

As stated previously the proposed works would result in the installation of 13 solar panels on the primary roofslopes of a historic property (with later extension) in the Pitfodles Conservation Area. The installation of 13 solar panels on the primary roof slopes of this property would have a significant detrimental impact on the special historic character of this building. The intervention would be clearly visible from Westerton Place as well as Westerton Road so would also impact negatively on the special historic character of the wider conservation area.



View from Westerton Road

Making upgrades to the existing building to improve thermal efficiency before exploring the installation of micro-renewables needs to be carried out first especially if the micro-renewables cannot be installed in a discreet location (e.g. secondary roof slope). From the information submitted this does not seem to have been carried out. Individual room temperature control, and waste heat reuse from electronics improves the thermal efficiency of the property but more could still be done. Other interventions into the building to improve thermal efficiency could be explored (e.g. in wall insulation). The supporting statement says *'the Energy Savings Trust, and they have approved the plans - part of this justification was an assessment of existing insulation and energy efficiency measures that are already in place'*. This assessment has not been submitted nor have details of energy saving measures other than individual room temperature control, and waste heat reuse from electronics.

The supporting statement says *'The proposed installation would remove 720kg of CO2 per year with a reduction in electricity use alone considered'*. Solar panels would not reduce the amount of electricity the house uses. It would just reduce the amount of grid electricity being used. Thermal efficiency improvements would reduce the amount of energy the building uses. If the amount of energy the building required was reduced then the number of solar panels required would be reduced.

The supporting statement does not explain why so many solar panels are required. There is some commentary on energy use in the property in the supporting statement but nothing that clearly explains why so many solar panels are required. Without a clear justification for why 13 solar panels covering the entire primary roof slopes of this building and that there is no other alternative is submitted the proposed works should not be supported.

[Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Micro-renewables](#) sets out how improving the thermal efficiency of historic buildings and the installation of micro-renewables should be approached. Key issues 1 and 3 on pg.4 address the points raised above.

The proposed panels are not the most discreet option. There are more discreet solar panels available (e.g. solar panels that are installed flush with the roof slate). Another alternative would be photovoltaic slates (this may be cost prohibitive). An alternative that should be given due consideration is a combination of thermal efficiency improvements in the existing building and then if required a reduced number of solar panels on the primary roof slopes.