

RE: DM/25/0666 Claremont



Emily Wade
To  Stefan Galyas

 Reply

 Reply All

 Forward



Thu 15/05/2025 15:29

Hi Stefan

Further comments on the above application following the receipt of further information.

The window details as submitted suggest the use of uPVC sashes, which will not be acceptable on an NDHA of this period unless the existing windows are uPVC throughout. We would usually expect the use of painted timber to windows and external doors.

The proposed roofing and facing materials seem acceptable in terms of the approach, but we would need a full spec. in each case to avoid a condition (e.g. manufacturer, range and colour).

We would need details of the soffit board to the eaves- we would expect this to be painted timber, not uPVC.

We would need detailed drawings of the proposed front door, or a manufacturer’s spec, or potentially a photograph for a reclaimed door, which should include details of materials (as above, this should be painted timber, not uPVC).

Rainwater goods etc should be painted metal unless the existing is uPVC throughout.

The details of the repairs to the shopfront canopy are acceptable.

Re-use of the original tiles below the shop window is welcomed.

The approach to the hard and soft landscaping seems acceptable but this will need to be shown on a plan. The proposed new hard surfacing material is acceptable.

I also note in reviewing the above that an updated elevation was provided showing solar PV panels to the front (south) facing roofslopes of the building, although these are not mentioned in the description of development, or in the submitted DAS. My apologies for overlooking these in my original comments, I think I was looking at a superseded version of the plan. Unfortunately, in my opinion the principle of solar panels in the locations shown is contentious in terms of their impact on the architectural value of the NDHA, due to their undue visual prominence in the most significant public views of the building, and their adverse impact on the character of the building. Although we do not appear to have any details of the panels themselves, if these are standard black units this prominence will be exacerbated by the difference in colour from the underlying roof tiles. The extent of the proposed array will be such that little of the original roof of the core of the building would remain visible.

In my opinion, this aspect of the scheme is unacceptable, and would result in a mid level of harm to an asset of a mid level of interest in the local context- paragraph 216 of the NPPF will apply. The panels would also be contrary to the requirements of policies CNP7.1 and CNP7.2 of the Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan. I would therefore recommend that this aspect of the proposal is removed from the current application.

Thanks,