

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3729/P	Sara Grohmann	21 Carnegie House New End Hampstead NW3 1JE	21/09/2015 09:00:37	OBJLETTE R	<p>Dear Mr Dempsey,</p> <p>I am writing in relation to your recent letter on the consultation of the planning application 2015/3729/P for works to be carried out at Carnegie House, Flats 1-24 in New End , Hampstead, for the amendments described by the applicant as:</p> <p>“We wish to introduce dummy sashes to the fixed lights to provide internally beaded windows in all instances to ensure security in accordance with Secure by Design. We also wish to introduce ventilation by means of over glass vents as none were shown on the existing proposal. Finally we wish for the windows to be Polyester Powder Coated Aluminium windows in white as the original application and to match surrounding windows”.</p> <p>The current planning application seems to seek approval for the three following amendments to the previous planning permission granted for this building last year:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Replacement of the approved fixed window detail with dummy sashes. 2. Introduction of above glass ventilators. 3. White polyester powder coating as the finish for the window frames <p>I would therefore like to comment as follows on the above proposed amendments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Replacement of the approved window frames with dummy sashes. <p>There is no clear explanation in the submitted documentation of why this change is required, although reference is made in the applicant"s letter to Secure by Design. Having window frames that incorporate both openable and fixed glass panes is a common requirement that does not typically require the use of dummy sashes. There is therefore seemingly no need to duplicate the window"s frame to achieve this requirement.</p> <p>As a result of the introduction of dummy sashes, the prosed window frames will have an overall profile for the horizontal and vertical mullions between 20 and 100% wider than the existing frames. This change, if approved, will consequently have a detrimental impact on the daylight of many habitable rooms in the building. Given this, I am surprised that no assessment of this impact via daylight calculations has been submitted with the planning documentation. As the majority of the habitable rooms in Carnegie House are single sided and many are facing either the internal courtyard or on a north-west elevation, if this change was to be approved, these rooms would suffer from a significant reduction in sunlight and daylight.</p> <p>The proposed frames also, because of their overall thick frames, will have a considerable negative impact on the external appearance of the building. Carnegie House, as you might know, was designed in 1948 by well-known architects A&j Soutar, also architects of the much praised Hampstead Garden Suburb. One of the building"s main elevation forms the western frontage of New End Square at the heart of the Hampstead Conservation Area, its southern elevation is fronting New End and given the</p>

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

building"s prominent position it is highly visible when approaching it from Flask Walk via Boades Mews.

It is my understanding, as stated in the Council"s Conservation Area statement, that UDP Policy EN31 states "The Council will seek to ensure that development in conservation areas preserves or enhances their special character or appearance, and is of high quality in terms of design, materials and execution."

It is hard to imagine how this change will contribute or enhance the character of the Hampstead Conservation area. To the opposite, the low-quality design of the proposed window frames, if approved, would have a detrimental impact on the already neglected building and even further stigmatize it in relation to the rest of the conservation area.

2. Introduction of above glass ventilators.

The applicant suggests that this change is necessary because requirements in the current Building Regulations. I think this is based on their failure to consider the current arrangement of the building that already ensures adequate ventilation. All habitable rooms in Carnegie House have high level openable vents and most of them also have air-bricks on the external walls of each habitable room. This detail forms part of the original design of the building. As such, under current Building Regulations, no change is required when replacing windows. I therefore see no need for such an intrusive solution with no consideration for the additional loss of day light and additional negative impact on the building external appearance.

Regardless of the vents not being necessary, there are also plenty of readily available aluminium thermally broken window systems with trickle vents incorporated in the design of the frames. The proposal therefore seemingly results simply from a lack of consideration, and as such fails to meet the Council"s own policy requirement for "high-quality in terms of design" in the Conservation Area.

It is difficult to imagine how a visually intrusive means of ventilation could be considered acceptable in the context of the Hampstead Conservation Area or be seen to preserve or enhance its character. Having myself looked, I have been unable to find any other building in the Conservation Area that has adopted this solution, while assuming all recently refurbished or newly built buildings have managed to comply with all current regulations.

3. White polyester powder coated finish.

On the issue of colour, it is unclear from the previous planning documentation, what colour the approved windows are assumed to be. While white seem to be a consistent tone for the windows in the conservation area, a high-gloss powder-coated finish would seem to be again inappropriate (its smooth finish making it distinctly different from painted timber and more similar to UPVC), especially if

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

combined with thick window frames. I believe it would just contribute to the uncharacteristic appearance of the proposed replacement windows. A matt finish would seem to be much more appropriate in the context of the Hampstead conservation area.

Due to the issues explained above I would therefore like to strongly object to this application.

Yours sincerely

Sara Grohmann

21 Carnegie House
NW3 1JE
