



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 September 2025

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/25/3369658

31 Beech Hill Avenue, Enfield EN4 0LU

- 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 Nick Christofi against the decision of Enfield Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00949/HOU.
 - The proposed development is entry gates and front elevation garden wall with pedestrian access.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for entry gates and a front elevation garden wall with pedestrian access at 31 Beech Hill Avenue, Enfield EN4 0LU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/00949/HOU, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 2022/1562/1, 2022/1562/2, 2022/1562/3 (Existing Front Elevation and Location Plan), and 2022/1562/4.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

3. Policy HW-2 of the Hadley Wood Neighbourhood Plan 2022-2039 (2023) ('HWNP') and Policy DMD 8 of the Enfield Development Management Document (2014) ('EDMD') set out that, in the interests of the character and appearance of the property and the area, front boundary treatments should be an appropriate level to allow views through to landscaped gardens, and should not normally exceed 1 metre in height.
4. The houses on Beech Hill Avenue are typically substantial in scale, individually designed, and set well back from the road on spacious plots. Whilst some are largely open to the road or have landscaped borders, I observed that many near to the appeal site sit behind more substantial boundary treatment, as evidenced at paragraph 4.5 of the appellant's statement. That treatment includes brick walls, often with taller pillars framing sections of black metal railing.

5. The proposed boundary treatment would sit just back from the pavement behind a narrow strip of shrubs. It would comprise a yellow brick wall, with approximately 2.1 metre high pillars capped with stone, along with black metal railings and entry gates. Given the stepped arrangement to reflect the area's sloping topography, and as the railings would be largely open and allow views through into the site, the proposal would not be an overly dominant feature in the streetscene, and it would not result in an adverse sense of enclosure.
6. The materials to be used on the proposed wall would broadly reflect the appearance of the host property. In the context of nearby boundary treatment, this garden wall, railings and entry gates would not appear incongruous, or out of place. The scheme would not therefore harm the character and appearance of the host property or the area.
7. Finally, having regard to the width of the site access, the permeability of the proposed black metal gate, and as this is a relatively quiet residential road, I agree with the Council that the scheme would not be harmful to highway safety, including pedestrians using the adjacent pavement.
8. For these reasons, whilst there would be a limited conflict with the stance in HWNP HW-2 and EDMD Policy DMD 8, the scheme would not conflict with those parts of London Plan (2021) Policy D4, Core Policy 30 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010-2025 (2010), and EDMD Policies DMD 6 and DMD 37 which require development to be well designed and appropriate to its context and setting. The scheme would not therefore conflict with the development plan when considered as a whole.
9. Turning to the matter of conditions, as well as the standard time limit, in the interests of certainty, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. As plan no. 2022/1562/4 depicts the proposed materials, the Council's suggested condition requiring that the development be constructed in materials to match the existing building is unnecessary.
10. For these reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, including representations by interested parties, the appeal is allowed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR