

# Planning, Design and Access Statement

Haydon House, 296 Joel Street, Pinner, HA5 2PY

---

**Proposal:** Planning application for alterations to the front elevation of the building at first floor and roof level only and to incorporate 2x rear dormer windows to increase accommodation to Flat 5 from 1 bedroom to 2 bedroom.

**Author:**

Mr Miheer Mehta

(Owner of Sterling Rose Homes and former Local Authority Planner)

**Submitted to:**

LB Hillingdon

**Dated:**

25/11/2025

## Author Background

Mr Miheer Mehta is an award winning Property Entrepreneur with over 20 years of Town Planning and Development experience within Greater London. He was a former Local Authority Planner with around 8 years of Local Government experience as a Development Management Senior Principal Planner with delegated authority at various London Boroughs, which include the London Boroughs of Lewisham, Camden and Ealing from 2006 to 2014. During his time within Local Authority, he has approved in excess of 2,000 homes across London and therefore holds a very expert understanding of Local Government matters.

Subsequent to his experience in Local Authority, he went on to create a planning gain company which sought to unlock primarily, brownfield development within Town Centres and Suburban Area within Greater London and to provide faster planning solutions across sites to provide mixed-use housing and a range of new housing for first time buyers. In 2015, he created Sterling Rose Homes and has led the business to gain planning consent for in excess of 2,500 homes since 2015 and has built more than 1000 new homes for first time buyers, young professionals and families during this time. He has also created a significant build to rent portfolio for working professionals within high PTAL locations around London and fully understands the needs of all aspects of the planning, construction and development process to also include the demands of occupiers too. He currently houses in excess of 500 tenants.

With his wealth of knowledge and expertise, he continues to understand and seek positive outcomes, working with all required stakeholders to gain new housing outcomes across Greater London at pace. He personally is involved in every element of the design process and pays meticulous care and attention to the appearance and layout of each new development.

**Yours Sincerely,  
Miheer Mehta**

## Photos of recent developments by Sterling Rose Homes



## Site & Surrounding

This statement supports a planning application at Haydon House, 296 Joel Street, Pinner, HA5 2PY, and is made on behalf of Sega Investments Ltd.

The proposal is for alterations to the elevations of the building to incorporate minor changes to the building to assist the proposed change of use of the building from offices into 8no. residential flats, under the Class MA of The Town & Country (General Permitted Development England) Order 2015, as amended in 2022.

Haydon House is a two-storey commercial building situated in Pinner. The Applicant has confirmed that the building has been vacant since December 2021.

## Relevant Planning History

51321/APP/2022/1861 – 2<sup>nd</sup> November 2022 – Approved for change of use into 6 flats

August 2025 – Planning Application **Approved** for external alterations to facilitate the 8 flat prior approval application

October 2025 - Prior Approval - **Approved** for change of use into 8 flats

November 2025 – Planning Application **Refused** for two-storey front extension and conversion of loft space into habitable accommodation to create additional 1-bed self-contained flat with balcony on the front elevation. Addition of new rooflights and second floor window. 6 reasons for refusal were laid out and will be discussed in the main report below.

## Background

This statement is submitted in support of an application for a Planning application for alterations to the front elevation of the building at first floor and roof level only and to incorporate 2x rear dormer windows to increase accommodation to Flat 5 from 1 bedroom to 2 bedroom. The site benefits from a previous prior approval for 8 flats and associated external works and this proposal is for the enlargement of the first floor flat to the front known as Flat 5.

## Proposal

The proposal is for a planning application for alterations to the front elevation of the building at first floor and roof level only and to incorporate 2x rear dormer windows to increase accommodation to Flat 5 from 1 bedroom to 2 bedroom.

## Policy

This proposal is submitted in conjunction with two previous approvals from August and October 2025 and seeks marginal changes to the elevations of the building. The proposal is for the proposed solely residential use of the building.

## Previous Refusal

The previous refusal raised issues with 6 different aspects, these have been listed below:

- 1) The proposed two-storey front extension, by reason of its excessive width, forward projection, poor proportional balance and incongruous design detailing including the inset balcony and chamfered corners, together with the failure to provide meaningful soft landscaping or greening within the forecourt, would result in an overly dominant, visually intrusive and poorly integrated form of development. The proposal would therefore be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area. The development is contrary to Policies BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (2012), DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020), Policy D4 of the London Plan (2021), and Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).
- 2) The site lies adjacent to the Eastcote Village Conservation Area. The proposed two-storey front extension, by reason of its siting, scale and design, would bring built form significantly closer to the street frontage and visually dominate the gap between the existing building line and the Conservation Area boundary. The development would therefore harm the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and its setting. The harm is assessed to be at the lower end of 'less than substantial', however the limited public benefits arising from the provision of a single additional dwelling do not outweigh this harm. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1, DMHB 1 and DMHB 4 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2, Policy HC1 of the London Plan (2021), and Paragraph 214 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).
- 3) The proposed one-bedroom flat would provide inadequate headroom and would rely solely on rooflights for outlook from key habitable rooms. In addition, the proposed balcony provides insufficient usable space and would be significantly constrained by the roof form. As such, the proposed development would fail to provide acceptable living conditions for future occupiers, contrary to Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021), Policies DMHB 16 and DMHB 18 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020), and Paragraph 135 f) of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).
- 4) The proposal fails to demonstrate that nearby trees of amenity value, including a protected tree within the adjoining property at 31 Deerlings Drive, would not be adversely affected by the development. Furthermore, the proposal fails to include any meaningful landscaping or greening within the forecourt or communal areas, resulting in a harsh and unsympathetic setting dominated by hard surfacing. The development would therefore fail to protect or enhance existing landscape features or contribute positively to the visual amenity of the area, contrary to Policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020), Policies G1 and G7 of the London Plan (2021), and Paragraph 136 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).

- 5) The application site lies within Flood Zones 2 and 3. No Sequential Test has been submitted to demonstrate that there are no reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas of lower flood risk. Accordingly, the proposal fails to demonstrate that the development would be safe or sustainable in flood risk terms, contrary to Policy DMEI 9 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020), Policy SI 12 of the London Plan (2021), and Paragraphs 170 and 174 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).
- 6) Insufficient information has been provided to determine the potential impacts of the proposed development on bats, a European Protected Species. In the absence of appropriate surveys or mitigation details, the Local Planning Authority cannot be satisfied that the proposal would not result in harm to protected species or their habitats. The proposal therefore fails to comply with Policy DMEI 7 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020), Policy G6 of the London Plan (2021), and Paragraph 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024)

## **Appearance, Design and Alterations (and adjoining a Conservation Area)**

The previous refusal reason no.1 refers to the building design and appearance being contrived by virtue of the inset balcony and overall design and appearance. The proposal also referred to the lack of greening or soft landscaping.

The previous refusal reason no.2 also referred to the site lying adjacent to the Eastcote Village Conservation Area. It also suggested that the built form would be significantly closer to the street frontage and visually dominate the gap between the existing building line and the Conservation Area boundary.

This proposal has taken into account the points raised and due to the points raised, the applicant only wants to now enhance the accommodation of the approved flat at the front of the building at first floor level. With this, the applicant wants to enhance and improve the elevation and incorporate additional roof accommodation. The existing flat at first floor level has limited head height to the front section of the flat due to the existing cat slide roof. This needs to be enlarged to accommodate better accommodation overall. Therefore, this is the key principle. The ground floor will remain in situ, and no works will be undertaken here. The proposal does not impact any foundation work to the existing building or neighbouring tree. The proposal only increases the height of the existing front ground floor elevation (which remains unchanged in position and elevation). Therefore, the natural thing to do is to then incorporate the existing building design and to ensure uniformity, this same opening and pattern of the front elevation is then replicated at first floor level. The bottom half of the windows at first floor level can be removed or obscured if required, however, this can be conditioned or details can be provided during the application process.

Firstly, the existing cat slide roof is not a positive contribution to the adjoining Conservation Area. The building is not within a Conservation Area, thus, this level of judgement is excessive. The proposed front building line is unchanged and will be unchanged. Therefore, the proposal before the Council is for the introduction of a new first floor front wall to the existing building

and the gable front wall above this. The gable follows the proportion of the existing width of the front section of the building and the overall feature of this is in keeping with neighbouring properties close by. The proposal does not harm the existing building and architectural improves the existing building and provides a more positive contribution to the existing building and area, including the adjoining Conservation Area.

The overall appearance and design is considered acceptable and no significant harm is caused. The increase in projection at first floor level is marginal and this does not harm the overall setting of the building and its neighbours. The key reason for this part of the alterations to the front elevation is to enhance the accommodation at first floor level only.

The applicant is comfortable to have a condition that requires additional landscaping, however, as the approval was via prior approval and the external alterations to this were also approved, the need for landscaping has not been applied. Some soft hedging and greening can be applied to the front boundary wall and to the front of the site and this can be conditioned to enhance the front area.

The proposal also incorporates two rear dormers which are policy compliant and can allow for outlook to the bedroom at second floor level, an aspect for refusal reason no3 touched on this. This change is considered to be minimal and is better arrangement than the existing roof lights and allows for better head height within this space.

The other reasons for refusal do not apply to this application. Reasons for refusal no 3, 4, 5 and 6 are not relevant and this is because the existing foundation will be unchanged and therefore the neighbouring tree will be unaffected (reason 4), a standard condition can be added to ensure any protection / greening can be provided. There will be no works to the ground floor and as the proposal is for the first and second floor, flooding would not be relevant too (reason 5). The site has no history or any occupational use of the building for bats and therefore this material is not necessary in this instance (reason 6), it is considered that as the previous approvals did not suggest any similar pre-requisite, that this requirement is unnecessary in this instance.

## **Standard of Accommodation**

It is considered that the changes improve the building façade to the front, remove the existing cat slide roof and enhance the approved accommodation within Flat 5. The existing Flat 5 has significant headroom issues to the front of the unit, and the applicant really wants to improve for future occupiers. Therefore, it is important that the front façade proposal is accepted.

The proposed accommodation will increase the existing 1 bedroom unit to 103.8 sqm in total by including the loft space. The unit as a whole will be 2 bedroom 4 person and will have a total of 79.1 sqm of minimum headroom at 2.5m. The other 24sqm will exceed 1.5m in height but will be less than 2.5m in height. In accordance with current policy the total floorarea above 2.5m would be in excess of 75% of the overall floorspace and meets policy. The staircase has only been accounted for once in the total floor area for the duplex flat.

The internal changes are nominal and incorporate a large storage area and a double bedroom at second floor level. It is considered as the flat is already approved, that this increase in size is acceptable.

## **Refuse / Cycle / Car parking**

The approved facilities would still apply and additional cycle will be provided on site.

## **Conclusion**

The proposal would be in compliance with current policy. Accordingly, it is suggested this application can be approved so work can be undertaken in early 2026.

We would seek your favourable recommendation and consideration, as we can implement this work immediately, whilst we are programmed to be starting on site shortly.

A pre-application submission has also been lodged with this submission, so any discussion and revisions can be applied, if applicable, during the application process.