



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 August 2006

by **Susan Hesketh** BSc (Hons) MRTPI

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
e-mail: enquiries@planning-inspectorate.gsi.gov.uk

Date: 5 September 2006

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/E/2016016

14A Redington Road, Hampstead, London, NW3 7RG

- The appeal is made under sections 20 and 74 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant **conservation area consent**.
- The appeal is made by Mrs Sokel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
- The application Ref 2005/4502/C, dated 21 October 2005, was refused by notice dated 6 March 2006.
- The proposal is for the demolition of an existing detached 2-storey dwellinghouse and the erection of a replacement dwellinghouse.

Decision: The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/A/2016018

14A Redington Road, Hampstead, London, NW3 7RG

- 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 Mrs Sokel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
- The application Ref 2005/4500/P, dated 21 October 2005, was refused by notice dated 6 March 2006.
- The development proposed is demolition of existing detached 2-storey dwellinghouse and erection of a replacement dwellinghouse.

Decision: The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

1. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention is given to the preservation or enhancement of the character or appearance of conservation areas and this requirement is carried forward into the Council's UDP policies and supplementary planning guidance for the Redington/Frognal Conservation Area within which the appeal site is located. The Conservation Area Statement notes that in the past new development has not always been respectful of its context. It states that modern architecture should not be resisted per se, but should respect and reflect its context in terms of scale, height, massing and relationship to the street. The Council considers that the existing dwelling on the appeal site is not of particular architectural merit and does not object to its demolition, providing that the replacement building is of design merit.
 2. Planning permission and conservation area consent have been granted for the demolition of no 14, to the east of the appeal site, and its replacement by a building in a traditional style. I
-

have therefore considered the appeal proposals in the light of this permission for no 14. To the west of the appeal site is no 16 Redington Road, a listed building which is set back from the road in an elevated position behind a brick wall and mature vegetation. It has a two storey studio building adjacent to the appeal site.

3. Bearing in mind the requirements of the Act and the Council's reason for refusal, the issues to be determined in this appeal are:
 - a) whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area, and
 - b) the effect of the proposed development on the setting of the adjoining listed building, no 16 Redington Road.

Inspector's Reasons for Decision

Impact on the Conservation Area

4. The Redington/Frognaal Conservation Area was designated as an exceptional example of consistently distinguished Victorian and Edwardian architecture. Redington Road is the longest road in the conservation area and features a wide range of primarily early 20th century domestic architecture. The character is derived from the variety and high quality of design of the houses, the topography and the layout. The common elements are the use of red bricks, clay tiles, dormer and sash windows and the variety of set backs from the road frontage.
5. Whilst there is a wide variety of architectural styles in the road, most are fine examples of the architecture of their day. Even the mid twentieth century houses currently on plots 14 and 14A are examples of architecture of that period. I consider that the quality of this conservation area is such that any new interventions should contribute to that architectural distinctiveness and heritage. It seems to me that this part of the conservation area is undergoing a period of critical change with a number of permissions having been granted for the demolition and redevelopment of existing dwellings or infill development. Some of the new development is traditional in design and some is strikingly modern. I feel that there is a danger that the history of architectural innovation in the area would be lost if too many buildings were permitted which sought merely to replicate the designs and ideas of the past.
6. The appeal site, in my opinion, lies at a critical point in the road. It is at the end of a row of houses which are sited close to the road. These houses are relatively urban in character. The larger houses to the west are all set well back within sylvan settings. As a result, any building on the appeal site is particularly important in the street scene, its side and front elevations being visible from the road. Whilst some of the bulk of the proposed dwelling would be at basement level, the proposal would produce a much taller building than the existing house on the site. Also, because it would be sited at the end of the row of houses close to the road, and forward of no 16, it would appear much more dominant in the street scene than the existing house which sits modestly on its plot and does not compete with the grander houses opposite and to the west. I take the view that any building on this site should acknowledge its critical location on the road, the architecture of no 16 and the relationship between the two buildings.

7. The appeal proposal, in my opinion fails to achieve these requirements. Its design is uninspired and banal and would not make a positive contribution to the conservation area. It would be a house of a type which could be found in any expensive suburb anywhere in the country. Its presence in this conservation area would add nothing to the rich and diverse architectural heritage of the area. I consider that the potential for redevelopment of this site is a rare opportunity for development and the Council is justified in seeking development of the highest architectural quality which would reflect the architectural flair and innovation of the area and which would add to its rich and diverse character.
8. The footprint of the proposed house would be similar to that of the existing house on the site and there would be a basement level. However, the 4 storey house would be much larger than the existing. In my opinion, its mass, dominant roof and uninspired design would be a jarring feature of the street scene. I am aware that the Council has approved a similar design for plot 14 and I accept that within the road there are examples of pairs of similar houses, such as the large semi detached houses directly opposite the appeal site. However, I do not consider that repetition of the pastiche of no 14 would be appropriate in this critical location.
9. I therefore conclude that the demolition of the existing building on the site should be resisted because the design of the proposed replacement building is of an unacceptable standard for this important site and conservation area. In my opinion the proposed development would harm the appearance of the street scene, would dilute the architectural quality and heritage of the conservation area and would therefore fail to preserve or enhance its character or appearance.

Setting of the listed building – 16 Redington Road

10. The appeal site lies to the front and at a lower level than no 16, which has a two storey studio building adjacent to the appeal site boundary. Being set back from the road, on a large plot behind a brick wall and mature vegetation, no 16 has a secluded character. The existing relatively modest, flat roofed house on the appeal site is subservient to the grander listed building and respects its setting. Whilst there is substantial vegetation between no 16 and the appeal site, I consider that the increased mass, height and dominant roof of the appeal proposal, would intrude upon the setting of the listed building and would not have a harmonious relationship with it. This factor adds weight to my conclusions on the other main issue in this case.

Susan Hesketh
INSPECTOR