

Sally Robbins

From: Sally Robbins
Sent: 11 September 2026 12:48
To: Sally Robbins
Subject: FW: 51321/APP/2025/2991 - Haydon House, 296 Joel Street - Further Design Comments

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 24 April 2026 15:46
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: 51321/APP/2025/2991 - Haydon House, 296 Joel Street – Further Design Comments

Hi Sally,

Regarding comments on Haydon House, please see below for your consideration.

Provision of a family sized unit with no private amenity space.

The new unit will rely entirely on the existing rear communal garden. We highlighted this policy concern during the pre-application stage. It is at the planning officer's discretion whether the shortfall in private amenity space is acceptable when balanced against the need for a family-sized dwelling.

When weighing this balance, there are two factors which should be taken into account: the physical limitations of extending an existing property, and the fact that the garden is communal rather than allocated to specific units. We previously suggested that more substantial improvements to this space were needed to make it genuinely usable / meaningful / inviting for residents. The applicant has made some minor enhancements to the space.

Scale of the front gable.

Although the gable front appears over-scaled in elevation, the chamfered corners will visually soften this effect in reality.

The tiled roof should effectively smooth the transition between the main gable pitch and the lower-pitched chamfered sides, further underplaying the prominence of the forward-projecting element.

Alternative designs, such as extending the gable to cover the chamfers, were explored but deemed more visually impactful and it was decided that the existing footprint's geometry necessitates a simple roofscape.

Furthermore, the chamfered section of Haydon House is comparable to 292 Joel Street, and the forward projection is contextualised by 31 Deerings Drive, which also steps forward at the end of the row.

Given the constraints of extending an existing building, we consider the projection and massing to be broadly acceptable. Any resulting visual impacts should be weighed in the planning balance against the benefit of providing a new family-sized dwelling in this location.

Potential privacy issues due to double height windows at the front.

To mitigate this, there is merit in introducing a spandrel panel. The lower portion of each window could incorporate frosted or opaque glass — either as an infill or glazed internally — to effectively resolve the privacy, internal comfort & useability concerns without significant impacts externally.

Conclusion:

While the proposal results in a number of compromises, these are mitigated to a degree by site constraints and proposed changes, making the scheme broadly acceptable subject to the planning officer balancing any outstanding impacts against the benefit of delivering a new family-sized dwelling in this location.

Hope this helps.

Should you have any queries or would like to discuss further, please let me know.

kind regards,

[Redacted Signature]

MUD | BSc | DipArch | PGDip
Principal Urban Design Officer
Design & Conservation Team
Strategic Planning and Regeneration Service

Planning and Sustainable Growth
Directorate of Residents Services
Civic Centre, 3N/02
Hillingdon Council

