
35810/APP/2026/735 - Tavistock Works - Design Comments

From Todor Kuznetsov <TKuznetsov@hillingdon.gov.uk>

Date Wed 29/04/2026 11:07

To Wai Hing Tse <Whingtse@hillingdon.gov.uk>

Hi Chris,

Great to meet you yesterday.

Please see points below as discussed.

Please note, I will submit this e-mail on Ocella shortly also for record.

1. Summary:

Change of height to six storeys (most likely due to fire regulations) is broadly acceptable.

The proposed red tone materials is not supported.

The proposed entrance is poor in terms of legibility / visual prominence.

There are some improvements that can be had in relation to the proposed corner unit and some other units in terms of layout / quality of living considerations.

2. Materials

This proposal is part of a larger master-plan scheme, albeit being delivered last. As such, it is "the last piece of the puzzle" and is broadly surrounded by the rest of the scheme / sits in context of the rest of the scheme, which uses a consistent palette of materials and architectural language.

However, the proposal sits in stark contrast to the consistent material palette which utilises:

- light, sandy-yellow or buff-coloured brick
- brass-like / light bronze-like grey beige metal frames and window frames

This makes the proposal sit incongruous and draw undue attention when seen in context of the masterplan. Any such contrast is unjustified given the use is purely residential and this phase being part of the larger master-plan (there is no good reason for this contrast or this additional attention). Furthermore, the immediate wider context doesn't entail red tones either.

We would like to see the red tone revised to use similar sandy-yellow / buff-coloured brick as the main body of the building. We would also like to see the rest of the materials, details and architectural language follow suit.

The change to sandy-yellow / buff-coloured brick may require the revision of what is currently white brick core. While we appreciate the gesture of distinguishing the core visually from the main body - thus creating a visual break and visually breaking down the block into two - white brick needs to be visually tested with the revised new colour theme to see if it is still visually effective. Other options should be explored also to ensure the contrast is sufficient but not too stark.

We expect window frames, balconies and other visual features of the scheme to follow the principles established by the wider master-plan. We would like the applicant to visually

demonstrate to us that the proposal sits congruous and complementary to the rest of the development (which the current proposal does not).

3. Entrance Legibility

Currently the entrance is very poorly articulated - difficult to spot from the street and doesn't look like a main entrance to a fairly considerable apartments block. While we support use of a material that distinguishes the entrance and couples it visually with the circulation core, more design work is needed to make the entrance more legible and visually celebrated / prominent.

There is some scope to make the entrance project out more to make it more prominent. Please note, entrances for apartment blocks typically require canopies projecting 1200 mm (Part M Buildings Regs) - we suggest this is incorporated as part of the redesign to make the entrance clear, legible and attractive. Poorly designed projecting canopies will not be considered acceptable (e.g. stuck-on glazed canopies or other similar).

We would also like to understand:

- location of mail boxes
- space for deliveries

Typically it is advisable that refuse stores are only accessed from the outside to prevent security breaches via the secondary door which undermines the lobby two-point-security arrangement.

Example below of how detailing and materials can help make the entrance prominent while still occupying a small portion of the facade. We'd like to see options developed to understand how this element of the scheme can be improved.

4. Corner Unit

The corner unit has not been designed well and can be optimised even within the footprint currently outlined for it.

The accessibility transit area has moved into the unit and is less convenient than before (at entry).

The unit loses too much space into corridors due to its layout, location of living room and bedrooms - if one moves the living room at the very end (instead of a bedroom at the end as currently), this can help shorten the corridor and regain some area back / optimise floor area use. Ideally the living room should face Tavistock Road (the more primary street) and the more private spaces (i.e. bedrooms) should be located away from that aspect - for privacy.

Access into the ground floor forecourt via a bathroom is not acceptable. Any front garden / forecourt should be accessed via the living room, or at the very worst via one of the bedrooms (although via bedroom is also substandard).

5. Bedrooms at Ground Floor

Locating bedrooms at ground floor with aspect directly onto a primary street (e.g. Tavistock Road) without any buffer in between is broadly not something we should be supporting. If this can be optimised - would be beneficial.

Hope this helps.

kind regards,

Todor Kuznetsov

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

