



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 August 2026 by E Street BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 October 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/C/25/3370075

42 Belmont Road, London N15 3LU

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mr Kypros Kyprianou against an enforcement notice issued by the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The notice was issued on 25 June 2025.
 - The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is without planning permission, the erection of a wooden fencing and concrete supporting posts at the rear of the property.
 - The requirements of the notice are to:
 1. Remove the wooden fencing, including all supporting concrete posts, that have been erected at the rear of the property in their entirety.
 2. Remove all resultant debris.
 - The period for compliance with the requirements is within 2 months of the notice taking effect.
 - The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). Since an appeal has been brought on ground (a), an application for planning permission is deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the Act.
-

Appeal Procedure and Preliminary Matter

1. 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. In addition, and having reviewed the changes, I am satisfied that the revised National Planning Policy Framework does not affect the substantive matters of the appeal and that proceeding without further consultation with the main parties would not be prejudicial to their respective cases.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the fencing on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

3. The appeal site is an end of terraced building which consists of six self-contained flats sitting on a corner plot with the appeal subject facing onto Langham Road. The prevailing boundary treatments within the surrounding area include low brick walling to the front elevation of dwellings, taller brick walls at the corner of road junctions and some isolated instances of close board fencing. It is not uncommon to have high boundary treatments to separate gardens, that can be seen, to the rear of properties.
4. The fencing is in broadly the same position as the previous wall, notwithstanding the blocking of the existing rear access pathway. Therefore, a sense of enclosure on the street scene remains. The replacement of wooden fencing from walling given the surrounding three other corner dwellings is unfortunate given the level of

consistency experienced. However, the use of timber fencing in this location, although different, is not considered harmful. Moreover, the concrete posts separating each panel indicate that the appellants intention is for it to remain in place for a substantial period and is of a higher quality than timber posts.

5. Together, they provide a coherent appearance which appears well-maintained. It is not unusual for a fence to be a boundary treatment; it is just in this case it is visible by the public. Its visibility lends to its obviousness and prominence; however, due to its height and siting it is not so significantly taller than surrounding walling. Together, it results in a feature which sits comfortably and no more prominent than the existing boundary treatments. As such, the development does not unacceptably detract from the character and appearance of the area, complying with Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017 and Policy DM1 of the Haringey Development Management Development Plan Document 2017 which amongst other things, seeks to ensure high-quality design.

Conditions

6. The Council has not recommended any conditions. I have not deemed any necessary.

Conclusion and Recommendation

7. For the reasons given above, the development complies with the development plan. I therefore recommend that the appeal on ground (a) should succeed and the deemed application for planning permission should be granted for the development described in the notice.

E Street

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

8. The appeal is allowed, the enforcement notice is quashed, and planning permission is granted on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act as amended for the development already carried out.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR