

Comments on planning application 2025/0261/L about the glazed panel proposed for the new front doors for Bourne Estate. This concerns the discharge of Condition 4b of Listed Building Consent 2022/5600/L and the basis on which the design of the door was granted consent.

I previously sent comments about the samples of front door furniture and the sample of flat glazing with an image of reeded glass stuck on the surface, which have been submitted for discharge of Conditions 4a and 4b of 2022/5600/L. The residents of Bourne Estate were not notified that these samples had been submitted and that there was a limited period during which comments could be made online. (Nor were we notified when application 2022/5600/L itself was submitted). I came across the application just before the end of this comment period. No opportunity was given to view a sample of the proposed door before the end of the online comment period.

I have now been able to view a sample of the door and it is clear that the size of the glazed opening is too small.

The "Design and Access Statement - Incorporating Heritage Statement", which is one of the documents included in the application for Listed Building Consent (application no. 2022/5600/L), states that: *"The intention of the works is to retain original features or, if this is not possible, to use materials which closely resemble the appearance and design of the original. The new doors will match the originals installed at the point when the building was constructed as closely as possible."*

The decision notice (dated 22/02/2023) granting Listed Building Consent subject to conditions for the front doors states: *"The applicant has produced an approximate replica of this door. A more faithful reproduction was sought, but could not be achieved owing to constraints imposed by performance requirements, especially regarding glazing sizes and locking. Unfortunately, the historic six-pane arrangement could not be successfully incorporated in the mean apertures imposed by the width of the stiles."*

The "stiles" on the proposed doors are far too wide adjacent to the glazed opening. The stiles on the original doors all run the full height of the doors and the width of them does not change. That is, the width of the stile adjacent to the vertical boarding below the lock rail is the same as the width of the stile adjacent to the glazed opening. Think about how the doors were constructed: the stile is a continuous board. This is shown

clearly in the images below of two doors that are identified as being original in the document "Appendix A – Photographic Schedule", which is one of the documents included in application 2022/5600/L.



The proposed door looks very inauthentic because the "stiles" are too wide adjacent to the glazing, making the glazing too small.

Such wide stiles are not necessary. They are not needed for the three-point locking hardware. The glazed opening can be larger and satisfy the fire safety requirements. The reason for the size of the glazed panel is that the manufacturer happens to already have had a door with a glazed panel of this size tested and that it has been certified to meet the fire safety requirements. This is a large contract for approximately 500 doors and it is completely reasonable to expect the contractor to have a new test carried out for a door with a glazed opening of the appropriate size. It seems that you have been misled about the constraints.

The proposed reduction in the size of the glazed opening in the front doors would also have a significant impact on the amount of light entering the flats. This would be unreasonable.

Please require that the size of the glazed opening matches that of one of the original door types, in order to avoid the inauthentic and crude wide "stiles" seen on the sample door and so as not to reduce the amount of daylight entering the flats. Please get in touch with me to discuss this.