The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 February 2022

by Julie Dale Clark BA (Hons) DipTP MCD DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date:22nd March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/22/3290783
1A Minchenden Crescent, Southgate N14 7EJ

- 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 A Flourentzou against the decision of London Borough of Enfield Council.
- The application Ref 21/03584/HOU, dated 21 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 12 November 2021.
- The development proposed is proposed retention of front boundary wall and proposed new pedestrian and vehicle gates.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the retention of front boundary wall and proposed new pedestrian and vehicle gates at 1A Minchenden Crescent, Southgate N14 7EJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/03584/HOU, dated 21 September 2021, and the plans submitted with it.

Main Issue

2. I consider that the main issue is the effect of the wall and gates on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a detached two-storey house and the front boundary wall and gates subject to this appeal have already been erected. No 1A is located towards the southern end of the road close to the junction with Forestdale. Whilst the front boundaries to the dwellings to the north are mainly low walls and hedges. Toward the southern end of the road there are higher walls including the house opposite the appeal site, No 2 Forestdale which has a substantial brick wall along its boundary with Minchenden Crescent and the adjacent property to the appeal site, No 2B Forestdale has higher walls. I also note that there are a mix of taller boundary treatments to some properties further up Minchenden Crescent to the north.

4. Whilst the wall and gates are higher and more prominent than that of the neighbouring pair of semi-detached houses, Nos 1 and 3 Minchenden Crescent, to the north, No 1A relates more to the higher walls at the southern end of the road. In this context therefore, they do not appear unduly out of place.

5. The policies referred to in the reason for refusal all seek to achieve a high standard of design. London Plan[1] policies D3 and D4 both relate to design with D3 advocating a design-led approach to development and D4 seeks to deliver good design. Core Strategy[2] Policy 30 also requires all development to be of a high quality and be design-led, having special regard to their context. Development Management Document[3] Policy DMD 8 sets out standard for new residential development and Policy DMD 37 also seeks to achieve high quality design.

6. Whilst a character of the area is that of low walls, there are a mix of boundary treatments and the position of the appeal site relates more to the higher walls immediately around it than the lower walls to the north. The topography of the road also affects the context of No 1A's wall and gates in that it is located at the lower end of the road and so the wall and gates do not appear out of place when traversing up or down Minchenden Crescent from either the south or the north.

7. I have considered all matters raised but they do not alter my conclusion. I conclude that the wall and gates do not have a harmful effect on the character or appearance of the area and no conflict with the policies referred to above would arise. The appeal therefore succeeds.

J D Clark

INSPECTOR

[1] Mayor of London – The London Plan The Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London March 2021.
[2] Enfield Council The Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010-2025, Adopted November 2010.
[3] Enfield Council – Improving Enfield Development Management Document (DMD), Adopted November 2014.