

49 Etheldene Avenue lies within the Rookfield Conservation Area, and is considered to positively contribute to its significance. It is also within the Rookfield Article 4 Direction Area. The Rookfield Estate is of special interest partly due to its topography and that it was developed by a single family of builders over a considerable length of time that is reflected in the use of changing architectural styles over the period of its building which has led to a variety of character. The Rookfield Estate preserves to a remarkable degree the vision of a suburb in the city with the application of town planning principles of the late 19th and early 20th centuries and has matured into a residential environment of considerable charm and architectural interest.

Etheldene Avenue (including No 49) was built between 1906-1908 and consists of longer terraces and follow the Norman Shaw tradition with casement windows and hanging tiles. No. 49 retains the majority of its original windows, with the exception of window W2 which may be a more modern replacement, though this is slightly unclear. The detailing of the windows along the terrace is generally consistent and well preserved. The article 4 direction area has helped ensure this uniformity has been maintained.

Alterations to windows can have a considerable impact on the character and appearance of the area and the highly preserved nature of the street means it is sensitive to change particularly on the front elevation, which is in part why the article 4 direction area has been implemented. There is an in principle objection to the loss of the original windows W1, W3, W4&5, and W6&7. The loss of these windows, particularly those to the front elevation would be considered to cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the Rookfield Conservation Area as it would erode its similarity and high quality features which are an essential characteristic of part of the distinctive, high quality Edwardian streetscape. There is no provided justification for the loss of the original windows, and the provided photos would appear to show that these are in good condition.

The existing detailing is hard to replicate, particularly with double glazing which requires thicker bars and can produce double reflections and gives glazing bars a thicker and floating appearance as you can see the inwards projection through the multiple panes of glass. This floating appearance is much more obvious when double glazed units are used in windows with leadwork and lead to an incongruous faux appearance as the lead is thinly applied to only one sheet of glass and is noticeable visually not framing any of the glass panes – this is very important when considering window W3. Additionally, there is some concern over the size of the proposed glazing bars, and they are too thick – 30mm seems larger than the existing.

In addition to the above concerns there are other aspects of the window details provided which raise concerns as they are not as per the existing:

- W1 – The details are missing part of the existing window an outer frame to the top of the window, and the cill detail appears to be different as there is only 1 in the detail drawing?
- W2 – This is likely a more modern replacement. The details appear to match the existing joinery details, except the glazing bar details as noted above.
- W3 – The details are missing an outer, moulded frame on the sides and top, differing opening arrangement to the existing, glazing bar details as above, the leadwork isn't shown on the detail sections.
- W4 & W5 – the details appear to match the existing joinery details, except the glazing bar details as noted above.

- W6 & W7 – The detail sections appear to be missing the corner detail joinery – this appears to be a drafting error as it shows a gap. The expressed corner should be replicated. Glazing bar details as above.

As discussed above the loss of the original windows, particularly to the front elevation, would be considered to cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the Rookfield Conservation Area. In addition to the loss of the windows there remain concerns over the proposed replacement window details as discussed above.

As the Rookfield Conservation Area is a designated heritage asset great weight should be given to the asset's conservation, and any harm caused to the significance of a designated heritage asset requires clear and convincing justification and should be weighed against public (not private) benefits. Accordingly, as the proposals are considered to cause less than harm to the significance of the Conservation Area, Conservation would not support this application.

Secondary glazing to the front elevation is likely to be a much more acceptable solution.