

Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 16 November 2021 by Max Webb

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/21/3281941

91 Queen Annes Grove, Enfield EN1 2JU

- 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 Soner Mustafa against the decision of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 21/02251/HOU, dated 8 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 12 August 2021.
 - The development is a green screening fence at high level at the rear of the garden.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a green screening fence at high level at the rear of the garden at 91 Queen Annes Grove, Enfield EN1 2JU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/02251/HOU, dated 8 June 2021.

Appeal Procedure

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

Procedural Matters

3. The original planning application was made retrospectively. The appeal has therefore been considered on the same retrospective basis.
4. On 20 July 2021 the Government published a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). I have had regard to this as a material consideration however, planning decisions must still be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The issues most relevant to this appeal remain unaffected by the revisions to the Framework. I am therefore satisfied that there is no requirement to seek further submissions on the revised Framework, and that no party would be disadvantaged by such a course of action.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal site is located to the rear of a street of semi-detached properties, in the vicinity of several large sheet metal buildings. There is a road to the rear of the appeal site, providing access to these buildings. The rear boundaries of

properties in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site do not have uniform boundary treatments, with both fences and greenery present.

7. The development is a large privacy screen. The privacy screen is a similar height to the sheet metal building to the side. It rises slightly higher than the sheet metal building opposite, although it is only visible through glimpse views from the road to the rear. Whilst it is taller than the neighbouring fencing, it is significantly lower than the hedgerow that forms part of the boundary treatment on the neighbouring property. The combination of the large buildings and hedgerow ensures the privacy screen, although tall, does not appear awkward in relation to the established scale of the surrounding area and is not visually dominant.
8. The privacy screen is a green colour, appearing in-keeping with the surrounding greenery, including neighbouring boundary treatments, as well as the green colour of the sheet metal buildings. The materials used ensure the screening does not stand out from the surrounding boundary treatments and buildings. It is thus not incongruent or harmful in terms of design and, due to the context, does not appear out of character.
9. Overall, the development does not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the surrounding area. It therefore complies with Policy CP30 of the Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010-2025 (adopted 2010), which looks to ensure development has regard for its context. It also conforms with Policies DMD6, DMD8 and DMD37 of the Enfield Development Management Document (adopted 2014), which collectively seek to ensure an appropriate scale for development, with particular reference to making sure boundary treatments do not dominate, and that development should have appropriate regard for its surroundings.
10. The Council have referred to Policies D1, D4 and D8 of the London Plan (adopted 2021). D1 is strategic in nature and D8 refers primarily to the public realm, and they are therefore not greatly relevant to this householder development. D4 refers to the design review processes for applications and is therefore also not particularly relevant to this appeal.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to the Development Plan as a whole, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed. Given the nature of the development and that it has already been erected, no conditions are necessary.

Max Webb

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

K Taylor

INSPECTOR