

HGY/2023/2974 21 Parklands, Cholmeley Park

Replacement of 40 x no existing painted timber frame DGU (double glazed) windows and 3x no doors with new timber framed TGU (triple glazed) windows and doors.

Highgate Conservation Area Advisory Committee objects to this application on the basis that the replacement windows are not like-for-like as is shown on the submitted detailed drawing 23.PAR 03 001 rev.02.

The Parklands estate has a distinct character from the standardisation of its parts combined with complex building forms. The windows are a very important part of the design cohesion. We note the existing windows are double hung sliding sash windows as shown on drawing 23.PAR 03 001 rev.02. None of the existing windows have top hung opening lights above a fixed light below as is now proposed for the larger windows. The following changes would cause harm to Highgate Conservation Area.

On examination of the detailed drawings, comparing existing and proposed, we find:

23.PAR 02 009 rev 01: 5no windows have top hung opening lights above a fixed sash.

Opening arrangements not shown for windows in the tower.
Fenestration pattern to the tower windows, small windows under the eaves each side and window adjacent garage are changed and the proposals are too plain.

23.PAR 02 010 rev 01: 1no window has a top hung opening light above a fixed sash.

No information provided for window 'wr0c' in terms of opening lights but change in fenestration unacceptable.

Windows/doors at basement level are all out of character.

3no. windows aligned vertically between the gabled extension and the tower are shown as side hung opening lights without glazing bars. These again are out of character.

Windows to the tower: no information is provided. Subject to details and opening light arrangements, etc., these windows would be acceptable. See comments on detail drawings below.

23.PAR 02 011 rev 01: Please see our comments on the tower windows above.

The proposed change of glazing proportions for the doorsets on the north elevation would lose the character of the original entirely. Presumably the timber railings would remain. The same is true of the garden doors at basement level.

On both North and South elevations top or side hung lights would be unacceptable.

The small window ref. ww0a would be acceptable subject to details (see below)

23.PAR 03 001 rev 02 Detailed drawing for Wf0d, existing and proposed: this shows, as expected, that the existing window (and presumably all windows) is a double hung sliding sash. The proposed window has a top hung opening light and fixed sash below. This change altogether changes the consistent appearance of Parklands

right hand drawing provides some dimensions which we have compared with the Naturo 76 on page 16 of the Heritage Statement.

"Conclusion: The replacement windows proposed match the existing...They retain the existing design and material quality which defines 21 Parklands and its group within the Conservation Area."

The section on the right makes it clear that this window is not like-for-like. The 3D image and the section make it clear the window is for a single opening light and there are no details on the company's website of the various opening arrangements shown on the drawings. Various 'heritage' glazing bars are shown at the bottom of page 16 which do not relate to the Naturo 76 illustration.

23.PAR 03 001 rev. 2 indicates that the sizes of all the elements would be exactly the same as the existing windows but, comparing the dimensions on this drawing with the Heritage statement there are clear differences between the existing and proposed windows, for example:

Combined dimension at head is 38mm less as proposed

Combined width at side reveal is 18mm less as proposed

Combined dimension at cill level is 42mm less

There is no information for the meeting rail

Taking all of these dimensions together the windows are likely to look rather mean compared with the existing.

Altogether the exact proposals for the windows are somewhat unclear and would be unsuitable as replacements for all the reasons set out above. Highgate Conservation Area Advisory Committee considers that whereas at pre-app No. 21 was considered to have a neutral impact, the proposed changes would result in it being re-classified as being negative thus causing harm to Highgate Conservation Area and so should be refused.