

## Rebecca Lo

---

**From:** Nayan Gandhi <nayan.gandhi@rpsgroup.com>  
**Sent:** 16 December 2020 1:56 PM  
**To:** Mandip Malhotra  
**Cc:** stuart; Rebecca Lo; Craig Shanley; Karen Price  
**Subject:** The Gramophone, Hayes - Overlooking  
**Attachments:** GRM-AI-XX-ZZ-DR-A-302[P10] - Proposed East and South Elevation.pdf; GRM-SK-Proposed Massing Amendments.pdf; Proposed East and South Elevation - Comparison markup.pdf; Facing boundary distances\_v1.pdf; GRM-AI-XX-ZZ-DR-A-211[P09] - Proposed Level 01 and 02 Plan.pdf

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Dear Mandip,

Thank you for your time yesterday. You agreed at the meeting that if we turned windows serving the Listening Café into high level windows and etched/obscured all windows facing the Machine Store Residential Block A, this would address your concerns regarding the provision of those windows at second floor level.

We have prepared the attached draft revised elevation drawings showing these changes, which we submit for your written confirmation that these are acceptable. As you are aware, we do need to gain stakeholder approval of design changes, and we do not have time to go back and forth, hence I need your written confirmation that the following drawings are acceptable:

- Proposed Level 01 and 02 Plan drawing (Architecture Initiative Drawing No GRM-AI-XX-ZZ-DR-A-211, Rev P9)
- Proposed East and South Elevation drawing (Architecture Initiative Drawing No GRM-AI-XX-ZZ-DR-A-302, Rev P10)

These show that the windows you have concerns about have been altered in shape and size and will be obscure/etched glass, which will eliminate any privacy/overlooking issues, and yet at the same time allow for an element of natural light into the building and also retain interest along this elevation. Indeed, etching/obscuring is a standard way of addressing this issue when buildings are perceived to be too close together, which no doubt you have come across before. For clarity, with these changes, we would also achieve an 84% reduction in the amount of glazing facing the residential block, and any windows would be obscured at second floor level.

I understand your concern arises from Local Plan Part 2 Policy DMHB 11 Part b) and Appendix A, particularly Paragraph A1.23. The latter states, as a guide, distances between habitable rooms should be at least 21m, to ensure there is no overlooking/privacy issues. With the proposed etching, any potential overlooking would be rendered completely non-existent as the transparency of the windows is effectively eliminated, and therefore we comply with the principles of the policy.

The reduction in glazing serving the Listening Café was made for design reasons, as small square window styles are found in the established pattern of windows on other facades of the building, so we thought it would be best to reflect this on the new elevation as well, instead of three high-level windows as suggested at our meeting. However, if you prefer three high-level windows instead (to reflect the extent of glazing proposed previously), then please do let us know and we can re-introduce these, albeit as high-level obscure windows.

We also enclose some supporting information, which will help you understand the context of the proposed changes, as follows:

- A distances drawing (File Name: Facing Boundary Distances\_v1.pdf) which provides a measurement of distances between the Pressing Plant cinema building and the Machine Store Resi Block A. As Craig explained in our meeting yesterday, the proposed RLG cinema building will be set further away from the

Resi block (by around 300cm to 550cm) than the previously consented building. As you are aware the external stairwell is being removed, which had that remained as part of the proposal, it would have drawn people even closer to the residential block than the proposed scheme. Therefore, the overall effect reduces the potential privacy and overlooking issues.

- A massing drawing (File Name: GRM-SK-Proposed Massing Amendments.pdf) which provides you with an overview of the massing changes when looking along The Groove. This clearly shows that our building will be stepped back from the line of the consented cinema building, increasing distances between the cinema building and the residential block.

The final drawing in this file includes an internal view of the proposed window, which provides you with a clear idea that you cannot see out of the windows when this is etched/obscure, which is a standard approach when dealing with buildings located in close proximity.

- Another version of the 'Proposed East and South Elevation' drawing (Architecture Initiative Drawing No GRM-AI-XX-ZZ-DR-A-302, Rev P10) which includes an outline reference of the previous windows proposed at the Listening Café, so you can understand the changes that have been made.

As you will be aware, Condition 4a) of the original planning permission requires the approval of details of external materials prior to their installation. The applicant has already agreed to the re-imposition of this condition with our Section 73 permission, and therefore the Council will have the opportunity to review the exact details of the etching/obscuring in due course.

We discussed daylight/sunlight and other issues. Without going into too much detail as I believe it is unnecessary, the Daylight/Sunlight report followed BRE standards which compared existing conditions with the proposed building, not a comparison of the consented building with the proposed building. That said, the report did contain some information comparing the schemes (Paragraph 6.14.1 and its accompanying table), and found there would be an immaterial change on Machine Store Block A units. This is in part because our building is located to the north of the residential block. Your external advisor would have reviewed this information, after which you have concluded there is no significant issue on daylight/sunlight matters to warrant refusal. I believe the matter is therefore resolved, to avoid any doubt.

With these changes and additional information, which reflects our agreement yesterday, we understand that we have addressed all of your concerns regarding this matter. Please would you kindly confirm in writing so we can then obtain appropriate consent to the changes from various stakeholders, with a view of submitting a formal change to these drawings as soon as we possibly can. Thank you.

I have copied in Craig Shanley (our architect) into this email chain, so we can provide any clarifications as necessary. I look forward to hearing from you shortly.

Kind regards,

Nayan

**Nayan Gandhi**

Principal Planner

RPS | Consulting UK & Ireland

**M** +44 7483 445090

**E** [nayan.gandhi@rpsgroup.com](mailto:nayan.gandhi@rpsgroup.com)

---

**From:** Mandip Malhotra <[MMalhotra@hillingdon.gov.uk](mailto:MMalhotra@hillingdon.gov.uk)>

**Sent:** 11 December 2020 10:44

**To:** Karen Price <[karen@hawesprice.co.uk](mailto:karen@hawesprice.co.uk)>

**Cc:** Nayan Gandhi <[nayan.gandhi@rpsgroup.com](mailto:nayan.gandhi@rpsgroup.com)>; stuart <[stuart@hawesprice.co.uk](mailto:stuart@hawesprice.co.uk)>; Rebecca Lo <[RLo@hillingdon.gov.uk](mailto:RLo@hillingdon.gov.uk)>

**Subject:** Re: The Gramophone Project, Blyth Road

Dear Karen

Condition wording

I am proposing wording for the plans condition on your current application as follows- i will allow you to consider it further amongst your team and let me know if you are happy with the principle of the approach, the relevant drawing numbers will be inserted thereafter:

Condition 2 proposed wording:

**RESIDENTIAL BLOCK AND LANDSCAPING**

Notwithstanding details shown on the plans hereby approved under this consent; the residential development and all landscaping within the red line plan shall be completed strictly in accordance with the following plans:

XXXXXX

**CINEMA DRAWING**

Notwithstanding details shown on the plans hereby approved under this consent; the cinema building only (land outlined in blue on drawing ref: GRM-AI-XX-ZZ-DR-A-001, P06) shall be completed strictly in accordance with the following plans:

XXXXXX

Residential Amenity

Policy DMHB11 of the Local Plan part 2 sets out design and amenity standards that new developments should achieve, the supporting text in Appendix A of that document provides further details in respect of amenity.

The cinema block as proposed under the current application fails to accord with minimum separation distance requirements, albeit this was known as part of the previous approval, the building height was lower and on balance, the harm was deemed to be an on balance decision taken at the time the application was determined.

We now find ourselves assessing the current proposal, which increases the building height, therefore resulting in a more dominant form of development for the future occupiers of the Crest Nicholson block, the daylight and sunlight report identifies further losses to these apartments (which i note we have previously advised is not a standalone reason for refusal) which i note that you have not disputed. This is then further exacerbated by the inclusion of an additional window within the facade facing the Crest Nicholson block (which serves your proposed Listening Cafe)

which has raises concerns of overlooking and further diminishes the residential amenity of the Crest Nicholson future occupiers.

I appreciate that Crest Nicholson have not raised an objection, but more notably, these units are not occupied and the role of the planning department is to therefore ensure that the current application does not cause a harmful impact to those future occupiers.

Obscure glazing to the window does not overcome all concerns, the perception of overlooking remains which coupled with loss of light and an overbearing impact from the developments increased height does tip this proposal into an area where it is not acceptable and the on balance arguments that have been made move to reasons for refusal due to the cumulative impacts.

I will call you shortly to discuss this further.

Kind regards  
Mandip

---

**From:** Karen Price <[karen@hawesprice.co.uk](mailto:karen@hawesprice.co.uk)>

**Sent:** 10 December 2020 5:42 PM

**To:** Mandip Malhotra <[MMalhotra@hillingdon.gov.uk](mailto:MMalhotra@hillingdon.gov.uk)>; Rebecca Lo <[RLo@hillingdon.gov.uk](mailto:RLo@hillingdon.gov.uk)>

**Cc:** 'Nayan Gandhi' <[nayan.gandhi@rpsgroup.com](mailto:nayan.gandhi@rpsgroup.com)>; Stuart Smith <[Stuart@hawesprice.co.uk](mailto:Stuart@hawesprice.co.uk)>

**Subject:** The Gramophone Project, Blyth Road

Good Afternoon to you both

I have seen that Nayan has chased for a response on the drawings as without this information it is difficult for us to pursue any other matters and we are running out of time. We have reported to all relevant parties that the aim is to go to the January Committee and that everything must be finalised prior to the Xmas break. Therefore we really only have next week.

Can you please advise when we will receive confirmation from your Legal advisors on whether or not they agree with the approach presented in relation to Condition 2 and the S106 Agreement.

In terms of your request to remove the glazing in the Listening Café and the glazing in the communal staircore above the entrance from the Groove, as already mentioned the permitted scheme has a full glazed elevation where the entrance area is and therefore obviously this could be implemented. Crest Nicholson, the owner of the residential block opposite the Pressing Plant, submitted the permitted drawings with the full glazing and therefore could not have had any concerns and they have not made any objections to our revised proposals. Furthermore, the Council have not provided any calculations as to how they have deduced the effect of light spillage on any of the residential rooms. For ease I have attached the permitted and proposed elevations.

The articulation of the elevation has come about through discussion with the GLA Design Panel and the U + I Designers for the whole site. The idea of a public space being within a blacked out

box does not create the sort of ambience that is trying to be created here. Natural light is always important in public spaces. We would therefore suggest that instead of removing the windows the glass is etched so that it is obscure and reduces the light spillage. If this was considered acceptable then we would issue to the GLA Design Team and U + I's Designers for their approval.

I understand from Nayan that the Council are now satisfied with the Energy Assessment and shall be grateful to receive written confirmation of the same.

This will leave the matter of the acoustic condition to be dealt with and I am sure you will need to be preparing your advisors to ensure that they can deal with this as soon as we receive confirmation on the drawing issue and therefore hopefully next week we can conclude matters.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Kind regards

Karen

**Hawes Price Limited**

The White House  
1<sup>st</sup> Floor  
26 Mortimer Street  
London W1W 7RB

Tel: 0207 409 0408

Fax: 0207 409 0056

Mob: 07769 742539

Email [karen@hawesprice.co.uk](mailto:karen@hawesprice.co.uk)

[www.hawes-price.co.uk](http://www.hawes-price.co.uk)

**Disclaimer** This e-mail and any attachment are confidential and contain proprietary information, some or all of which may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the author immediately by telephone or by replying to this e-mail, and then delete all copies of the e-mail on your system. If you are not the intended recipient, you must not use, disclose, distribute, copy, print or rely on this e-mail.

Hillingdon Council routinely monitors the content of emails sent and received via its network for the purposes of ensuring compliance with its policies and procedures. The contents of this message are for the attention and use of the intended addressee only. If you are not the intended recipient or addressee, or the person responsible for sending the message you may not copy, forward, disclose or otherwise use it or any part of it in any way. To do so may be unlawful. If you receive this email by mistake please advise the sender immediately. Where opinions are expressed they are not necessarily those of the London Borough of Hillingdon. Service by email is not accepted unless by prior agreement.

This e-mail message and any attached file is the property of the sender and is sent in confidence to the addressee only.

Internet communications are not secure and RPS is not responsible for their abuse by third parties, any alteration or corruption in transmission or for any loss or damage caused by a virus or by any other means.

RPS Group Plc, company number: 208 7786 (England). Registered office: 20 Western Avenue Milton Park Abingdon Oxfordshire OX14 4SH.

RPS Group Plc web link: <http://www.rpsgroup.com>