

From: Emily Wade <Emily.Wade@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 09 June 2025 10:25:50 UTC+01:00
To: "Stefan Galyas" <Stefan.Galyas@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Old Milking Parlour DM/25/0902

Hi Stefan

Further comments on the above discharge of conditions application. I've added these in red below.

Condition 3:

Facing and roofing materials:

The brick and tile samples as submitted are acceptable.

Noted.

The use of uPVC for soffit and fascia boards, gutters and downpipes will not be acceptable- we would expect to see traditional materials such as painted timber and painted metal.

Existing soffit & fascia boards have been amended to be painted timber to match existing house. UPVC gutters and downpipes are present on the existing house, so have followed this.

The use of uPVC is unfortunate in the context but given its presence on the existing house it is not considered that an objection can be sustained.

Likewise uPVC windows will not be acceptable- I think, subject to confirmation by the applicant, that the existing windows to the house are painted timber? If confirmed, we would expect the same material to the extension windows

Windows to main house are wood effect uPVC units external with white wood effect finish inside conservation style - please find attached images of the existing windows, which include close up pictures of the finishes.

As above, and given the rear-ward position of the extension, it is not considered that an objection can be sustained.

Condition 4:

Details of:

- Typical examples of new or altered external doors and windows. The drawings should show the depth of the reveal and glazing bar detail.

Although the design of the casement windows as shown appears acceptable, the use of uPVC as above is not appropriate and should be reconsidered. It would also be helpful if the applicant could confirm the depth of reveal of the existing original windows to the building and whether the 70mm shown on the submitted sections matches this?

uPVC note as above and noted that design of casement windows acceptable. Existing depth is approx. 35mm and details have been amended to suit, please find attached amended drawing.

Noted, the revised drawings are acceptable.

We appear to have sectional but not elevational drawings of the external doors?

This was missed off, the elevation of the timber door has now been added, please find attached amended drawing.

The amended drawing is acceptable.

- The glazing and doors to the front and rear arches of central infill range within the context of the retained fabric.

Can the applicant please supply a sectional detail of the glazing to the apex of the arch- the elevation provided seems to show the existing fabric within the arch removed aluminium framed window with applied timber detail attached to the face of the arch- this may be contentious, but the section will be needed to fully understand the proposal.

Details have been adjusted slightly and a section detail has been added to show how the new elements interface with the existing elements, please find attached amended drawing.

I am afraid I still don't fully understand the proposal in this respect. The drawings appear to show glazing set between the replaced upper portion of the oak archway, and also a further aluminium framed window set in front of the archway? Why is this secondary window necessary? My concern is that the external aluminium framed window will partially obscure and detract from the appearance of the oak framing to the arch. I would have expected glazing between the members of the archway only. Perhaps the applicant can explain, or revise the drawings as necessary?

- The new glazing to the existing gablets within the context of the retained fabric.

The details as submitted are acceptable.

Noted.

- Typical eaves details to the extension.

The detail as shown appears acceptable but the materials as noted above are not.

Details amended to show timber soffit & fascia boards as noted above.

This is now acceptable.

- The solar panels including sections to show the relationship to the surrounding roofslope.

The submitted details show conventional solar panels mounted above the roof tiles of the extension. However, as this is a new build, I would query why in line panels are not proposed? These would have a better appearance and be less visually prominent.

The solar PV panels are actually located on the main house and to ensure the existing fabric was not damaged we specified PV panels that are surface mounted. We have also added a roof plan extract showing the location of the panels on the roof for ease, please find attached amended drawing.

The solar array does not match the details shown on the approved roof plan in its extent- significantly more panels are now shown. However, the panels are to an elevation which is less prominent in its orientation, being side on the road, and as such this aspect of the proposal is not considered contentious, on balance.

- Typical examples of the new rooflights.

The details as submitted are acceptable.

Noted.

Thanks

Emily

Please note that this advice is given at Officer level only and is without prejudice to the formal decision of the District Council.

Please note that this advice is given at Officer level only and is without prejudice to the formal decision of the District Council.

Submit your planning application online.

<http://www.planningportal.gov.uk>

Emily Wade Ma MSc

Conservation Officer

Planning Services

Tel: +44 (0)1444 477385

emily.wade@midsussex.gov.uk <http://www.midsussex.gov.uk>



No ID? You can apply for free voter ID
Find out more at
electoralcommission.org.uk/voterID
or call 0800 328 0280