Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:
2019/5421/P	Carl	16/02/2020 20:17:20	COMMNT

Response:

Further to our conversation yesterday afternoon, I have downloaded the Fitzjohn's and Netherhall Conservation Area Statement.pdf from the Camden website. Having read through the document, I have extracted sections from the Statement (please see below), which are relevant to the proposed window replacement. The first thing I noticed is that No. 112 Fitzjohn's Avenue is not included in the list of Buildings which make a positive contribution. Secondly, the paragraph relating to Elevational Alterations and Loss of Detail only specifically mentions the prohibited use of PVCu when replacing windows.

Thirdly, the existing clay tiles and mansard roof form enveloping Flat No. 5 appear incongruous and insensitive to the surrounding pitched roof forms and gable ended dormers of the adjacent properties. This strongly suggests that Flat No. 5 is a much later addition to the property and was granted planning approval sometime prior to the designation of the Conservation Area. To therefore place architectural significance on the nondescript timber framed windows of Flat No. 5 and deem them to be 'original windows which would represent a significant loss' - effectively assigning them equal architectural value alongside the original sash windows in the flats below seems unduly zealous in this instance. The scale, proportion and composition of the later addition roof level windows are also completely out of character and bear no relation to the sash windows below.

In our considered opinion, the points raised above reasonably justify the replacement of the existing windows with aluminium framed windows, rather than using pastiche timber sash windows which would do nothing to enhance the overall composition of the Principal elevation. Aluminium framed double glazed units will offer the Applicants' improved thermal and sound insulation, as well as reduced maintenance provision by virtue of the fact that they will not need repainting every 5 years to maintain their integrity (unlike the existing timber) - which would require a scaffold platform on all 4 sides and will be somewhat impractical given the site constraints / height above ground and expensive.

We would be completely understand and support the current recommendation if the roof level windows were original features and architecturally composed accordingly - in which case we would be advising the Applicant to replace any sash windows set within small pitched gable ended dormers with like for like in accordance with the Conservation Area Statement (albeit utilising double glazed units). On this occasion, we appeal to you and the Conservation Team to reconsider the current recommendation for refusal as we cannot find anything in the Fitzjohn's and Netherhall Conservation Area Statement.pdf which strongly supports the current stance when the factors outlined above are taken into consideration.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/5421/P	Carl	14/02/2020 14:36:28	PETITNSUP	Hi Alyce,
			р	

Further to our conversation yesterday afternoon, I have downloaded the Fitzjohn's and Netherhall Conservation Area Statement.pdf from the Camden website. Having read through the document, I have extracted sections from the Statement (please see below), which are relevant to the proposed window replacement. The first thing I noticed is that No. 112 Fitzjohn's Avenue is not included in the list of Buildings which make a positive contribution. Secondly, the paragraph relating to Elevational Alterations and Loss of Detail only specifically mentions the prohibited use of PVCu when replacing windows.

Thirdly, the existing clay tiles and mansard roof form enveloping Flat No. 5 appear incongruous and insensitive to the surrounding pitched roof forms and gable ended dormers of the adjacent properties. This strongly suggests that Flat No. 5 is a much later addition to the property and was granted planning approval sometime prior to the designation of the Conservation Area. To therefore place architectural significance on the nondescript timber framed windows of Flat No. 5 and deem them to be 'original windows which would represent a significant loss' - effectively assigning them equal architectural value alongside the original sash windows in the flats below seems unduly zealous in this instance. The scale, proportion and composition of the later addition roof level windows are also completely out of character and bear no relation to the sash windows below.

In our considered opinion, the points raised above reasonably justify the replacement of the existing windows with aluminium framed windows, rather than using pastiche timber sash windows which would do nothing to enhance the overall composition of the Principal elevation. Aluminium framed double glazed units will offer the Applicants' improved thermal and sound insulation, as well as reduced maintenance provision by virtue of the fact that they will not need repainting every 5 years to maintain their integrity (unlike the existing timber) - which would require a scaffold platform on all 4 sides and will be somewhat impractical given the site constraints / height above ground and expensive.

We would be completely understand and support the current recommendation if the roof level windows were original features and architecturally composed accordingly - in which case we would be advising the Applicant to replace any sash windows set within small pitched gable ended dormers with like for like in accordance with the Conservation Area Statement (albeit utilising double glazed units). On this occasion, we appeal to you and the Conservation Team to reconsider the current recommendation for refusal as we cannot find anything in the Fitzjohn's and Netherhall Conservation Area Statement.pdf which strongly supports the current stance when the factors outlined above are taken into consideration.

I trust that clarifies the Applicants' position, and we look forward to your response in due course.

Best Regards,

Carl