

Capital Place (Ref. 36728/APP/2025/3224) – 15/04/26

Design Comments – Applicant Response

Comments from London Borough of Hillingdon’s Design Officer were received on the 13th of February 2026. The revised submission contains updated plans, a Design and Access Addendum (Ref P02) and CGI imagery in response to officer’s comments.

This submission comprises the following:

- Drawing ref. 7697 – al(05)0005 P02
- Drawing ref. 7697 – al(05)0010 P02
- Drawing ref. 7697 – al(05)0011 P02
- Drawing ref. 7697 – al(05)0012 P02
- Drawing ref. 7697 – al(05)0013 P02
- Drawing ref. 7697 – al(05)0021 P02
- Drawing ref. 7697 – al(05)0022 P02
- Drawing ref. 7697 – al(05)0023 P02
- Drawing ref. 7697 – al(05)0024 P02
- Drawing ref. 7697 – al(05)0030 P02
- Drawing ref. 7697 – al(05)0040 P01
- Drawing ref. 7697 – al(05)0041 P01
- Design and Access Statement P02
- CGIs
 - 481 CAM 01 B
 - 481 CAM 01 B-e (higher resolution image)
 - 481 CAM 02 C
 - 481 CAM 02 D-e (higher resolution image)
 - 481 CAM 02 e

Design Officer Comment	Applicant Response
<p><i>The submitted CGI is currently somewhat inconsistent with the submitted plans and elevations, and potentially visually misleading. To ensure the design intent is clear and avoid confusion / discrepancies, we recommend the following queries are addressed as follows:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Entrance Design Clarity: <i>The CGI must accurately reflect the internal and external volumes (currently under-represented). The CGI currently depicts the entrance as a void defined only by fins, contradicting the submitted plans and sections where some of the floors are infilled / glazed and other do allow for a greater outdoor void in between the the proposed fins and the existing facade.</i> 	<p>The Applicant has updated the CGI’s in response to the comments as the originally prepared versions failed to provide a more precise representation of the proposals. The proposal in this case is for a double height entrance and this has been updated clearly within the CGIs to reflect the proposed development. Please see:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 481 CAM 01 B • 481 CAM 01 B-e • 481 CAM 02 C • 481 CAM 02 D-e • 481 CAM 02 e

<p><i>Any first and second-floor balconies / railings must also be visually clearly and convincingly represented (currently omitted / under-represented)</i></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fins Thickness & Support Frame: <i>The current CGI depicts the fins as "floating", potentially failing to account for necessary structural thickness of the fins themselves as well as any additional support frame they may require. In practice, the double-height fins are likely to require a substantial framework and fixings (e.g. at base, parapet and slab) as well as potentially additional thickness. These additions may fundamentally change the architectural appearance for the entrance concept. Ideally this level of detail should be resolved now to ensure the design is not diluted during later stages / condition discharge.</i> <p><i>We recommend a precedent, proposed fins system, and/or detailed drawings are submitted to ensure the proposed appearance is achievable / buildable. If changes to the fins and support system are required, the CGI should ideally be corrected to represent more realistically.</i></p>	<p>The updated CGIs now illustrate the structural support frame at Level 2, and two additional structural steel columns have been incorporated at the front of the extension to provide support and demonstrate the integrity of the proposed design. These columns extend to the full height of the building. These can be seen behind the glass at ground floor and behind the fin panels above.</p> <p>New drawing references 40 P01 and 41 P02 depict the steel structural support frame in detail. In particular, drawing 40 P01 highlights annotation '04', which provides a sectional detail of the proposed aluminium frame and aluminium fins that connect back to the brickwork.</p> <p>Additionally, the windows have been recessed by 245 mm from the face of the elevation to prevent the façade from appearing flat. Drawing 40 P01 also includes a precedent image demonstrating how the lightweight aluminium system can be successfully integrated within the architectural context.</p>
<p>Proposed Infill: <i>While the appearance as exemplified in the submitted CGI for the proposed infill / spandrels between windows is broadly acceptable, none of the information so far clarifies what material is envisaged and whether this material would achieve the demonstrated appearance.</i></p>	<p>Please see new Drawing Ref. 40 for the material.</p>
<p>Visual Depth: <i>While the submitted bay study is noted, could the applicant provide a dimensioned "grey-infill" section to confirm the depth of proposed recesses (including for window reveals)?</i></p> <p><i>Furthermore, we recommend introducing a nominal recess (e.g., 50mm) to the infill panels —potentially maintaining the lintel on the primary plane with the rest of the existing facade — to provide visual depth and prevent large portions of contrasting materials from</i></p>	<p>Please see new Drawing Ref. 40 for window and infill panel detail. The proposed material is identified as fibre cement board. The infill panels have been pushed back to 150mm.</p>

<p>meeting on a single visual plane (producing 'flatness' effect).</p>	
<p>Roof Forms: While the current close-up entrance CGI is useful, it does not illustrate how the building would be experienced prevalingly by the public. We require a broader, medium to long distance pedestrian-level view from along Bath Road to be submitted to demonstrate the entire building, including roofline and any roof-level changes / projections.</p>	<p>CGIs from Bath Road have been added to the pack and included within the amended Design and Access Statement.</p>
<p>Drainage of 2nd Floor Balcony / RW Goods: The second-floor balcony projects beyond the roofline, raising concerns regarding water runoff, weathering and the need for rainwater drainage goods. Clarification is needed whether rainwater goods may be added / designed in or whether rainwater drainage for this central element in the scheme would be concealed internally.</p>	<p>The proposal is to connect to the Rain Water Pipes which are located at either side of the entrance.</p>
<p>Entrance Landscaping: The visualisation should include the proposed landscaping changes and correct surfacing materials to avoid confusion.</p>	<p>Entrance details and correct surfacing material has been added to the CGIs</p>
<p>Signage and Lighting: Proposed signage should be shown indicatively in the CGI(s) to allow for an informed assessment of its scale and integration. Internally illuminated signage will not be acceptable. A low-intensity, external light source (e.g. trough up-light) may be acceptable. Lux levels must be restrained to avoid excessive contrast and light overspill (including for aviation purposes).</p> <p>Is any additional facade lighting envisaged? If proposed, please provide details to ensure it would not be excessive, the intensity remains proportionate and complementary to the building, and minimises light pollution to protect local biodiversity.</p>	<p>It is intended that any external lighting and signage will be secured at a later date under an advertisement consent application when the this part of the design is advanced to an appropriate stage. No lighting or signage is shown on the CGIs.</p>
<p>The proposed hard-surfacing within the Root Protection Areas (RPAs) of existing mature trees raises significant concerns regarding their long-term health. Could these areas of hard-standing be omitted or relocated — potentially into the extensive car parking area</p>	<p>The scheme has largely been developed within the existing parameters on site, including the current areas of hardstanding – see attached topographic survey overlay in blue. The design intent is that the majority of the existing trees to Bath Road and High Street</p>

— to ensure these trees are preserved? Given their role in softening the Bath Road streetscape, it is essential that these mature specimens are protected and, where necessary, supplemented with replacement planting should any existing trees be in decline.

Harlington are retained, along with the alignment of the areas hardstanding. That way we can work within the parameters on site whilst limiting any additional impact to the tree roots. Most of the trees along these edges are fairly mature, ranging from moderate to good, and have established in and around the existing surfacing so we believe any additional impact will be moderate if at all. No new buildings are proposed in the root protection areas.