

PLANNING & HERITAGE STATEMENT

Revised rear/side extension - response to refusal 20260251

Site	47 The Avenue, Gravesend, Kent DA11 0LX
Previous application	20260251
Applicant	Mr Dhiman
Date	August 2026

Purpose: To support the revised householder application and provide a single integrated planning and heritage assessment demonstrating how the scheme addresses the previous reason for refusal.

Prepared by Dream Design Develop Ltd



Dream Design Develop Ltd

01474 648009

info@dreamdesigndevelop.co.uk

www.dreamdesigndevelop.co.uk

© 2026 Dream Design Develop Ltd. This document is protected by copyright.

No part of this document may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, transmitted in any form or by any means (electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise), or used for any purpose without the prior written permission of Dream Design Develop Ltd.

Executive Summary

This combined Planning and Heritage Statement supports a revised householder proposal at 47 The Avenue following refusal of application 20260251. The former application was refused because the combination of the extension's scale, flat-roof form and visibility from the prominent corner with Lennox Road East was considered harmful to the host dwelling, street scene and the Pelham Road/The Avenue Conservation Area.

The revised scheme has been specifically redesigned in response. The projection is reduced from 5.00 m to 4.50 m; the former flat roof and roof lantern are removed; a pitched lean-to roof is introduced; the kitchen/diner shown on the plans reduces from 55 sq m to 50 sq m; and the elevations now depict a rendered treatment that relates more closely to the existing rendered dwelling. No changes are proposed to the front elevation.

The revised heritage case also corrects the principal weakness in the previous Heritage Statement. It no longer relies on the works having limited public visibility. Instead, it expressly accepts that the rear/side extension is visible from Lennox Road East because of the corner position and demonstrates why the revised form is appropriate when seen from the public realm.

The delegated report did not identify unacceptable effects on neighbouring amenity, future occupier amenity, parking/highways or archaeology. The revised scheme is smaller and does not introduce changes that would undermine those findings.

Overall case: the redesign directly addresses the three matters relied upon in the refusal - scale, roof form and public visibility - and results in a materially more subordinate, context-responsive extension that preserves the character and appearance of the conservation area.

1. Introduction

1.1 This statement has been prepared in support of a revised householder planning application for the demolition of the existing rear projection and erection of a single-storey rear/side extension at 47 The Avenue, Gravesend, Kent DA11 0LX.

1.2 The statement combines the planning and heritage assessment into one document. It should be read alongside the revised location/block plan, floor plans and elevations and focuses particularly on the design evolution following refusal of application 20260251.

1.3 The current application description should be kept fully consistent with the revised plans. In particular, the revised proposal no longer includes the roof lantern shown in the refused scheme.

2. Site, Surroundings and Heritage Context

2.1 No. 47 The Avenue is a two-storey detached dwelling occupying a prominent corner plot on the south-eastern side of the junction of The Avenue and Lennox Road East.

2.2 The property lies within the Pelham Road and The Avenue Conservation Area and is subject to the relevant Article 4 Direction. The surrounding historic townscape is characterised by established late-Victorian and Edwardian residential development, generally comprising pitched tiled roofs, traditional proportions and detailing, coherent building lines, individual garden plots and mature landscaping.

2.3 The dwelling is not identified in the submitted material as a statutorily listed building. It nevertheless contributes positively to the conservation area through its detached scale, traditional form, prominent pitched roofscape, principal street-facing elevation and relationship with the corner.

2.4 The front elevation and main roof are the most sensitive parts of the building in heritage and townscape terms. The existing rear projection is a later element of more limited architectural significance. However, because of the corner orientation, the rear and side of the property are visible from Lennox Road East and must be assessed as part of the public townscape.

3. Significance of the Conservation Area

3.1 Historic significance

The area illustrates the suburban expansion of Gravesend during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Its historic interest is expressed through the surviving street pattern, domestic plot structure and concentration of period housing.

3.2 Architectural significance

Architectural significance derives from the collective quality and consistency of traditional residential buildings, including pitched roof forms, established proportions, period detailing and a restrained palette of materials.

3.3 Townscape significance

The conservation area also derives significance from consistent building lines, front gardens, mature planting and repeated roof forms, which together create a coherent and legible residential character.

3.4 Contribution of the application property

No. 47 contributes through its scale, detached form, principal elevation, roofscape and corner presence. The property is therefore a positive component of the wider conservation-area townscape. The rear projection itself is of lower significance, but replacement development must still respond sensitively to public views along Lennox Road East.

4. Relevant Planning History and Previous Decision

4.1 Application 20260251 sought demolition of the existing rear projection and erection of a rear/side extension with a roof lantern. The delegated report recorded the former extension as up to 5.00 m deep, extending broadly across the rear of the dwelling, with a flat roof at 2.80 m and an overall height of 3.37 m including the roof lantern.

4.2 The officer concluded that the former scheme's scale, flat roof form and visibility, particularly from Lennox Road East, would result in poor design and harm the character and appearance of the dwelling, street scene and Pelham Road/The Avenue Conservation Area.

4.3 The report specifically noted that, notwithstanding the rear position of the works, the prominent corner location made the development highly visible from the public realm. The former Heritage Statement therefore understated an important aspect of the site context.

4.4 Importantly, the delegated report separately found that the proposal would provide acceptable internal accommodation and retained garden space, would safeguard neighbouring amenity, would not raise parking or highway concerns, and was unlikely to have an archaeological impact. Groundwater, historic landfill and gas-pipeline matters were not treated as reasons for refusal and could be addressed, where necessary, through conditions or informatives.

5. Revised Proposal and Design Evolution

5.1 The revised scheme is a substantive redesign rather than a re-presentation of the refused proposal. It reduces the extension's depth and mass and changes the roof form and external expression so that the development responds more closely to the architecture of the host dwelling.

Matter	Refused scheme	Revised scheme	Planning / heritage response
Overall depth	5.00 m	4.50 m	Reduced by 0.50 m (10%), decreasing projection and visual mass.
Roof form	Flat roof	Pitched lean-to roof	Direct response to the officer's concern that the former roof did not reflect the pitched-roof host.

Roof lantern	Included; overall height stated as 3.37 m including lantern	Removed	Simplifies and lowers the visible roof composition.
Kitchen/diner shown on plan	55 sq m	50 sq m	Corroborates the reduction in the scale of the enlarged rear accommodation.
External appearance	Former submission referred to brickwork; officer noted the host is rendered	Revised elevations depict a rendered treatment and pitched roof covering	Relates the extension more closely to the material character of the existing dwelling.
Front elevation	No works	No works	The principal elevation and its conservation-area contribution remain unchanged.
Flank fenestration to extension	No flank windows	No new flank windows	Maintains the previous positive conclusion on privacy and neighbouring amenity.

6. Planning Policy and Legislative Framework

6.1 The delegated report identified the principal relevant policy framework as the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (2014), including Policies CS19 (Development and Design Principles) and CS20 (Heritage and the Historic Environment), saved Policy TC3 of the Gravesham Local Plan First Review (1994), the Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide, Design for Gravesham - Design Code, the Pelham Road and The Avenue Conservation Area Appraisal and the statutory duty under section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

6.2 Section 72(1) requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas. The National Planning Policy Framework also requires the significance of heritage assets to be understood and gives great weight to their conservation, while supporting well-designed development that responds to local character and design guidance.

6.3 The Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide is of particular relevance because the previous officer relied upon its expectations concerning depth, subordination and roof design, especially where an extension is visible in the street scene or occupies an open corner position.

7. Integrated Planning and Heritage Assessment

7.1 Principle of development

The proposal remains a householder extension to an established dwelling. No objection was raised to the principle of extending the property. The key issue is whether the revised scale, form, appearance and relationship with the conservation area are acceptable.

7.2 Scale, depth and subordination

The former 5.00 m projection was expressly relied upon as part of the finding of excessive scale. The revised 4.50 m depth represents a 0.50 m or 10% reduction. The kitchen/diner shown on the plan also reduces from 55 sq m to 50 sq m. The reduction in plan depth is reinforced by the removal of the roof lantern and the adoption of a sloping roof plane.

The extension remains single storey against a two-storey host and the lean-to roof slopes down towards the garden. The resulting mass is therefore clearly secondary to the main dwelling and allows the original building to retain visual primacy.

7.3 Roof form and architectural relationship

The replacement of the flat roof and roof lantern with a pitched lean-to roof is the clearest response to the previous refusal. The former roof was criticised because it introduced a form not reflected within the pitched-roof host. The revised roof uses

a recognisably subordinate pitched form that relates to the established roof language without competing with the principal roof.

The roof lantern has been removed entirely, avoiding the additional rooftop element previously visible above the flat roof and simplifying the extension's silhouette.

7.4 Public visibility and street scene

The revised assessment accepts that the extension will be visible from Lennox Road East. The planning and heritage case therefore does not depend upon screening or on an assertion that the rear is private or unseen.

Visibility is not inherently harmful. The relevant question is whether the visible element is well designed. In oblique public views, the revised proposal presents a lower-order sloping roof, reduced projection and simplified silhouette. It will read as a secondary domestic addition to the larger two-storey dwelling rather than as the broad flat-roofed, lantern-topped form previously criticised.

7.5 Materials and detailing

The delegated report noted an inconsistency between the former application form's reference to brickwork and the rendered appearance of the host dwelling. The revised elevations depict a rendered treatment rather than the former brick hatch, together with a pitched roof covering that visually relates to the host.

For certainty, the applicant would accept a condition requiring the external render to match the existing dwelling in colour and texture, the roof covering to match or closely correspond with the existing tiles in colour and profile, and the new windows, doors and rainwater goods to be sympathetic to the host.

7.6 Effect on heritage significance

The front elevation and principal roofscape - the elements making the strongest contribution to the property's presence on The Avenue - remain unchanged. The works are confined to a lower-significance rear/side part of the building and include removal of an existing rear projection previously described as a later addition of limited architectural significance.

Although the replacement extension is visible from Lennox Road East, it has been specifically redesigned to be visually subordinate. The reduced depth, lean-to roof, absence of a lantern and matching external treatment allow the original two-storey dwelling and its main roof to remain the dominant features in the townscape.

The proposal is therefore considered to preserve the architectural and townscape qualities that give the Pelham Road and The Avenue Conservation Area its significance, satisfying the section 72 duty and the relevant local heritage policies.

7.7 Neighbouring amenity

The previous officer found no detrimental effect on neighbouring amenity and specifically noted the single-storey nature of the extension and absence of flank fenestration. The revised scheme is smaller in depth and does not introduce new flank windows to the extension. There is therefore no basis for a less favourable conclusion in respect of light, outlook, privacy or enclosure.

7.8 Future occupier amenity and garden

The delegated report found the internal accommodation and retained garden provision acceptable. The revised 4.50 m projection leaves more garden depth than the refused 5.00 m scheme while continuing to provide functional family accommodation. The previous positive conclusion is therefore maintained.

7.9 Parking, highways and other considerations

No parking or highway concerns arose previously and the revised extension creates no new transport impact. Archaeological impact was considered unlikely. Groundwater protection, historic landfill and proximity to gas infrastructure did not amount to reasons for refusal and remain capable of being dealt with in the same manner through any necessary condition or informative.

8. Detailed Response to the Previous Refusal

Issue	Previous finding	Revised response	Effect
Scale / bulk	Former 5.00 m-deep extension considered large and harmful in overall scale.	Depth reduced to 4.50 m; lantern removed; kitchen/diner shown reduces from 55 sq m to 50 sq m.	Material reduction in projection and visible mass; stronger subordination to the host.
Flat roof / host roof	Flat roof was considered a new feature not reflected in the pitched-roof dwelling.	Flat roof replaced by a pitched lean-to roof; roof lantern omitted.	Direct response to the officer's principal roof-form criticism.
Visibility from Lennox Road East	Former scheme found highly visible because of the corner position.	Visibility expressly accepted; visible form redesigned with reduced depth, pitched roof, no lantern and matching appearance.	The case now demonstrates acceptable design when seen from the public realm rather than relying on concealment.
Street scene / conservation area	Scale, roof form and visibility found harmful to the dwelling, street scene and conservation area.	Front elevation unchanged; main roof retained; extension redesigned as a subordinate lean-to with sympathetic external treatment.	Original dwelling remains visually dominant and conservation-area character is preserved.
Materials	Former application referred to brickwork although the house is rendered.	Revised elevations depict render; matching/sympathetic materials can be conditioned.	Removes the previous ambiguity and provides control over the final conservation-area finish.
Neighbour amenity	No harmful effect found.	Scheme is smaller and retains the single-storey/no-new-flank-window approach.	Previous positive finding remains applicable.
Future occupier amenity / garden	Internal space and garden provision found acceptable.	Reduced projection retains more garden than the refused scheme.	Acceptable position maintained and modestly improved in garden terms.
Parking / highways	No concerns identified.	No material transport change.	No reason to depart from the previous positive finding.
Other constraints	Archaeology unlikely to be affected; landfill/gas matters capable of condition or informative.	No material change to those considerations.	Matters remain non-obstructive to a grant of permission.

9. Planning and Heritage Balance

9.1 The previous refusal was founded on a focused design and heritage concern rather than a broad objection to the principle of extending the dwelling. The revised proposal has been shaped directly around the officer's analysis.

9.2 Each component of the previous reason for refusal has been addressed: the projection has been reduced, the flat roof has been replaced, the lantern has been removed, the publicly visible form has been simplified and the material treatment has been aligned with the rendered host.

9.3 The principal elevation and main roof remain unaltered, ensuring that the elements of the building that make the strongest contribution to The Avenue continue to define the site. In views from Lennox Road East, the extension will be legible as a secondary addition rather than a competing built form.

9.4 The revised scheme also retains the favourable conclusions previously reached on neighbour amenity, future occupier amenity, garden provision, highways and other site constraints.

9.5 Taken as a whole, the proposal is considered to accord with Policies CS19 and CS20 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy, saved Policy TC3, the relevant Gravesham design guidance, section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and the design and heritage objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

10. Conclusion

10.1 The revised application represents a material and targeted response to the refusal of application 20260251. It does not seek to defend the former flat-roofed design; it replaces it with a more sympathetic and subordinate extension.

10.2 The depth is reduced from 5.00 m to 4.50 m, the roof lantern is removed, a pitched lean-to roof is introduced, the external treatment is aligned with the host dwelling and the principal front elevation remains unchanged.

10.3 The public visibility of the corner site is expressly recognised. The revised proposal is designed to be acceptable in those views and to preserve the visual primacy of the original dwelling and the established character of the Pelham Road and The Avenue Conservation Area.

10.4 It is therefore respectfully submitted that the specific design and heritage shortcomings identified in the previous decision have been overcome and that planning permission should now be granted.