

Delegated Report

Listed Building Consent Application

Planning Application No: 20220774

Location: 4A Joy Road Gravesend Kent DA12 1NT

Description: Application for Listed Building Consent for the repointing of the south and west facade with lime mortar.

Applicant: Mrs Indre Zukaite

Site Visit Date: 22/07/2022

Submitted Documents/Plans

- Application form;
- Drawing no. JR_P-A.00 Rev. E – Location Plan; and
- Drawing no. JR_P-A.23 Rev. E – Sample Panels.
- ~~Drawing no. JR_P-A.00 Rev. A – Location Plan;~~
- ~~Drawing no. JR_P-A.21 Rev. A – West Elevation;~~
- ~~Drawing no. JR_P-A.22 Rev. A – South Elevation;~~
- ~~Design & Access Statement.~~

Relevant Planning History

None.

Development Plan

Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (September 2014):

- CS01 – Sustainable Development
- CS19 - Development & Design Principles
- CS20 – Heritage and the Historic Environment

Gravesham Local Plan: First Review (1994)

- TC2 – Listed Buildings

Paragraph 33 of the NPPF (2021) sets out that policies within adopted local plans should be reviewed to assess whether they need updating at least once every five years, and should then be updated as necessary. Such reviews are also a legal requirement as set out in Regulation 10A of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) England Regulations 2012.

The Council undertook such a review in September 2019 and found that the adopted Local Plan Core Strategy is in need of a partial review in terms of Policy CS02, due to the increased need for housing since the Local Plan Core Strategy was adopted and the need to ensure that a sufficient land supply exists to meet this need. Whilst saved policies from the Local Plan 1st Review (1994) generally conform with the NPPF (2021), the Council will also seek to replace these.

Other material considerations

Section 16 (2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires special regard to be had to the desirability of preserving the listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses when considering whether to grant listed building consent.

National Planning Policy Framework (2021)

- 2 – Achieving Sustainable Development
- 12 – Achieving sustainable development and well-designed places
- 16 – Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

Supplementary Planning Guidance

- Gravesham Listed Buildings: A guide for owners and occupiers (April 2020)

Consultations, Publicity and Representations

Consultees

GBC Conservation Officer – 10/05/2023 (Latest comment first)

The pointing finish now appears to be acceptable in the latest photographs. It is noted however that the raking out needs to be at least twice the depth of the joint thickness; i.e. a 10mm bed joint would require raking out 20mm to ensure a good key.

GBC Conservation Officer – 21/02/2023

The photos appear to indicate a bucket handle joint rather than a flat iron but more importantly the mortar appears to have been applied too wet and is smearing on the face of the bricks. This can be avoided by mixing the mortar semi dry or biscuit dry, meaning the mortar should only have enough water in it to mix but should be crumbly and hold together when a handful is gripped in the hand. The raked out brick joint should be spray wetted before applying the mortar, then left to semi-set and excess mortar brushed off and tamped in with the churn brush.

<https://youtu.be/JWIOHA1Jsz4>

Mixing – long video but explains the right consistency of water to the mix

<https://youtu.be/FkBF7C18PwQ>

GBC Conservation Officer – 24/01/2023

The mix looks acceptable. The mortar needs to be slightly more recessed which will help give an improved appearance with less mortar to brick showing.

GBC Conservation Officer – 29/11/2022

NHL 3.5 is now proposed as the mortar for repointing the areas indicated on the drawings and it is also acceptable to avoid repointing the string course and rubbed brick window arches as this would need to be carried out by a specialist.

It would be advisable to still see a sample area of the repointing and this could be submitted in photographs to speed up the process of approval.

GBC Conservation Officer – 31/10/2022

Acceptable – depth preparation of the joint needs confirming, depth of raking out is normally specified as twice the height of the joint, e.g. 10mm joint height requires 20mm depth of the joint.

The building has been poorly pointed in the past with the incorrect joint finish and cement based material. The area being repointed is large enough to revert to the correct finish as advised above. Refer to the Historic England guidance attached previously and advise what is proposed.

It is not for the local planning authority to specify works. The applicant and agent must appoint a suitable competent contractor. For example one that is experienced in conservation work e.g. [Apollo](#) (not a recommendation but known to carry out such work.)

The mortar mix should adopt Natural Hydraulic Lime as advised above, and not be cement based. The sand and aggregate should be specified – colour and grade and supplier as previously stated there are now many suppliers of pre mixed - another [Here](#). It is for the agent to specify not the LPA.

GBC Conservation Officer – 02/09/2022

The mortar pointing carried out, as shown in the photographs, is a struck joint which is inappropriate and will need to be removed. It doesn't appear that much of the joint has been raked out so it should be possible to remove it. It also appears to be cement based as it is darker than a lime mortar would be.

There is still no specification for the mix nor how it should be applied and finished. The agent will need to read up on the subject and not rely on the contractor and I would advise that reference is taken from the Historic England guidance attached and the following useful guidance from a manufacturer and supplier of Naturally Hydraulic Lime - [here](#) . There are also many manufacturers of pre mixed NHL lime mortars and a web search will offer some [here](#) with local ones being available.

The gauged red brick flat window arches should not be pointed, they are very fine joints and will be damaged if re pointing is attempted by an unskilled craftsman. The projecting red brick string course above the window arches was originally gauged brick with fine lime putty joints, it has bad damage to brick arrises and will need carefully pointing in a red brick dust based mortar to restore the brick arris and then a thin lime putty joint to reinstate the appearance of the rubbed brick, matching the fine joints of the window arches. Based on the work carried out so far I am not convinced that the contractor has the skill, experience or knowledge to successfully complete this work.

If the agent is confident that the current contractor has the skills, then once an acceptable mortar mix and specification has been approved, a sample panel should be produced for the removal of the existing unacceptable re pointing with a sample of the [yet to be] approved mortar.

At present the proposals cannot be supported for the above reasons.

GBC Conservation Officer – 22/08/2022

I understand this application is as a result of planning enforcement action and work has already commenced.

Can the applicant's agent show in the drawings the work that has already commenced and how much of the wall has been repointed?

Can photographs be submitted with the supporting statement showing the work carried out to date and details of the repointing finish?

There is insufficient detail specification for the repointing mortar mix or finish, which needs to be submitted as part of this application in order to assess the impact of the proposals.

Publicity

Site and press notice – overall consultation expiry date was 12.08.2022 – one response received (objection) the comments of which can be summarised as follows:

Non-material planning considerations

- The re-pointing caused dust and noise during warmer months when windows and doors are open;
- Scaffolding has been in place for months which causes a nuisance – their access for deliveries is blocked, cannot dispose of their bulky item from garden and the polythene cover covering the scaffolding is now ripped and billows when windy making a disruptive noise during the night.

Officer's Analysis

The application site consists of two storey building situated on the northern side of Joy Road; it is grade II listed. The proposal is for repointing of the south (front) and west (flank) elevations which it was stated was to be in a damaged condition. Re-pointing had started to take place on the building without the benefit of listed building consent. Planning Enforcement were made aware and subsequently an application has been made for the re-pointing.

The principle consideration in the assessment of the application is whether the proposal would protect the architectural and historic interest of this grade II listed building.

Whether the proposal would protect the architectural and historic interest of this grade II listed building

The application building is grade II listed. The application as originally submitted was for retention of the re-pointing which had already been carried out. The Conservation Officer assessed this re-pointing and advised that it was unacceptable as it was a struck joint which was inappropriate and would need to be removed. The Conservation Officer advised that the contractor and agent would need to research historic mortar pointing and provided advice from Historic England. He then advised that the agent should consider a contractor sufficiently skilled to carry out the historic mortar repointing on this listed building. Then details of a mortar mix and specification would be needed, and a sample panel would then be required. There was much to-ing and fro-ing before a mix that was considered acceptable was submitted – Limelite NHL3.5 with sharp sand on a ratio of 3:1. There was then several sample panels created before the pointing finish was deemed acceptable. Overall the sample panel as shown in the latest revised drawings is now considered acceptable in respect of the mortar mix and pointing finish. The agent has advised that 10 days would be sufficient to complete the works. Therefore, subject to a condition to remove the existing unauthorised re-pointing and for the new re-pointing to take place in accordance with the sample panel as shown in the submitted drawing within 1 month of the approval, the proposed re-pointing would rectify the harm that has been caused to the listed building and protect the architectural and historic interest of this grade II listed building going forward. In respect of listed building matters the proposal is therefore considered compliant with Policies CS19 and CS20 (LPCS) and saved Policy TC2 (LPFR).

Any Other Material Planning Considerations

None.

Conclusion & Recommendation

The proposal subject to conditions would rectify the harm that has been caused to this listed building through unauthorised works and would protect its architectural and historic interest for the future.

Recommendation: Permission

(For detailed conditions and informatives, see draft Decision)

Case Officer:	Ms Rebecca Harrison	Team Leader:	Miss Faye Hobbs
Signed:	<i>Rebecca Harrison</i>	Signed:	
Dated:	17th May 2023	Dated:	18 May 2023