

DISCLAIMER

Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Monday 01st January 2010. For further information see

<http://www.camden.gov.uk/ccm/navigation/environment/planning-and-built-environment/planning-applications/development-control-members-briefing/>

Delegated Report (Members Briefing)		Analysis sheet	Expiry Date:	07/01/2010
		N/A / attached	Consultation Expiry Date:	16/12/2009
Officer			Application Number(s)	
Elizabeth Beaumont			2009/5343/P	
Application Address			Drawing Numbers	
Flat D, Guilford Court 51 Guilford Street WC1N 1ES			Please refer to decision notice	
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)				
Replacement of existing sliding glass windows with fixed double glazing windows and alterations to top lights from fixed to outward opening, to second floor flat (Class C3) on the front and side elevation.				
Recommendation(s):		Grant planning permission		
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission		

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	14	No. of responses	02	No. of objections	02
			No. Electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:	<p><u>Flat P, Guilford Court and Guildford Court Management Limited</u> – two letters received, dated the 7th and 11th December 2009 – objects for the following reasons;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• No consultation with all other leaseholders. Letters sent to some not all leaseholders after submitting application. Some addresses are incorrect. 8 out of the 16 leaseholders rent out their flats and do not live in the block. Tenants may not have passed on letters. (see below)• The development is not like-for-like, this is a new design of windows. Windows on front and side elevations are sliding panes of glass. For each window there are 4 panes of glass arranged in two overlapping pairs separated by air gap of 3cm. each pair runs in channels that are of hardwood frames, 1960s version of double-glazing (Please refer to 2-2.5)• There are no drawings showing how they the windows will be fitted into the existing frames. The largest window would be 3.05m and 11.5 high. This is inappropriate in residential premises. Windows are substantially different and would stand out. (Refer to 2-2.5)• The sliding window in the block should be of identical design. A ‘pick and mix’ approach would ruin the appearance of the block. Just because the flat is on the 2nd floor it is not out of sight or out of mind. If a leaseholder on a lower floor were to adopt this design it would be glaringly obvious. (Refer to 2-2.5)• If Camden were to approve this scheme then every other leaseholder would have to adopt the same approach. Any changes to the block should be decided by leaseholders collectively. If this cannot be agreed we should stick to the current windows. The application is inaccurate and misleading. (see below)• There is an existing planning consent for all the windows (2004/4016/P). This has been implemented on the window above the entrance door. The applicant has been unable to persuade all leaseholders to adopt the design but has a poor response. Camden should not consider a new application while there is an existing consent. (see below)• The windows should be repaired not replaced. (see below)• Applicant is not changing windows to the rear, so this is inconsistent with his claim to improve the insulation of the flats. (refer to paragraph 1.1)• The building is five storeys and not 4. (see below)					

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FENSA says under the 2002 legislation that side window opening cannot be replaced by top openings over fixed windows. (see below) <p><u>Officer's comments</u> – Existing and proposed elevations and sections were submitted. The Council cannot refuse an application on the basis that the application should be made by all tenants within the block. It is the applicant's choice to submit an application to replace rather than repair the existing windows. It is noted that the building is four storeys with a mansard roof extension which is not shown on the drawings however, this is not considered to affect the proposal. Building regulations are not assessed as part of the planning process however an informative would be attached to any decision notice regarding building regulations. Consultation letters were sent to all the addresses within the block and a site notice was displayed outside the property.</p>
CAAC comments:	<u>Bloomsbury CAAC</u> – no comments received

Site Description

The site is located on the south of Guildford Street with Queen Square to the rear. The site comprises a 4 storey residential block with mansard roof in an area that is characterised of a combination of office and residential accommodation. The block is not listed but is located within the Bloomsbury Conservation Area. The application relates to a flat located on the second floor of the building.

Relevant History

26/11/2004 – **p.p. (2004/4016/P)** granted for the replacement of existing sliding glass (frameless) windows with aluminium (colour brown) sliding framed windows.

Relevant policies

Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006

SD6 (Amenity for occupiers and neighbours)
B1 (General design principles)
B3 (Alterations and extensions)
B7 (Conservation areas)

Camden Planning Guidance 2006

Bloomsbury Conservation Area Statement

Assessment

1. Proposal

- 1.1 Permission is sought to replace the existing sliding glass panels with fixed double glazed glazing. No alterations are proposed to the existing frame. The existing fixed top panel will be replaced with a top opening panel which would be top hung with hinges to the existing frame and will open outward. The application site comprises a second floor flat with front, side and rear elevations. It is proposed to replace only the windows on the front and side elevations. The windows on the rear elevation which front into the internal courtyard are not included as they are of a different design and do not need to be replaced.
- 1.2 The existing fenestration pattern on the residential block is characterised by brown timber framed windows with sliding glass panels with no centre glazing bars and fixed top panels. The area where the two glass panels overlap is visible and creates a darker outline in the centre of the glass.
- 1.3 Planning permission (2004/4016/P) was previously approved to replace the sliding glass (frameless) windows with brown aluminium sliding framed windows. This would result in the introduction of a central glazing bar. The scheme was only partially implemented in one window on the front elevation on the first floor.

2. Design

- 2.1 Camden Planning Guidance 2006 states that where it is necessary to alter or replace windows that are original to the building they should be replaced like-with-like wherever possible in order to preserve the character of the property and the surrounding area. In the existing block the fenestration pattern is not entirely original. On the third floor on the front elevation the windows

have been replaced with a similar design as proposed in this scheme. The sliding panels have been replaced with fixed glazing and the fixed top panels have been replaced with top opening panels creating a double frame. A window on the side elevation at ground floor level has also been replaced with entirely fixed windows. There is no record of planning permission for these developments. Planning permission was approved in 2004 for the replacement of the frameless glass panels with aluminium framed windows with a central glazing bar.

- 2.2 It is considered that the proposed alterations to the glazing from sliding panels to fixed double glazed panels would not have a detrimental impact on the character of building or the character and appearance of the wider conservation area. It is not proposed to alter the existing frame and the double glazing will be inserted into this frame. In order to allow the top panel to open the top glazing panel the fixed panel will be replaced with a framed glass panel which will create a double frame. The alterations to the top panels with outward opening windows would mirror the flat on the third floor. It is considered that differences to the original opening method and the detailed design of the top panel as shown on the floor above would not detract from the original design.
- 2.3 The existing overlapping sliding panels can be distinguished from the street, due to the slightly darker colour of the overlap. It is considered that despite the visibility of this element it is not a prominent overall architectural feature of the building which should be retained. It is considered that the main feature of the facades of the building is the large expanse of glass without a central glazing bar.
- 2.4 It is considered that this proposal would not prevent future scheme proposing alternative styles being introduced. This proposal is considered acceptable in the context of the building as it serves to replicate the overall character of the fenestration pattern. It is considered that although the proposed design would have a different opening method the overall fenestration pattern, proportions, materials and the size of the window opening would be similar to the original.
- 2.5 It is considered that the proposed replacement and variations to the opening method and thickness of the frame of the top panel would not have a detrimental impact on the overall character of the building or the character and appearance of the wider conservation area. On this basis the proposal is considered acceptable.

3. Amenity

- 3.1 It is considered that the proposed alteration to the windows would not have a detrimental impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers or residents with regard to sunlight, daylight, outlook and privacy compared to the existing situation.

4. Recommendation – Grant planning permission