
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 December 2020

by S. Rennie BSc (Hons), BA (Hons), MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/W/20/3254763

18 The Broadway, Stanmore, London HA7 4DW

- 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 Alvin Rich against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref: P/0455/20, dated 5 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 3 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is for a pitched roof extension with mansard roof extension to rear with dormers and roof lights to create additional commercial space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a pitched roof extension with mansard roof extension to rear, with dormers and roof lights to create additional commercial space at 18 The Broadway, Stanmore, London HA7 4DW, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/0455/20, dated 5 February 2020, 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: 121/EX/001, 121/EX/102, 121/EX/120, 121/EX/121, 121/PR/202 Rev C, 121/PR/220 Rev A, 121/PR/221 Rev A;
 - 3) Prior to their use in the development hereby approved, details/samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the roof extensions hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details/samples.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on (1) the character and appearance of the area and (2) the living conditions of neighbours to the site.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The proposal would be for a mansard roof to replace the existing flat roof that exists above a three storey projection to the rear of this commercial building. The mansard roof would allow for additional office space.
4. The rear of this parade of buildings is less attractive than the front elevation, and backs onto a large carpark. It has more of a utilitarian appearance with metal external stairs and large flues, for example, being clearly visible. There appears to be multiple extensions and flat roof areas projecting from the rear of the parade. There is no example of a mansard roof, but there are examples of such a roof form in the wider area that I observed on site.
5. Furthermore, the mansard roof would be a relatively modest addition to the rear of the parade which would have minimal visual impact. To my mind, it would not be out of keeping with the wider character of the area and would not be harmful to the visual appearance of the rear of the parade. It would also have the benefit of providing additional office space and therefore would have an economic benefit, making good efficient use of the building.
6. The rooflights proposed would be a very minor addition which would not be particularly noticeable or of a scale that would harm the visual qualities of the original rear roof slope, which already includes a rooflight on another property.
7. There is also a hip-to-gable extension proposed, which the Council has not objected to. I would also agree that the hip-to-gable extension is of a suitable design and scale, which would not appear out-of-keeping with the terrace of properties.
8. Overall, the proposed development would preserve the character and appearance of the building and the rear elevation of the parade, thereby being in accordance with policies 7.4 B and 7.6 B of The London Plan (2016), Policy D3 of the draft London Plan (2019), policy CS1B of The Harrow Core Strategy (2012), and policy DM1 of Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013). These policies require development to have regard to the local context, complement the local character, and respect the host building, amongst other things.
9. I also find that the development would broadly accord with both the 'Design and Layout Guidance for New Residential Development' document and the National Planning Policy Framework on these issues.

Living Conditions

10. The proposed mansard roof extension would include office windows in the rear and side elevation. The side elevation window would have views at a close distance to the side and rear of No 20a Broadway. However, the side of No 20a in this location has a side window which is at a much lower level. There are windows in the rear of No 20a, although these would be at a lower level and any view from the proposed window would be at a significant angle. There are also existing windows in the side of No 18 which would have a greater potential to overlook No 20a.

11. On this basis the proposed development would not result in a significant increase in overlooking of the residential property at No 20a. Furthermore, there are no other aspects of the proposed development that would result in significant adverse impacts to the living/working conditions of neighbouring properties.
12. Therefore, there would be no harm to living conditions and the proposed development would accord with policy 7.6 of The London Plan (2016), Policy D3 of the draft London Plan (2019), and policy DM1 of Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013). These policies require development to not be harmful to amenities and any have impacts on neighbouring occupiers, amongst other things.
13. I also find that the development would broadly accord with both the 'Design and Layout Guidance for New Residential Development' document and the National Planning Policy Framework on the matter of living condition impacts.

Conditions

14. I have considered the conditions put forward by the Council against the requirements of the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) and the National Planning Policy Framework. The conditions I have included from the recommended list have been subject to some alterations to improve clarity and ensure consistency with the Framework and PPG.
15. I have attached the standard time limit condition and a plans condition as this provides certainty. I have also added a condition concerning materials to ensure a satisfactory appearance.
16. For the reasons explained in the main issues above, the effect of the development on neighbour living conditions, including from overlooking, is not significant and so there is not the necessity for a condition that the proposed side elevation window be fixed shut or obscure glazed.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons outlined above and in considering all matters raised the appeal should be allowed, subject to the conditions set out in the Decision paragraph 1 above.

Steven Rennie

INSPECTOR