



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 20 October 2020 by Emma Worby BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by Andrew Owen BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/20/3255148

15 Gerrards Close, Southgate N14 4RH

- 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 Mr & Mrs Jerome Chamfray against the decision of London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 20/00465/HOU, dated 7 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 15 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is a replacement front boundary wall, erection of new wooden fence to front/side elevation and widening of existing pedestrian access.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeals Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. The description of development has been taken from the appeal form rather than the application form as it represents a more succinct description of the proposal.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site is occupied by a two-storey semi-detached property which is divided into two separate dwellings, one with access to the front garden and one with access to the rear garden. The site is located at the end of Gerrards Close and is adjacent to a row of garages. The proposal would replace the boundary wall to the front of the appeal site on a like for like basis. It also includes a new trellis and close-boarded timber fence to the side boundary on top of a new retaining wall, along with some additional soft landscaping to the front of the site. The Council have raised no objections to the proposed widening of the existing pedestrian access and I have found no reason to disagree with this finding.
6. The existing boundary treatment to the side of the property is comprised of a small brick wall, a number of shrubs and some trees, which currently provide a

soft landscaped boundary to the site and has a positive impact on the surrounding character and appearance of the area. Due to the location of the site, at the end of the road and adjacent to the garages, this side boundary is highly visible from the public realm. Although this boundary is not specially protected and features few actual trees, its loss would have a negative impact on the streetscene where planting is used to soften the built-up nature of the area and adjacent trainline.

7. The proposed fence, which would replace the current boundary treatment, would be significant in height and would extend the whole length of the side of the property and extend along the side of the garden to No. 16, resulting in a hard edge and a visually dominant addition to the site. Furthermore, surrounding properties largely use planting and low brick walls as boundary treatments and so a large close-boarded fence would be out of keeping with neighbouring dwellings to the detriment of the immediate area. The only other close boarded fence nearby is at the end of the Close and is set behind a grass verge so is not as prominent in the streetscene. Also although new trees may be planted, they would be located behind the fence and so would not negate its visually harmful impact.
8. The removal of some hardstanding and provision of soft landscaping to the front of the dwelling, even if increased as shown in the plan submitted to the Council after their decision, would enhance the appearance of the garden. However, this would be outweighed by the resultant harm from the removal of the current planting on the site and the addition of the proposed fence.
9. Overall, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area and would be contrary to Policy CP30 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy (2010), Policies DMD8, DMD37, DMD80 and DMD81 of the Enfield Development Management Document (2014) and Policies 7.4 and 7.21 of The London Plan (2016). Collectively, the policies seek to ensure high quality, design-led developments and landscaping which reverses the decline in street greenery, ensure boundary treatments do not cause harm to the character and appearance of the property or streetscene and retain and protect trees with amenity value.
10. Policy CP36 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy (2010) and Policies DMD76 and DMD78 of the Enfield Development Management Document (2014) have been included in the Council's reasons for refusal. However, these relate to biodiversity, wildlife corridors and ecological assets to which the Council have not expressed any concerns and would not be impacted by the proposed development. Therefore, these policies are not relevant to the appeal before me.

Other Matters

11. The appellant has stated that the proposal would improve the security of the site and the safety of the existing boundary wall, which is in need of repair. However, these issues could likely be addressed without causing the same degree of harm to the character and appearance of the area as would result from the proposed development, for example by replacing the wall to its existing height and maintaining the existing vegetation which provides a good degree of security.

Conclusions and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Emma Worby

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR