



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 June 2025 by Kim Vo MPLAN

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/25/3364911

39 Parkgate Crescent, Enfield EN4 0NW

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr. R Brin against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref is 25/00137/HOU.
 - The development proposed is described as the retention of front raised wall/piers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matter and Main Issue

3. Enfield's Local Plan 2019-2041 is at an advanced stage. However, there is no indication of its adoption. Therefore, I have considered the appeal under the current adopted development plan. The main issue for which is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is within a residential area, adjacent a bend in the road where the land slopes down towards Number 41 Parkgate Crescent. There is a variety of front boundary treatments within the vicinity. Some dwellings include tall timber panels and walls. However, these are limited and do not reflect the established, traditional character of the area, where the majority of frontages have low brick or stone walls, railings and landscaped plantings. Raised pillars of varying heights are also common although, these are typically modest in scale. Collectively, these elements all positively contribute to the consistently spacious feel of the locality.
5. The front four piers have increased in height and are prominently positioned next to the public pavement. Both the piers and walls are also finished in white render. This is a notable contrast from the previous arrangement of shorter brick pillars and walls, which supported the more open and landscaped character. Accordingly, due to the increased scale, siting and materials, the development appears as a dominant and incongruous addition. Although the retained hedgerow provides some mitigation, the solid and bulky nature of the rendered structures results in the

enclosure of the frontage. This significantly departs from the traditional and spacious quality of the street, with their imposing presence further pronounced by the appeal site's elevated siting. The appellant has cited examples of boundaries similar to the appeal scheme which I saw on my site visit. However, these are evident on limited properties and do not constitute a sufficiently established feature such that my findings would change.

6. For these reasons, the development results in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area. It is contrary to Policies D4 and D5 of The London Plan 2021, Policy HW-2 of the Hadley Wood Neighbourhood Plan 2023 and the National Planning Policy Framework. Together, and amongst other things, these policies seek to secure appropriate front boundary treatments and where developments should be sympathetic to local character, undergo thorough design scrutiny and achieve the highest standards of accessible and inclusive design.

Other Matter

7. Policies DMD 6 and DMD 7 of the Enfield Development Management Document 2014 (DMD) have been referred to in the reason for refusal, with Policy DMD 8 referred to in the Delegated Report. However, they are not directly applicable as the appeal scheme relates to boundary treatments and does not involve the development of garden land or new housing. The policies mentioned above are sufficient to make a decision against the development plan on the main issues.

Conclusion and Recommendation

8. For the reasons given above, the proposals would conflict with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate a decision should be made other than in accordance therewith. I therefore recommend the appeal is dismissed.

Kim Vo

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

9. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR