



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 September 2020

by Chris Forrett BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/W/19/3243436 96 and 98 Cat Hill, Barnet, London EN4 8HX

- 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 Arash Yazdi and Mr Roopesh Patel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 19/5324/HSE, dated 1 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 28 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a front porch with new steps to each dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a front porch with new steps to each dwelling at 96 and 98 Cat Hill, Barnet, London EN4 8HX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/5324/HSE, dated 1 October 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Plan, PL-161 rev A; PL-162 rev A; and PL-163 rev A (where these relate to the proposed porches and steps).
 - 2) The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the porch shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located in a predominantly residential area and contains a pair of semi-detached dwellings which are elevated from the road. From the evidence before me, there has been a number of planning permissions at 96 Cat Hill, one of which includes a front porch which would project approximately 1.8 metres from the existing dwelling. At the time of my site visit, building works were being carried out to No.96, although the works undertaken did not appear to match that shown on the plans before me. That said, given the appeal proposal, this does not impact on the merits of the development before me.

4. The proposed porch at No.96 would be of the same design and appearance to that already granted permission by the Council, with the exception that it would project 2.1 metres from the dwelling. The appeal proposal also includes a similar sized porch at 98 Cat Hill.
5. I saw that the properties on the south side of Cat Hill do not generally have any significant front projections. However, I am conscious that permission already exists for a large porch structure at No.96 and the limited increase in forward projection would not, in my opinion, result in an excessive development which would be harmful to the host property or the wider streetscene.
6. In respect of No.98, the porch would have a broadly similar visual impact to the host property and the streetscene to that at No.96, albeit that No.98 does not benefit from a two-storey side extension. Whilst the impact of the porch at No.98 could be considered to be greater than that at No.96, there is a great deal of merit in the symmetry provided by the porches on this pair of semi-detached properties. With that in mind, I consider that the porch at No.98 is not objectionable.
7. In coming to these views, I acknowledge the appeal properties are set at a higher level than the road and as a result are significantly more prominent than the properties on the opposite side of the road. That said, the porches would assist in providing a 'stepping up' arrangement, particularly when this is viewed in the context of the existing projecting bay windows.
8. For the above reasons the proposal would not result in an unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area and accord with Policies CS NPPF, CS1 and CS5 of Barnet's Local Plan (Core Strategy) Development Plan Document (2012); Policy DM01 of Barnet's Local Plan (Development Management Policies) Development Plan Document (2012) and the Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guidance (2016) which amongst other matters seek to ensure that proposals accord with the presumption in favour of sustainable development are approved without delay, and that proposals respect the local context and character, are not overly dominant, and are sub-ordinate to the original house.

Conditions

9. The Council has provided a list of suggested conditions that it considers would be appropriate should I have been minded to allow the appeal. Other than the standard time limit condition, it is necessary to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the reason of certainty. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area, a condition relating to matching materials is also necessary.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Chris Forrett

INSPECTOR