
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 October 2021

by John Wilde CEng MICE

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/21/3271665

53-55 The Broadway, Joel Street, Northwood HA6 1NZ

- 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 Dholak Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 5564/APP/2021/302, dated 25 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 17 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey roof extension to provide a third floor level to an existing gym.
-

This decision is issued in accordance with section 56 (2) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 as amended and supersedes that issued on 5 November 2021.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal building is a three storey brick building, forming the southern end of a terrace of properties extending northwards to Briarwood Drive. It is setback from the other properties in the terrace and of a more modern design, incorporating a form of mansard roof, unlike the pitched roof forms of the rest of the terrace. To the south of the appeal building is the Northwood Hills Station, a single storey building with a pitched roof.
4. On the opposite side of Joel Street there is a further terrace of three storey properties with pitched roofs, commensurate in style and massing with the appeal building and its adjoining properties. The majority of these buildings on both sides of the road have commercial/retail units on the ground floor.
5. The height of the appeal building is currently virtually the same as the ridge heights of the adjoining buildings. This factor, combined with the setback and brickwork over two storeys, means that despite being of a more modern design, the building integrates well within the street scene.

6. When seen from Joel Street the proposed extension would result in a building that would be higher than the adjoining properties and significantly higher than the station building. It would be a more substantial building that would be out of keeping in terms of its bulk and mass with the other buildings in the area and its proportions would also be at odds with the rhythm of the surrounding built form. The proposed linking parapeted section would not overcome this.
7. From Ferndown, the rear elevation of the existing building is already seen as a large dominant brick edifice somewhat at odds with the domestic scale of the neighbouring buildings. I note that a new larger scale residential development is in progress in the car park area but nonetheless consider that the proposed extension, notwithstanding the set-back, would result in an unduly large and bulky building completely out of keeping with the surrounding more domestically scaled development.
8. For these reasons the proposed development would conflict with policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 – Strategic Policies, which requires that, amongst other things, extensions should achieve a high quality of design which enhances the local distinctiveness of the area. It would also conflict with policy DMHB 11 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management Policies which requires, amongst other things, that development, including extensions, should harmonise with the local context by taking account of the height, mass and bulk of adjacent structures.

Conclusion

9. Therefore, for the above reasons, and having taken into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

John Wilde

INSPECTOR