



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 September 2025

by Felicity Thompson BA(Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/C/24/3345564

4 Bramley Road, London N14 4HP

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mr Jawaid Sheikh against an enforcement notice issued by the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The notice was issued on 10 May 2024.
 - The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is without planning permission, the unauthorised erection of a front boundary wall and piers (identified in blue on the plan attached to the enforcement notice, for identification purposes) in excess of the parameters set out within Part 2, Class A of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015.
 - The requirements of the notice are to:
 - 5.1 Reduce the height of the front boundary wall and piers (identified in blue on attached plan for identification purposes) to a maximum height of 1 metre from original ground level in order to comply with Part 2, Class A of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015.
 - 5.2 Remove all resulting materials from the premises.
 - The period for compliance with the requirements is one month.
 - The appeal is proceeding on the ground set out in section 174(2)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed, the enforcement notice is upheld, and planning permission is refused on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act as amended.

The appeal on ground (a) the deemed planning application

2. The main issue is the effect of the front boundary treatment on the character and appearance of the area.
3. The appeal property is a detached dwellinghouse located in a mainly residential area, largely characterised by dwellings set back from the road with, for the most part, partly enclosed off-street parking to the front, with some landscaping. Dwellings in the vicinity, including their front boundary treatments, are not uniform in appearance, however they generally include a similar palette of materials and design features such that there is a degree of harmony. Boundary treatments to frontages commonly consist of simple low walls, some with planting behind, the general height and design of which results in a level of openness and visual permeability.
4. The front boundary treatment because of its overall height and the number of brick piers, appears appreciably taller than and at odds with the inherent simplicity of boundary treatments on other frontages in the vicinity of the site. Moreover, given its extent, it appears unacceptably enclosing, which contrasts with the sense of

openness that characterises the frontages of nearby dwellings. Consequently, the front boundary treatment has an incongruous appearance that harms the character and appearance of the area.

5. The appellant referred to and provided some details of other tall boundary treatments, none of which are viewed in context with the appeal site. That at 22 Bramley Road is closest but relates to a smaller frontage and has a more straightforward appearance and is not directly comparable. The other cases for which limited details have been provided, appear to relate to larger properties set in generous grounds and are not therefore comparable. In any event, the existence of tall boundary treatments in the wider area does not provide a strong argument for granting permission for development which causes harm.
6. For the reasons given, the front boundary treatment is contrary to Policy DMD37 of the Council's Development Management Document (DMD) Adopted November 2014 which requires that development is appropriate to its context and has regard to its surroundings.
7. The strategic aims of Policy CP30 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010 - 2025 Adopted November 2010 are not directly relevant to the detailed consideration in this case and weighs neither for nor against the development.

Other matters

8. I acknowledge that the dwelling is located close to a fairly busy road and the appellant's comments regarding the exposure to views and headlights from traffic. However, since there is no substantive evidence regarding the nuisance caused by traffic, or that the appeal development is the only way such privacy and screening needs could be met, this is a matter of little weight.
9. In their statement the Council referred to harm to highway safety which did not form part of the reasons for issuing the notice. Consequently, this has not formed part of my assessment.
10. In any event, even if I had found favour with the appellant's arguments in respect of this matter, it would have attracted only neutral weight and could not have outweighed the harm in respect of character and appearance.
11. I appreciate that the appellant was not aware of the need for express planning permission and the required modifications may cause some hardship. However, this and the appellant's general misgivings about the Council's actions have no bearing on the planning merits of the development.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed. I shall uphold the enforcement notice and refuse to grant planning permission on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act (as amended).

Felicity Thompson

INSPECTOR