

Design Comment	Response	Relevant doc / drawings
We would question if the 5 th floor plans are accurate as the window fenestration shown to the rear (railway elevation) does not match the elevation drawing. (glazing bars between sections)	Revised the window fenestration and detailing to match existing condition.	Proposed Elevations
We also note that the noise impact assessment document p18 states that acoustic screening is required at roof level (paraphrased).	The assessment of the roof external amenity space was tested with a 1.5m screen and shown to achieve the external noise target of 55 decibels (LAeq). Now shown on architectural and landscape plans.	Proposed Floor Plans, Elevations and Landscape Details
Similarly it should be clear if particularly at first and second floor level to the south that there is sufficient noise buffering for the flats from the train noise and in particular the overnight freight train noise highlighted in the report. This is due to the plans showing no changes to the standard double glazed units.	Please note NIA the note has been reviewed by our noise consultant to states: <i>"Similarly it should be clear if particularly at first and second floor level to the south that there is sufficient noise buffering for the flats from the train noise and in particular the overnight freight train noise highlighted in the report. This is due to the plans showing no changes to the standard double glazed units."</i> The EHO have no comment. Mitigation measures can be conditioned i.e. changes to glazing.	-
Following careful consideration we would question whether the extension to the central roof tank is feasible. The proposals would involve cutting away all the supporting concrete structures beneath it in order to construct the sixth floor. In addition it is to be both lengthened and widened. Furthermore the floor section below has no supporting structure shown. Therefore we would question if this is possible. If this is what is planned it would be recommended that a structural report explaining how it is to be achieved should be supplied. If not this should be described in the proposals.	A structural engineer has input into the design and confirmed that the roof extension and terrace is achievable.	-
We also are aware that the draft conservation area appraisal was published in December 2025 and has not been noted in the heritage assessment.	This wasn't available online – updated addendum provided.	Heritage Statement Addendum
The overall materials and detailing of the property mean that it has a strong historic identity and makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The elevation to the railway is a set piece design and is a key view to the conservation area. The proposals would compromise the design of the building, are at odds with its character through the material choice.	We would be happy to revisit material choice – through pre-application this material was agreed as most sensitive but happy to review other options?	-

The slight kinks at the edge of floor plans adjacent to the windows would be particularly visible at night and add to an overall disruptive feel. These should therefore be set back.	The design has been refined to minimise the visual impact of the internal party walls. These flank walls have been recessed deeper into the floorplate wherever feasible. Where spatial constraints prevent this setback, the party wall interface is at a 45-degree angle, softening the junction and reducing its visual impact.	Proposed Elevations
The offsets to the north elevation could be re-worked in relation to the detailing of the sub division of the rooms.	We aren't entirely clear on this point but have provided our design justification below - The North Elevation of the Record Store has become visually obscured by the new Weston Homes development, The Venue, on Powerhouse Lane. From the primary approach on Gramophone Lane, all new façade infill panels are to strictly align with the existing structural grid, ensuring the symmetry at the building's main entrance is fully retained.	Proposed Elevations
To the south there would be a visual jarring caused by the offset of the 5 th floor sub division glazing from the floors below. This would be detrimental to the buildings appearance and the character of the building and wider area. It should therefore be reviewed.	To satisfy building regulations regarding overheating and acoustic performance, full replacement of windows is proposed across the development. To ensure visual harmony, the fenestration of new windows at Level 5 will be carefully designed to align with the metal 'Crittall-style' glazing on the curtain walling below, to maintain continuous vertical alignment and reducing any visual jarring between floors.	Proposed Elevations
The loss of the north light structure to the top floor roof space would be detrimental as it adds to the character and interest of the building.	As the water tank is visible from street level and, as we understand it, of greater significance than the north light structure, the water tank has been retained. It is not possible to retain both within the design however impact to any significance of the locally listed building has taken a considered approach to lessen impact wherever possible.	-
We would disagree with the heritage assessment submitted with the application which states that these harms (which are not all referenced) are outweighed by the benefit of bringing the building back into use.	All public benefits are set out within planning statement – we'd be happy to include within heritage statement too if helpful?	Planning Statement

While the document tends to show images of dual aspect flats the proposals themselves result in single aspect flats with large glazed windows either facing directly south onto a busy mainline railway or north close to another substantial structure. They have been designed to have the bedrooms to the rear with light coming from the window of the living dining space. In this they would appear to be contrary to the London Plan policy C.4 in relation to Aspect, Orientation daylight/ sunlight	Slightly unclear which policy this is referring to but Policy D6 relates to 'maximising provision of dual aspect' only where it can be demonstrated that there is adequate passive ventilation, daylight and privacy and avoid overheating. Apologies if I have misunderstood the comment? However, the technical details ensure that the proposal complies with each amenity matters for future occupiers.	-
Issues highlighted during the current heatwave would lead us to question how warm these south facing flats would be if no ventilation is possible. The officer should be satisfied that this has been addressed.	The development is in full compliance with all relevant planning policies and building regulations relating to overheating. Please refer to section 11 of 250294-CPW-XX-XX-RP-Z-0001 Energy Statement	Energy Statement
There have been a number of recent cases where proposed trees to be provided on roof plans have later been found not to be possible due to the structural loading on the building. Therefore we would recommend that the architect confirms via a structural report that this planting can be supported by the new roof.	As set out above, we did review the plans with a structural engineer prior to submission.	-
There may also be issues in relation to the heights the trees grow to with regards to the adjacent to the railway and potential interference with the nearby masts and associated wiring of the electrification infrastructure.	Reviewed with regard to these comments, above structural comment and in relation to warming climate / rainfall and revised landscape plan to show more large shrub rather than trees at roof level – whilst still meeting UGF.	-
The trees in the existing tree pits to both the east end of the building and the north seem not to be surviving particularly well. It would be useful to perhaps re-dig these pits and ensure that there is both enough space, nutrients and water. If these are acceptable the species of tree needs to be reconsidered.	Tree details updated on drawing – further detail of re-digging can be conditioned.	'Landscape Details 1 – Tree Pit Details – dwg 401 Rev P04'
The proposed sedum roofs that do not meet the GRO code 2014 can be more vulnerable to drying out and failure.	Updated to a native turf mix.	-