

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/1615/P	Andrew Lambert	16 Lupton Street London NW5 2HT	04/04/2016 11:46:53	OBJ	<p>We live at No. 16 Lupton Street, next door to No. 18. We are strongly opposed to the request to replace all of N. 18's windows and doors from timber to uPVC in the front and rear.</p> <p>We know that Victorian sash windows can be draughty. Double-glazing is a good idea and a great way to reduce heating costs. In fact, we would like to double glaze our windows ourselves at some point. But we wouldn't consider doing it in anything but timber.</p> <p>Nearly all the Victorian terraced houses on Lupton Street have timber windows and doors. It is a crucial part of the character of the houses. The windows are such a prominent part of a building to surround them with plastic is to remove them of their personality. We are very concerned that No. 18 will stick out as an ugly oddity on the street, devaluing the nature and character of Lupton Street. uPVC is given horribly sharp-edged, flat-profile, lifeless finishes. It discolours and can become brittle and crack.</p> <p>While it might initially seem cheaper than timber, it has been estimated that uPVC can actually be 14-25% more expensive than timber when looking at the 'whole life cost'. This is because uPVC only has an estimated life of 25-30 years as oppose to timber which, if maintained properly, can last 100+ years. Furthermore, when uPVC windows do go wrong they cannot be repaired easily and generally have to be replaced. Timber, on the other hand, is much more repairable. It is also untrue to think of uPVC as 'maintenance-free'. According to the Housing Association Property Manual they should be cleaned every 6 months, lubricated annually and have weather stripping and gaskets renewed every 10 years. It therefore seems short-sighted of the owners of No. 18 to try and save money today only to have to spend more in the future.</p> <p>UPVC is also one of the most un-green choices one can make for a building material. In "Environmental Impacts of Polyvinyl Chloride Building Materials" respected pollution scientist Dr Joe Thornton describes PVC as "one of the most environmentally hazardous consumer materials produced" and that "PVC is the antithesis of a green building material".</p> <p>In conclusion, then, we would quote Camden's Planning Guidance Design document which states that "uPVC windows are not acceptable both aesthetically and for environmental reasons, including their relatively short lifespan and inability to biodegrade. " It also says that any alterations should "respect and enhance" the character and appearance of a property and its surroundings. We would suggest that the proposed replacement for uPVC windows and doors neither respects nor enhances the property or the surroundings and should therefore be rejected.</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p> <p>Andrew Lambert &amp; Karen Martinez 16 Lupton Street London NW5 2HT tel: 0207 267 5213</p>