

Chivers, Jennifer

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: [REDACTED]
Attachments: Carnegie_House_comparison.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Jennifer

2015/3729/P

Please see attached a comparison of the existing and proposed window arrangements, which is lacking in submitted information.

As you can see, based on a typical window, the new proposal currently represents more than a 40% increase in the amount of visual framing, and 18% loss of glazing. When this loss of glazing is compounded by the unavoidable loss of light transmission that comes with the additional layer of glass in double glazing (circa 10%), this will result in a loss of daylight in excess of 25% within the habitable rooms. This loss will be significantly more in rooms with smaller windows, where the increase in farming will be over 50%.

I note that the agents recently submitted D&A Statement, which was received after the consultation period had closed, now concedes that dummy sashes are not required by Secure-By-Design above ground floor, and as such this loss of light unnecessary. Please can you confirm to me the response from your own Building Control officers regarding the need for ventilators.

Please also note that in your report to the Member Review Panel your assertion that the ventilation is on 4cm is incorrect and misleading, it is actually nearly twice as big at 7.3cm (1052mm – 979mm). Please can you correct this.

I hope the drawings help illustrate our concerns.

David

david saxby
OO

