



Delegated Report

Planning Application

Planning Application No: 20230178 – Listed Building Consent
20230190 – Planning Application

Location: Kent Barn East Of Gore Green Road Gore Green Road Higham Rochester

Description: 20230178 - Application for Listed Building Consent for the proposed conversion of and alterations to listed timber frame barn into a 4 bedroom dwelling; new boundary treatments, landscaping and other ancillary works including provision of parking spaces.

20230190 - Application for variation of condition 2 attached to planning permission reference no. 20180380 to replace the approved Kent Barn Plans with revised drawings incorporating alterations to improve design and functionality.

Applicant: Mr Mark Caldecourt

Site Visit Date: Desktop Assessment

Submitted Documents/Plans

Planning Application Forms (Planning and Listed Building);
Design & Access Statement Rev B – March 2023;
Heritage Statement – November 2022;
Archaeological Watching Brief Final Report – March 2022;
Drawing No. 29767A_001 – Site Location Plan;
Drawing No. 29767A_002 – Existing Block Plan;
Drawing No. 29767A_003 – Proposed Block Plan;
Drawing No. 29767A_400 Rev A – Proposed Kent Barn Ground Floor Plan;
Drawing No. 29767A_401 Rev A– Proposed Kent Barn First Floor Plan;
Drawing No. 29767A_402 Rev B – Proposed Kent Barn Roof Plan;
Drawing No. 29767A_403 Rev B – Proposed North East & North West Elevations;
Drawing No. 29767A_404 Rev B – Proposed South West & South East Elevations;
Drawing No. 29767A_405 Rev A – Proposed Section AA, BB & CC;
Drawing No. 1 – Topographical Survey;
Drawing No. 2 – Main Barn Floor Plan;
Drawing No. 5 – Elevations #1;
Drawing No. 6 – Elevations #2;
Drawing No. 8 – Sections 1&2;
Drawing No. 9 – Sections 3&4;
Drawing No. 10 – Sections 5&6;
Drawing No. 11 – Sections 7 TO 10;
Drawing No. 12 – Sections 11 TO 14; and
Drawing No. 13 – Sections 15&16.

Relevant Planning History

Reference	Description	Decision	Decision
-----------	-------------	----------	----------

			Date
20210366	Application for approval of conditions 4,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,17,21 attached to listed building consent reference number 20180381 relating to (4) contaminated land assessment, (6) timber repair details of the listed barn which includes Schedule of Repair and Method Statement, (7) details on the new insulation and its relationship with the existing timber frame, (8) external joinery, (9) external facing materials, (10) surface treatments, (11) details of any flues, vents or cover holes, (12) rainwater goods, (13) full details of any aerials or dishes, (14) boundary treatments, (15) soft landscaping, (17) external lighting and (21) Ecological Mitigation.	Approval of Details	03.02.2022
20210339	Application for approval of conditions 4,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,17 and 21 attached to planning permission reference number 20180380 relating to (4) contaminated land assessment, (6) timber repair details of the listed barn which includes Schedule of Repair and Method Statement, (7) details on the new insulation and its relationship with the existing timber frame, (8) external joinery, (9) external facing materials, (10) surface treatments, (11) details of any flues, vents or cover holes, (12) rainwater goods, (13) full details of any aerials or dishes, (14) boundary treatments, (15) soft landscaping, (17) external lighting and (21) Ecological Mitigation.	Approval of Details	03.02.2022
20180381	**AMENDED APPLICATION/REVISED DESCRIPTION** Application for Listed Building Consent for the proposed conversion of and alterations to listed timber frame barn into a 4 bedroom dwelling; conversion/rebuilding of stables into a 3 bedroom dwelling, with carports and store and including linked addition at the rear for kitchen/diner and living room; demolition and removal of outbuildings, structures and paraphernalia and replacement of cart shed with outbuilding for use as carports and bin store; new boundary treatments, landscaping and other ancillary works including provision of parking spaces; and provision of new access arrangements to Black Cottage.	Permission	18.01.2019
20180380	**AMENDED APPLICATION/REVISED DESCRIPTION** Proposed conversion of and alterations to listed timber frame barn into a 4 bedroom dwelling; conversion/rebuilding of stables into a 3 bedroom dwelling, with carports and store and including linked addition at the rear for kitchen/diner and living room; demolition and removal of outbuildings, structures and paraphernalia and replacement of cart shed with outbuilding for use as carports and bin store; new boundary treatments, landscaping and other ancillary works including provision of parking spaces; and provision of new access arrangements to Black Cottage.	Permission	18.01.2019

Development Plan

Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (September 2014):

- CS01 – Sustainable Development
- CS02 – Scale & Distribution of Development
- CS11 – Transport
- CS12 – Green Infrastructure
- CS18 – Climate Change
- CS19 – Development & Design Principles
- CS20 – Heritage and the Built Environment

Gravesham Local Plan: First Review (1994)

- TC2 – Listed Buildings
- C13 – Policy for Extensions to Dwellings in the Countryside
- T1 – Impact of Development on Highway Network
- P3 – Vehicle Parking Standards

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.

National Planning Policy Framework (2021)

- 2 – Achieving Sustainable Development
- 4 – Decision Making
- 12 – Achieving sustainable development and well-designed places
- 13 – Protecting Green Belt Land
- 15 – Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment
- 16 – Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment

Supplementary Planning Guidance

- 2 - Residential layout guidelines including Housing Standards Policy Statement October 2015 Adopted 1996 – amended June 2020;
- Technical Housing Standards – nationally described space standard (2015);
- SPG 4 - KCC Parking Standards (2006);
- SPG 5 – Kent Design Guide (2006);
- Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide (2021); and
- Gravesham Landscape Character Assessment (2009).

Consultations, Publicity and Representations

Consultees

Dickens Protection Society

The Society would wish to request that no additional changes are allowed to compromise the building's listed status.

KCC – Biodiversity

No ecological information has been submitted with this application. As a result of reviewing the data we have available to us, and the information submitted with the planning application, we advise that further information is sought from the applicant with regards to the potential for ecological impacts to arise/having already arisen.

There is concern that roosting bats were identified within the building on-site in 2018. Further surveys were required to be undertaken for roosting bats as part of condition 2 of the previous planning permission (application 20180380) and no evidence of such surveys or a licence from Natural England to commence construction works at the site has been provided as part of the submission. Without further supporting information being submitted there is a risk that the planning condition and legislation relating to roosting bats have been breached. Roosting bats are protected under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) and the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).

Habitats and features (including previous records of roosting bats) are present on and around the site, indicating ecological value and the potential for protected species presence that must be taken account of in the planning decision. As such, an Ecological Impact Assessment (EcIA) should be undertaken by a suitably qualified ecologist¹, in accordance with good practice guidelines. The previous assessments undertaken at the site in 2018 are out-of-date².

The EcIA will include the following:

- Details of the impacts of development proposals on the ecological baseline established via a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) and any additional surveys undertaken;
- Details of any necessary and achievable ecological mitigation and/or compensation measures;
- Details of ecological enhancement measures, and;
- Provision of sufficient information to determine whether the project accords with relevant nature conservation policies and legislation.

To ensure that the planning determination is adequately informed in respect of all potential ecological impacts, we advise that the EcIA is sought prior to determination of the planning application. This is in alignment with paragraph 99 of ODPM 06/2005 which states “it is essential that the presence or otherwise of protected species and the extent that they may be affected by the proposed development, is established before the planning permission is granted, otherwise all relevant material considerations may not have been addressed in making the decision”.

The EcIA will also ensure alignment with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2021 and the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (NERC) Act 2006. Under section 40 of the NERC Act (2006) and paragraphs 174 and 180 of the NPPF (2021) biodiversity should be maintained and enhanced through the planning system. As such, we advise that information is submitted with the EcIA to demonstrate that the development can achieve a biodiversity net gain.

Clarification was made with KCC relating to the condition details on the previous approval which were approved under references 20210339 and 20210366 on 03.02.2022. KCC Biodiversity therefore raise no objections.

KCC – Heritage Conservation

Previous comments apply. Below-ground Watching Brief would be required.

Natural England

No comments received.

Historic England

No comments received.

Higham Parish Council

No comments received.

GBC – Environmental Protection

20230178 - No objection to this application. It's noted that any contamination on the site has been remediated to our satisfaction and the condition discharged under an earlier application – 20210339. Nothing further is needed regarding on this in relation to this application.

20230190 - No objection to this variation application. It's noted that any contamination on the site has been remediated to our satisfaction and the condition discharged under an earlier application – 20210339. Nothing further is needed regarding on this in relation to the variation.

GBC – Highways Officer

20230178 - Generally I do not comment on listed building consent applications as usually there is a second application for details if appropriate that relate to highway issues, which in this case could be 20230190.

Reference is made to car and cycle parking, but the suggested provision is not included within the red line drawing, even as a blue line, although the Design and Access Statement shows the Cart Barn being converted to a car port for cars and bin storage, but cycle storage is not mentioned. With four bedrooms four secure cycle parking spaces are required to comply with SPG4

Access onto the highway is as existing and there are no objections to this.

20230190 - As this a variation to Condition 2 of application 20180380, it has no highway applications. No Objections.

GBC – Conservation Officer

Original Comments - 31 July 2018

Layout of the Farmstead

The Kent Historic Environment Record (2012 Kent Farmsteads & Landscape Project) notes Gore Green Farm as a post medieval (c1540) farmstead following a loose courtyard layout pattern with working agricultural buildings on three sides and detached elements to the main plan. The farmhouse is noted as being detached with its gable end-on to the yard. The plan form appears to have no alteration when compared with the first series OS maps and the record also notes a possible moat to the NE. The listing also refers to a possible 16th century origin of the barn and dendrochronology should be undertaken to confirm this date.

The following map regression shows little alteration to the courtyard layout and is useful in confirming the evolution of buildings around the courtyard. The first series OS map of 1871-1890 indicates that the barn was detached but by the 1897-1900 map the northern side of the courtyard was extended to abut the main barn. In the second map (1897-1900) there appear to be open sided structures onto the northern fields, which are constructed against the northern side of the main barn and extend along the north side of the courtyard. Looking closely at the 1897 maps onwards, the single structure to the north of the courtyard but running parallel with it, does not appear to be attached to the other courtyard buildings, there being a small passageway between it and the courtyard buildings.

In the first series map of 1871-1890, one can see to the south of the farmhouse there is a trackway that offers an alternative access to the farmhouse. This trackway runs around the back of the main barn, to the east and on to the dykes to the north. By the 1907 map the trackway has disappeared and the only access to the farmhouse is via the courtyard.

From a historical point of view the re-instatement of the trackway to the farmhouse, with a garage to its rear, would be an acceptable alternative to the proposed formation of the driveway to the west of the courtyard.

The reinstatement of the structure to the North West of the main barn, as seen in the 1871 and subsequent maps is justifiable on historic grounds. Although it should read as an unattached structure to the main courtyard this could be achieved architecturally with a glass link.

It would be preferable to base any new boundaries on those that existed historically in earlier maps, such as the 1897-1900 map. However from a planning point of view the restriction of residential boundaries to be drawn as close as possible to the buildings to be converted and this can be achieved with post and rail fencing, and/or native hedgerow.

OS Map 1871-1890



1897-1900



1907-1923



1929-1952



Present Day



Internal layout and Impact on External Elevations

The importance of minimising external window openings in the building conversion to residential use should drive the internal layout. Within the main barn for example borrowed light from the cart entrances should be utilised for lighting bedrooms and living space as much as possible, to allow non habitable rooms and bathrooms to exist without natural light. The present arrangement negates this possibility and results in roof lights that could be omitted. This needs further design consideration.

The southern side wall of the main barn is unusually intact and will need to be carefully repaired. There is a large amount of repair needed to the main structure of the barn and again careful and detailed drawings will need to be produced, bay and bay, which should indicate the repairs proposed with details of the method and extent of any replacement material. Ideally this should be produced at this stage by a historic timber frame specialist, in order to justify the conversion.

The northern side of the courtyard should replicate as far as possible the layout that is evident in the earlier 1897-1900 OS Map. We raised concerns about the two storey re-construction of the north side of the courtyard and this still needs to be justified. It would be preferable to look at the north side of the courtyard in terms of the original layout of the buildings indicated in the 1897-1900 OS map, which would have been single storey cart sheds and cattle shelters.

Externally

We have discussed surface treatment in recent emails with the architect. The use of a combination of Breedon self-binding gravels and resin bonded gravel should be considered as appropriate surface materials. Cart entrance/exit to the main barn should be defined as should the cart track through the barn. This can be achieved with contrasting natural surface materials and their colour/texture – i.e. York Stone paving and stable block paving.

The removal of the high leylandii at the front of the farmhouse is to be welcomed as is the reinstatement of original timber windows in the farmhouse and its general restoration would also contribute to the enhancement of the farmstead group. As mentioned above the re-instatement of the alternative trackway to the farmhouse would also be an acceptable alternative to that proposed, which has no historic precedent.

External lighting will also need careful consideration and should be indicated with details of fittings to be agreed.

*Note: Comments made in response to, and inserted into, applicants architects email of 21 August 2018.
GBC Conservation Architects comments are in italics*

1. Site plan

The domestic garden space has been reduced, leaving a large section of the eastern parts of the gardens as meadow space. The hedge rows have been bought into the new domestic gardens so that the open countryside is preserved.

We have read Allan Cox's thoughts about the historic entrance for the farm house. We feel that this would be detrimental to the listed building and the open country side as this option would bring the cars round the back of the listed Kent barn with parking needed outside of the courtyard.

The access to the farmhouse was previously separated from the barn courtyard and I can see no harm in re-instating this historic arrangement. That said I understand the cost and viability implications and therefore would accept a well screened, with native tree and hedge of approximately 2 metres in depth, access way as indicated.

Therefore we have amended the plan as discussed on site to show the new drive to the black cottages reduced and now entering through the site of the disused slurry pit. The remaining structure of this is now marked as removed. The surface of this drive is now shown as Breeden self-binding gravel. I note that Allan Cox would like the main courtyard to be formed from resin bonded gravel. The appearance of this will be too clean and perfect, it will not give the appearance of a farmstead and therefore in my opinion it will appear over domesticated. The drawing therefore till notes the surface as tar and chip which will be a give a much looser appearance than resin bonded gravel.

I do not accept that self-binding gravel would be inappropriate and have concerns about the specification of tar and chip as this can be poorly laid with too little chip in the tar. The images of the Elms Farm, Sarre courtyard are however acceptable and it will be necessary to apply a condition for the specification of the courtyard surfacing to be approved before it is carried out on site.

With regards to parking, we have provided 1 carport space for the Stable, with a further space in the courtyard. 2 carport spaces for the barn and collectively both new dwellings have 3 visitor bays. I am not sure that the highways office picked this up first time round?

2. The Kent Barn

We have added internal glazing to the bedrooms to allow us to removed 4no rooflights. The roof lights that remain are needed for light and ventilation to the bedrooms and bathrooms. I do not want to be in the situation where we have to add background ventilation into the rooms to achieve building regulations sign off. It is more harmfully to have to ventilate rooms with mechanical ventilation rather than through natural means. I don't believe the perceived harm outweighs the benefit to the user and building.

The reduction in roof lights is welcomed. Mechanical ventilation will be a building control requirement for bathrooms and I do not see why roof lights should be required for these rooms in the listed barn.

3. Carport

The carport has been increased in width so that it provides 2 spaces with minimum clear widths of 2700mm.

Other

4. Please see the attached letter from Savills regarding the existing stables at the yard. They have assessed the local demand and availability for livery in the local area, broadly the letter says there is a large amount of availability to rehome the 3 horses on site therefore there will be no need to build new stables elsewhere in the open country side. Please see letter.

5. Throughout the course of the application the applicant has continued to instruct ecological surveys. Please see the latest draft report attached. In brief no reptiles have been found.

6. Precedents for a 2 storey section of stable have been put together on the attached sheet, these give strong justification for a 2 storey elements to the stable. I also note Allan's comments above the map regressions and a separate building being shown north east of the existing and proposed stable run. The option of building on this area was ruled out in the pre application?

Please also see the heritage statement that shows the 1840's tithe map. The main barn appears to be in a L-shape. The Stable at the northern end appears to be much wider than its current width. With what I suspect was originally a 2 storey grain store which would have likely been used in later years as a hay loft. This evidence along with the attached examples from elsewhere in Kent show that farm buildings were constantly adapted to suit the needs of the farm. On balance I think the current layout and massing is correct for the site. However we could make the scheme work if we were allowed to extend the current proposed two storey section out to the end of the north elevation of the stable. This would then appear as a full 2 storey granary, we could then add the suggested single storey block to the rear of the stables as shown on the later OS maps. This would allow us to provide an additional 2 bedroom property, which is much need in the location. See the attached sketch. Is this something you would support?

The 1871-90 OS shows a clear courtyard boundary with the separate access to the farm house. There is a building to the north east of the barn that is outside the courtyard, it is not attached to the barn:

The 1897-1900 OS shows that there is now a lean too on the north side of the barn and that further buildings have been extended along the north side of the courtyard towards the barn:

The 1907-1923 OS shows more clearly that the lean too on the north end of the barn and closest to the barn is open sided to the north (dotted line) and that the courtyard side of the structure attached to the north west of the barn is narrow and enclosed. There is a narrow passage between the field building and the open sided structure that leans against the north end of the barn and the narrow courtyard building attached to the barn:

We need to discuss whether the conjectural two storey "Granary/Hayloft" is preferable to a single storey field structure to the north of the barn/courtyard, which is indicated on the OS maps and how this sits with greenbelt policy.

On balance I would rather stick with the current layout as I think it sits well within the mas of the overall farmstead and is fully justified as being farmstead vernacular in Kent.

7. Largely other requests made by consultees and Allan Cox should not prevent the grant of permission with conditions attached? As you saw the barn needs to be fully scaffolded to gain safe access for any in-depth analysis of the building. This would likely be during the preconstruction phase of the project.

GBC Conservation Architect - 7th November 2018

Note: Comments made following removal of two storey element to the stables

This alternative offers a more acceptable reference to the previously buildings on the site. I would recommend further work to the long elevations to more clearly interpret the use of these buildings by recessing the weather boarded elevation behind post and braced bays where the side of the building was

open. On the closed side of the elevation it would be preferable to introduce smaller windows punched into the elevation, all to be black stained along with the weatherboarding.

GBC Conservation Architect - 17th December 2018

We have had a good dialogue with the architect and the proposals are now generally acceptable.

Regarding the site layout and parking, I'm sure you will have noted the lack of garaging for the barn conversion and will be anticipating an application for one when the first owner moves in. Other than extending the car port allocated for the black cottage and losing the visitor car park spots I cannot see an appropriate solution. The residential curtilage is always a challenge for agricultural conversions and restricting the use of land in order to preserve the open rural character of a conversion is something we have discussed. You may consider it appropriate to require through condition a tighter boundary line for the domestic curtilage or to designate specific areas for such uses.

We've had some discussion on previous barn conversions about the need to define the cart entrance through appropriate external surface treatment, rather than a swathe of patio the materials should at least acknowledge the original cart entrance by adopting a contrasting surface e.g. Cobbles or brick pavers contrast with York stone paving. This could be conditioned.

The courtyard surface treatment was also discussed and the example submitted was from a barn conversion in Sarre. This did appear acceptable and also offered a means of demarcating parking bays by fitting bricks into the surface. It will be necessary to condition this through specification and drawing details.

External lighting will need careful consideration as will the fixing of lighting to buildings. The latter should be avoided or should be discreet. There is a fad for LED lighting which can become overbearing and certainly can impact on rural character and appearance. A condition could be applied requiring and restricting external lighting.

The floor layout for the barn conversion is fairly conventional. A reversed plan with kitchen, dining and lounge on the first floor would have allowed the roof to remain entirely exposed. This is always desirable with barn conversions and the only recent one I can recall in Gravesham was Hazels Barn. That said the gallery is also helpful in offering some openness to the roof.

The stables conversion with re-instated structure to the north east as now proposed is preferable to the two storey option that was originally submitted. This will allow the barn to dominate the courtyard and is more accurately based on the map regression, which establishes evidence for such a structure.

Generally external treatment of the conversion is acceptable, windows and roof lights are now acceptable and the proposed use of peg tiles will enhance the roof of the barn. The use of clay pantiles over the cart entrance is unusual for this part of Kent, seen more in the south and east. It does allow for the shallower roof pitch but I do wonder if there is any evidence in surviving timbers of a pitched/hipped roof over the cart entrance. Might this be conditioned as part of the timber frame survey, which will be required as a condition? I note that rainwater goods are proposed as powder coated aluminium, but would advise the use of a sand cast effect as well. This could be conditioned.

I note there will be a loft in the barn - this could also be utilised for an internal tv aerial. Any satellite dish requirement will have to be away from the building and can be installed at ground level in the garden and hidden in landscaping/planting. A condition will be required.

Regarding joinery details I am interested to know how windows will be inserted into the building envelope and in particular how the timber frame will be treated. Insulation of the external envelope can have an adverse impact on the appearance of either the inside or outside detailing of the building, depending where it's located. Whilst internal insulation will result in the loss of visible internal timbers, it does however mean that the relationship of the external timber cladding to the brick plinth is not altered. External insulation results in a large overhang of the weatherboarding in relation to the brick plinth as well as a modified eaves

and roof detail. The drawings are unclear as to how insulation will be treated and detailed and so will require a condition.

GBC Conservation Architect – 25th April 2023

This application originally went through detailed negotiations to ensure the minimal amount of rooflights and windows were introduced into the barn, in order to minimise the visual impact on the barn and avoid over domestication of it.

The applicant now wishes to increase the number of rooflights, and this will result in further harm to the appearance of the listed barn.

The gable walls of the barn were also carefully considered in order to minimise openings through the timber frame and sole plate. The applicant now proposes forming an opening through the end wall (internal door between the living area and the newly proposed bathroom lobby). The increase in the number of openings and additional interventions to achieve increased thermal performance required to achieve habitable rooms will cause further harm to the appearance and fabric of the listed building.

One further proposed alteration to the approved alterations is the removal of the recessed entrance lobby located in the original cart entrance/threshing floor. The approved design offered a sensitive proposal to maintaining the open appearance of the cart entrance. The current proposal will bring the glazed screen forward to the external wall of the barn, thus compromising the original sensitive design for a recessed glazed screen. On balance, this alteration to the design will result in harm to the appearance of the listed barn by increasing the domestic appearance of the barn conversion.

The proposals are therefore contrary to local and national policy and cannot be supported.

GBC – Waste & Recycling Manager

No comments received.

Neighbouring properties

Public consultation was by way of the displaying of a site notice, press notice and individual neighbour letters sent to 15 surrounding properties with an overall expiry date of 7th April 2023. One letter of support was received.

Officer's Analysis

Procedural Notes and Background

Planning permission and listed building consent for the conversion of the barn into a 4-bedroom dwelling and conversion/rebuilding of the stables into a 3-bedroom dwelling with ancillary works, was given in January 2019 and therefore the principle of converting the buildings has already been established. As such, it will not be for this application to re-assess the principle of the development but instead will be assessing the proposed amendments to the already approved scheme.

This current variation and listed building consent submissions relate only to the Kent Barn which currently has planning permission for conversion into a 4-bedroom dwelling. The conversion/rebuilding of the stables does not form part of this application.

Proposal

The application seeks amendments to the approved planning and listed building consent under planning references 20180380 and 20180381. The proposed amendments are as follows:

- a. Change position of 3no. approved conservation roof-lights, and introduction of 5no. new conservation roof-lights;
- b. Introduce 1 new window to the rear (south-west) elevation;

- c. Replace existing door with new fixed window to side (south-east) elevation;
- d. Change position of external doors to rear-midstrey to rear (south-west) elevation;
- e. Change of roof material to rear-midstrey to rear (south-west) elevation, from Clay Pan Tiles to Lead Sheet with Rolls;
- f. Change of roof material to cat-slide roof to side (south-east) elevation, from Kent Peg Tiles to Lead Sheet with Rolls; and
- g. Changes to internal layout and new partition walls.

The revisions relate to the Kent Barn only and all other details remain as the previous approvals.

The Site and Surroundings

Gore Green Farm is a historic farmstead located in Gore Green Road Higham and comprises a number of buildings in various uses and in differing states of repair and condition set around a hard surfaced quadrangle courtyard in open countryside some 60m to the north of the junction of Gore Green Road with Bull Lane.

The historic maps show the farmyard dates from 1852 but it is clearly older as the barn dates to circa 16th century. St John's College, Cambridge has likely owned the application site since the 16th Century.

The buildings within the farmstead comprises the farmhouse (Black Cottages) which is an extended detached two storey dwelling which has been subdivided into two units and is on the south side of the farmyard. The building has a tiled roof and black painted brick exterior with some weatherboarding to the gables. It has a front canopy which is of poor construction and there are a variety of windows including modern upvc replacements.

The historic barn on the eastern side of the quadrangle farmyard is a Grade II Listed Queen Post Truss barn, which was listed on 26 July 1983. The listing description states:

Perhaps C16. Aisled oak structure in 5 bays. Weather boarded with asbestos cement roofing. Queen posts. Passing braces in aisles. Central midstreys somewhat altered.



On the northern side is a stable building partly with a brick wall on one side and timber frame structure with partly collapsed pitched roofs, part felt and part slate, with many slates missing.

On the western side is an open barn with tin roof and timber frame also of poor construction and with a lean-to on the south side.

There is a large pond to the north of the yard and adjacent to Gore Green Road. To the west of the open barn and to the south of Black Cottages are grazing fields as well as to the south of Black Cottages. The

area around the barn is also rather neglected with some old caravans and other structures more akin to hobby farming.

The stable use (Black Cottage stables) appears to be very low key and there appears to be no planning records relating to its use with some grazing in adjacent fields.

As the planning history and background sections show, planning permission has already been granted for the conversion of the barn and stables.

Design, Character, Appearance and Impact on Heritage Asset

Policy CS19 (Development and Design Principles) sets out detailed criteria against which the acceptability or otherwise of proposed development will be evaluated. In particular it requires new development to be visually attractive, fit for purpose and locally distinctive. It should conserve and enhance the character of the local built and natural environment and integrate well with the surrounding area. It requires new development to safeguard the amenity, including privacy, daylight and sunlight, of its occupants and those of neighbouring properties and land and avoid adverse environmental impacts from pollution. Proposals should include details of appropriate hard and soft landscaping, protect and where opportunities arise enhance biodiversity and provide appropriate facilities for the storage and disposal of waste.

Policy CS20 (Heritage and the Historic Environment) sets out that the Council will accord a high priority towards the preservation, protection and enhancement of its heritage and historic environment. In accordance with national policy, the weight accorded a designated heritage asset's conservation value will vary having regard to the importance and significance of the asset and the degree of impact.

The previous applications (Refs 20180380 and 20180381) went through detailed negotiations to ensure the minimal amount of rooflights and windows were introduced into the barn, in order to minimise the visual impact on the barn and avoid over domestication of it.

In addition, the gable walls of the barn were also carefully considered in order to minimise openings through the timber frame and sole plate.

The current application seeks to increase the number of rooflights, as well as proposing forming an opening through the end wall (internal door between the living area and the newly proposed bathroom lobby), and the removal of the recessed entrance lobby located in the original cart entrance/threshing floor.

The proposed increase in the size and number of rooflights, and the increase in the number of openings and additional interventions to achieve increased thermal performance required to achieve habitable rooms will causing further harm to the appearance and fabric of the listed building. Furthermore, the approved design offered a sensitive proposal to maintaining the open appearance of the cart entrance. The current proposal would bring the glazed screen forward to the external wall of the barn, thus compromising the original sensitive design for a recessed glazed screen. On balance, this alteration to the design will result in harm to the appearance of the listed barn by increasing the domestic appearance of the barn conversion.

Overall, and taking the above into consideration, the proposed variations and revisions to the approved scheme, would result in a more domestic and unsympathetic appearance to the barn conversion which would have an unacceptable and detrimental impact on the Grade II Listed Building.

The development would therefore be contrary to Policies CS19 and CS20 of the Local Plan Core Strategy (2014), Policy TC2 of the Gravesham Local Plan: First Review (1994) and Section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

Neighbouring Amenity

The proposal would result in an increase in the size and quantity of the first floor windows which would afford greater views of the surrounding area. However, taking into consideration the separation between

the barn and the surrounding properties and the relationship to habitable room windows, it is not considered to result in a loss of privacy.

The development would therefore be in accordance with Policy CS19 (LPCS) and Paragraph 130f of the NPPF (2021).

Parking

The proposed conversion remains as a 4-bedroom dwelling as previously approved, with no other alterations to the proposals. Therefore, the parking provision is unchanged and no objections are raised.

Any Other Material Planning Considerations

All other details remain as previously approved and any conditions imposed on the previous applications are still relevant and should be satisfied fully in line with their requirements.

Conclusion & Recommendation

The proposed variations and revisions to the approved scheme, would result in a more domestic and unsympathetic appearance to the barn conversion which would have an unacceptable and detrimental impact on the Grade II Listed Building, contrary to Policies CS19 and CS20 of the Local Plan Core Strategy (2014), Policy TC2 of the Gravesham Local Plan: First Review (1994) and Section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

(For detailed conditions / reasons for refusal and informatives, see draft Decision)

Case Officer:	Mrs Amanda Grout	Team Leader:	Richard Hart
Signed:	<i>A Grout</i>	Signed:	<i>R Hart</i>
Dated:	26 th April 2023	Dated:	27th April 2023