
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 May 2025

by **Laura Renaudon LLM LARTPI Solicitor**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/C/23/3327953

22 Mount Pleasant, BARNET, EN4 9HH

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
- The appeal is made by Mr Arjan Terziu against an enforcement notice issued by the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
- The notice was issued on 18 July 2023.
- The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is *Without planning permission the construction of a front porch*.
- The requirements of the notice are to (1) demolish the front porch; (2) restore the land back to the condition shown in a pre-existing front elevation drawing, 2023-1602-1, submitted with application 23/1645/RCU; and (3) permanently remove from the property all constituent materials resulting from the works required by steps (1) and (2).
- The period for compliance with the requirements is three months.
- The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(a), (f) and (g) 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.

Summary Decision: the appeal is allowed, the notice is quashed, and permission is granted.

Preliminary Matters

1. The notice was issued nearly two years ago with the appeal made shortly afterwards. In that time there have been some significant changes to national planning policy. However, the relevant local planning context remains the same and I have not found it necessary to refer back to the parties.

Main Issue

2. The notice was issued for reasons of its effects on the character and appearance of the host property and of the streetscene and wider area. These effects form the main issue in the appeal.

Reasons

3. Mount Pleasant is a hillside road consisting of what appear to be post-war spacious semi-detached, some detached, residential properties set well back from the road on both sides. An interrupted hedgerow separates the footways from the road carriageway on both sides and the area is generally well-vegetated and the properties well-kept.
4. No. 22 consists of (from the front) the left hand half of a pair of semi-detached houses on the northern side towards the top of the road close to where it meets Belmont Avenue and Ashurst Road. The property has evidently been the subject of recent renovations, producing some marked changes in its appearance. It has been rendered to the front and new glazing inserted. It differs in some significant respects from the 'pre-existing front elevation' drawing referred to in the notice, not

only in respect of the front porch but in other ways too. The roof has been enlarged and extended. A large 'picture' window has replaced an earlier smaller three-pane window to the first floor above the porch. A number of rooflights have been inserted, one particularly large one having the appearance of a 'cabrio' roof window. That lies approximately to the centre of the front roof slope, slightly to the right (east) of the centre of the porch and the picture window above that.

5. Were I to consider the appeal on ground (f), I would find the notice to go too far in requiring the reinstatement of that 'pre-existing front elevation' drawing, because the notice alleges as its only breach of control the construction of the front porch. Other changes, including those just referred to, are not part of the allegation and their reversal therefore ought not to be the subject of the notice's requirements.
6. Because those other changes are not attacked by the notice, however, I should consider the construction of the porch in the context of the current, renovated, building including those other changed aspects I have referred to.
7. In the context of that significantly changed appearance of the property, the porch, which is unenclosed, does not appear particularly out of place. The portico is rather large, and protrudes somewhat further forward than that of the attached neighbour or of any others in the immediate vicinity, including others with colonnades such as the easternmost property of the row that adjoins Church Way. In this, it disrupts the building line to some degree, although the impact is limited owing to it being only a single storey structure. The integrity of the building line as a whole is maintained, with there being no change above the ground floor. Although rather oversized as porches go, it is not the only one in the vicinity to protrude further forwards than the bay windows of the property hosting it, and the structure is nonetheless a subordinate addition to the house as a whole. Its somewhat indiscreet appearance is consistent with the remainder of the renovations to the property.
8. The Council's Residential Design Guidance of October 2016 is not especially prescriptive as to the nature of porches, although notes that adding undue canopies can be unsightly as likely to protrude too far and dominate the front of the house. It notes that depending on the location, size and type, either larger or smaller porches may be appropriate. The large porch constructed here is in keeping with the style of the renovated house and on its own terms its design is not unbalanced. The flat roof, although not matching the roof style of the house itself, is of a piece with the remainder of the renovations including the picture window above it.
9. It is clear that other properties in the vicinity are or have been undergoing a process of renovation, with similar rendering, dark metalwork to window openings, and grey tiled or slated extended roofs appearing on other properties in the area. Such aspects of the renovation here are not attacked by the notice and the appellant makes the point that there is no general uniformity of design form. Thus I do not find that the development of the porch is unacceptably detrimental to the character or appearance of the streetscene or of the wider area.
10. For these reasons, and having had regard to those policies cited to me by the parties, I discern no overall conflict with the development plan for the area arising from the addition of the front porch. No planning conditions have been suggested

to me by either party and, in view of the retrospective nature of the development, I consider none are necessary.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should succeed on ground (a) and planning permission will be granted. The appeal on grounds (f) and (g) does not therefore need to be considered.

Formal Decision

12. 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, namely the construction of a front porch on land at 22 Mount Pleasant, Barnet EN4 9HH.

Laura Renaudon

INSPECTOR