



# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 February 2008

by **R R Lyon** MA CEng MICE MRTPI FIHT

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State  
for Communities and Local Government

The Planning Inspectorate  
4/11 Eagle Wing  
Temple Quay House  
2 The Square  
Temple Quay  
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372  
email: [enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk)

**Decision date:**  
**3 March 2008**

**Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/A/07/2060462**

**23 Hollycroft Avenue, London NW3 7QH**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by S and W Green against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
- The application Ref 2006/4394/P, dated 24 March 2007, was refused by notice dated 22 May 2007.
- The development proposed is provision of off-street car parking spaces requiring the creation of entrance gates in the front wall and a vehicular crossover.

## Decision

1. I dismiss this appeal.

## Reasons

2. Highway trees and front garden planting contribute to the mature character and appearance of the Redington/Froggnal Conservation Area. However, some areas of front gardens are taken up by hardstandings, and the standard and types of boundary treatments are varied. In several cases, the combination of open boundaries in front of a large paved area introduces a hard appearance into the street scene, which erodes the mature character and appearance of the area; the situation is finely balanced.
3. The appellant offers amendments to the submitted plans, but these would amount to a materially different scheme to that which was considered by the Council. I must consider the submitted scheme. The appeal site contains some paving, but the planting central to the area and on its periphery does make a significant contribution to the street scene. The submitted plans show that the proposal would result in the loss of that planting. Additionally, much of the garden wall would be lost, and a hard paved area introduced behind open textured wrought iron gates; its effect would not be minimal as the appellant suggests, it would further erode the character of the Conservation Area in the way that I describe above.
4. I consider that vegetation is at a premium in this area and conclude that implementation of the proposal would harmfully affect the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The proposal would conflict with policies S1/S2, B1 a) & g), B3, B7 and T9 of the London Borough of Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006 (UDP), and with advice contained in *Camden Planning Guidance (Landscaping and Trees)*.

5. Although the appellant indicates that one off-street parking space would be acceptable, I must judge the proposal on the 2 spaces that are applied for. Such provision would exceed the maximum provision allowed for in the Council's parking standards, and would potentially encourage car use and traffic congestion. I conclude that the policy would encourage unnecessary car usage in the area and would conflict with policy T7 and exceed the guidance in *Appendix 6 - Parking Standards* of the UDP.

*RR Lyon*  
INSPECTOR