

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:	19/06/2019
		N/A		Consultation Expiry Date:	26/05/2019
Officer			Application Number(s)		
Josh Lawlor			2019/1908/P		
Application Address			Drawing Numbers		
59 Redington Road London NW3 7RP			See decision notice		
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature		
Proposal(s)					
Installation of new boundary treatment comprising of metal gates with brick piers, alteration to existing vehicle cross-over, demolition of existing boundary wall					
Recommendation(s):		Refuse Planning Permission			
Application Type:		Householder Planning Permission			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	00	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>A site notice was displayed from the 01/05/2019</p> <p>A press notice was advertised between 02/05/2019 to the 26/05/2019</p> <p>No comments or objections were received from neighbouring occupiers</p>					
Local Amenity and Conservation Groups	<p>A letter was sent out to the Redington and Frognal Conservation Area Advisory Committee on the 25/04/2019</p> <p>No comment was received</p> <p>A letter was sent out to the Redington and Frognal Neighbourhood Forum on the 25/04/2019</p> <p>The Redington and Frognal Neighbourhood Forum objected to the proposal on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The metal gates are not an appropriate boundary treatment for the Conservation Area • Object to the loss of low brick wall • Harm to streetscape <p><i>Officer response: Please see design and heritage, section of this report.</i></p>					

Site Description

The host property relates to a two storey with dormer detached dwellinghouse. It is located within the Redington and Frogna Conservation Area and is identified as making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area. The Redington and Frogna conservation area appraisal and management strategy states that whilst there is no consistent architectural style on Redington road, red brickwork, clay tiles, dormer and sash windows are common features. The site is also located within the Redington and Frogna Neighbourhood Forum.

Relevant History

Relevant Planning History:

PWX0103903 Construction of replacement front entrance canopy and alterations to steps
Refused 15/01/2002

Reason for Refusal:

The proposed replacement front entrance canopy by reason of its design and size, would cause unacceptable harm to the appearance of the house and character and appearance of the Redington and Frogna conservation area

2015/2820/P Extension of existing rear bays at ground and first floor, changes to rear fenestrations, replacement rear dormer and alterations to front lightwells
Granted 16/09/2015

2016/4230/P Variation of condition 3 (approved plans) of planning permission 2015/2820/P granted 16/09/2015 (for extension of existing rear bays at ground and first floor, changes to rear fenestrations, replacement rear dormer and alterations to front lightwells) namely for alterations to fenestration details at front, both side elevations and rear elevation (including revised balustrades) and installation of additional rooflights.

A replacement canopy and replacement door were removed from this application. The door and canopy were regarded as part of the character of the house and therefore ought to be retained.

2017/0323/P Excavation of front forecourt to create underground car parking car with hydraulic lift platform. Refused 17/08/2017

Reasons for refusal:

- 1) failure to demonstrate that the proposed excavation would maintain the structural stability of building and neighbouring properties, avoid adversely affecting drainage and run-off, causing other damage to the water environment and cumulative impacts upon structural stability or the water environment in the local area*
- 2) The creation of an additional onsite parking space would promote the use of private motor vehicles, fail to encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport and exacerbate local traffic conditions*
- 3) The proposal, in the absence of a legal agreement to secure highway contributions to undertake external works outside the application site, would fail to secure adequate provision for the safety of pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles*
- 4) The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement to secure a Construction Management Plan, would be likely to give rise to conflicts with other road users, and be*

detrimental to the amenities of the area generally

- 5) *The proposed development, in the absence of a financial contribution secured to cover the costs of reviewing the Construction Management Plan, would be likely to give rise to conflicts with other road users, and be detrimental to the amenities of the area generally*

2019/0388/P Erection of metal gates to front boundary, alterations to front elevation including installation of railings over light well, new door, alterations to canopy – Withdrawn by applicant 21/03/2019

The application was withdrawn as the application was to be refused due to harm to the harm the proposal would cause to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area

Relevant policies

The National Planning Policy Framework 2019

London Plan 2016, consolidated with alterations since 2011

Camden local Plan 2017

- Policy D1 Design
- Policy D2 Heritage
- Policy A1 Managing the Impact of Development
- Policy T2 Parking and car-free development

Redington Froggnal Neighbourhood Development Plan (2018)

- BD 1 New Developments and Refurbishment of Existing Housing Stock
- BD 4 Redington Froggnal Design Codes for Development Sites, Including New Buildings, Extensions and Alterations
- BD 6 Retention of Architectural Details in Existing Buildings

This plan has not been inspected or formally adopted and therefore holds very limited weight in decision making.

Redington and Froggnal conservation area appraisal and management strategy (2000)

Camden Planning Guidance (CPG)

- CPG Design (July 2015 Updated March 2019)
- CPG Amenity (March 2018)
- CPG Transport (March 2019)

Assessment

1. Proposal

- 1.1. The installation of new boundary treatment comprising black steel railings and reconstituted stone copings, with bi-fold gates for vehicular access. The brick piers would have a height of 2.3m from ground level to the top the re-constituted stone coping, with the metal gates measuring 2m from ground level. The existing low brick wall with coping stone would be demolished.

2. Design and Heritage

- 2.1. CPG1 states that the Council encourages the combination of low brick boundary walls and hedges as a boundary treatment in conservation areas, where they make up the characteristic boundary treatment. Due to the prominence of the boundary treatments in the streetscene the council will expect the design, detailing and materials used to provide a strong positive contribution to the character and distinctiveness of the area and integrate the site into the streetscene
- 2.2. There is a presumption in favour of retaining boundary treatments in conservation areas that are characterful or contribute positively to the character of the area. Council will resist alterations to boundary treatments in conservation areas that do not preserve or enhance the existing qualities and context of the surrounding area (CPG1). When boundary treatments are to be altered, the elements should be repaired or replaced to replicate the original design and detailing and comprise the same materials as the original features.
- 2.3. The Redington and Froggnal conservation area appraisal states that works to front boundaries can dramatically affect and harm the character of the conservation area. The loss of trees and boundary planting and introduction of inappropriate boundaries is also likely to harm the conservation area.
- 2.4. The prevailing character of Redington road is of low brick walls with hedges. The loss of the original boundary treatment fails to preserve the historic boundary treatment and wider appearance of the conservation area. The addition of high metal railings with sliding gates is regarded as an incongruous feature which is not in keeping with the historical form of boundary treatment on this road and the wider Conservation Area. The addition of railings and sliding gates would be an incongruous addition which would harm the character of the conservation area. The high metal gates and brick piers would also obscure the public views of the main building when viewed from the street which is supported.
- 2.5. It is noted that there is no recorded planning history for the black painted steel gates and railings at no. 57. This boundary treatment is out character with the prevailing boundary treatments on Redington road and would not be considered as a precedent to support further development of this kind. Further development of this kind would lead to the formation of the impression of a more defensive, gated character which would dramatically alter the appearance and feeling of the conservation area.
- 2.6. The proposal would provide no public benefits to outweigh the less than substantial harm to the conservation area. Considerable importance and weight has been attached to the harm and special attention has been paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance conservation area, under s. 72 of the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990 as amended by the Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act (ERR) 2013.
- 2.7. Para 196 of the NPPF (2018) states 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'. The proposal would result in 'less than substantial harm' to the character, appearance and historic interest of the conservation area as well as to the host property. There is no demonstrable public benefit created as a result of the proposal.

3. Amenity

- 3.1. The Council will seek to ensure that the amenity of neighbours is protected from development. The factors the Council will consider the impact on daylight/sunlight, noise, overlooking, outlook, and artificial light levels (light pollution).
- 3.2. Given the nature of the proposal there would not be impacts on residential amenity.

4. Transport

- 4.1. Policy T2 states the Councils will resist the development of boundary treatments and gardens to provide vehicle crossovers and on-site parking. The site benefits from two existing vehicle crossovers and it appears the forecourt can accommodate space for two vehicles. The crossover would be repositioned slightly, however not increased in size and is therefore not likely to alter off-street car parking. The proposal would not lead to increased off-street car parking and is therefore compliant with policy T2

5. Recommendation

For the above reasons the application is **refused** planning permission.