



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 March 2026

by A James BSc (Hons) MA MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 April 2026

Appeal Ref: 6003306

30 Queen Street, Gravesend, Kent DA12 2EE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Pirakas Rajaratanam against the decision of Gravesend Borough Council.
 - The application reference is 20250928.
 - The development is described as 'new shop front installation and replaced the existing shutter'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the retention of the new shopfront and shutter at 30 Queen Street, Gravesend, Kent DA12 2EE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20250928 and the following condition:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be retained in accordance with drawing nos: 30-DA12 2EE-000002/A 01 and 7-DA12 2EQ-000001/A 02.

Preliminary Matters

2. As the appeal site lies within a conservation area and forms part of the setting of a listed building, I have had special regard to sections 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the appeal scheme preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Queen Street Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal relates to a mid-terrace property, which has a retail unit on the ground floor. The area comprises of a mix of uses including retail, commercial and residential. The appeal site lies within the Queen Street Conservation Area (CA). Queen Street is a historic route that links to the historic core of the town and predominantly features two and three storey buildings of differing styles and periods. The buildings are generally sited at the back edge of the pavement and contain retail/commercial units on the ground floor. The shopfronts along the street are predominantly modern in their character and materiality. The historic character of the buildings along this street is more evident above ground floor level.
5. The significance of the CA insofar as is relevant to this appeal is derived from the narrowness of the street, the bustling retail/commercial units on the ground floor

which denotes the area's evolution as a historic market place and the presence of traditional materials and joinery details at first floor and above.

6. Policy TC9 of the Gravesham Local Plan 1994 (the Local Plan) seeks to resist development that would result in the loss of existing shopfronts of traditional design and materials or the installation of shutters on the exterior of shopfronts. In this case, the appeal scheme has not resulted in the loss of a shopfront of traditional design and materials. The previous shopfront featured modern materials, extensive glazing and an external shutter. The door to the previous shopfront appeared to be set back only very marginally from the front elevation and made no reference to a historic shopfront arrangement.
7. The shopfront that is the subject of this appeal has a small stall riser and a timber fascia. It is extensively glazed with a central front door, which is flush with the rest of the shopfront. I appreciate that the shopfront is modern in its appearance and is not characteristic of a building of this age. However, the shopfront has replaced a modern shopfront, which was also extensively glazed and utilised modern materials. While the door and windows in the previous shopfront were individually framed, there is no compelling evidence before me that the previous frames utilised a traditional material.
8. The Council raises concerns in respect to the lighting levels from the signage and the extent of glazing. However, there is no advertisement consent appeal before me and the level of glazing is not dissimilar to the previous shopfront. Consequently, I do not find that the appeal scheme results in unacceptable levels of lighting or light spill. The colour of the shopfront and frame is also more subdued than the previous shopfront. Consequently, based on the evidence before me, I do not find that the appeal scheme is any more dominant in the street scene than the shopfront and shutter that has been replaced.
9. Overall, I find that the appeal scheme has a neutral effect on the character and appearance of the CA as a whole. Accordingly, I find that the proposal would preserve the significance of the CA and would comply with Policy TC9 of the Local Plan and Policies CS19 and CS20 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy, September 2014. These policies among other things seek to resist the loss of historic shopfronts and ensure that development conserves the historic environment. I appreciate that Policy TC3 of the Local Plan requires that development makes a positive contribution to the CA. However, in this case, I find that the development preserves the character and appearance of the CA. Consequently, it satisfies the requirements of the Act and the historic environment policies within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

10. '26 and 28, Queen Street' is a Grade II listed building, which dates back to 1831. It is three storeys high, with parapet and has a stuccoed finish. The building features traditional sash windows and has decorative, shell mouldings above the first floor windows. The building has a modern shopfront on the ground floor. Based on the evidence before me and my site visit, I find that the special interest of the listed building insofar as is relevant to this appeal is derived from its historic and architectural interest as an illustration of architecture from the 19th century. The building's surviving historic fabric, presence of traditional joinery at first and second

floor levels and its pleasing architectural design and appearance make important contributions in these regards.

11. I have a statutory duty under section 66(1) of the Act to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the setting of the listed building when making my decision. In this case, given that the appeal scheme replaces a modern shopfront, I find that it would preserve the special interest of the listed building.
12. I acknowledge that an objection has been received from a private representative, who raises similar concerns to that of the Council in respect to the effect of the appeal scheme on the character and appearance of the CA. However, this does not alter my findings, set out above.

Conditions

13. As the development has already been carried out, the standard time frame condition is not required. In the interests of certainty, a condition confirming the approved plans is necessary.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, having regard to the development plan as a whole and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

A James

INSPECTOR