongruous and harmful feature which does not exist in any form at the moment on at the application property. At approximately 2m in height from ground level, the vehicle entry gates would dominate over passersby in the streets. The gates would also restrict views into the site which would remove the sense of open spaciousness of the existing open front yard area in front of the garage, which also undermines the character of the wider street setting where an appreciation of the open spaciousness of front yards is generally provided for.

3.5. Similar boundary treatment exist at 22 and 37 Redington Road. The boundary treatment at 22 was approved in 2006 (2006/4172/P) and in the case of no. 37, photos show it in place since before 2008. Both of these significantly pre-date both the Neighbourhood Plan and Conservation Area Appraisal so are not considered precedents.

### Summary

3.6. 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.

3.7. 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.

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

#### **5. Biodiversity**

4.1 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 Frogna 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 vehicle gates, would result in an overly defensive and dominant addition to the front boundary, 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.