



Delegated Report

Householder and Listed Building Consent Applications

Planning Application No: 20240178
20240179

Location: Old Vicarage Church Street Higham Rochester

Description: 20240178 - Erection of a single-storey rear extension and the conversion of a first-floor room into a bathroom.

20240179 - Application for Listed Building Consent for the erection of a single-storey rear extension and the conversion of a first-floor room into a bathroom.

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Mathis

Site Visit Date: 22 March 2024

Submitted Documents/Plans

- Application form;
- Drawing no. 2331 E 001 – Location Plan;
- Drawing no. 2331 E 002 – Block Plan;
- Drawing no. 2331 E 005 – Existing Site Plan;
- Drawing no. 2331 E 010 – Existing Floor Plans;
- Drawing no. 2331 E 020 Rev. A – Existing Elevations;
- Drawing no. 2331 E 025 – Front Elevation in Context;
- Drawing no. 2331 P 100 – Proposed Site Plan;
- Drawing no. 2331 P 110 – Proposed Floor Plan;
- Drawing no. 2331 P 120 Rev. A – Proposed Elevations;
- Drawing no. 2331 P 125 – Proposed Front Elevation in Context;
- Drawing no. 2331 P 130 – Proposed Section A;
- Drawing no. 2331 P 131 Rev. A – Proposed Section B; and
- Design & Access Statement & Heritage Impact Assessment.

Relevant Planning History

Reference	Description	Decision	Decision Date
20110592	Erection of a detached garden room.	Withdrawn	10.04.2012
20080357	Erection of replacement single storey rear extension to form bathroom/wc and utility room.	Permitted	12.06.2008
20080356	Application for Listed Building Consent for internal and external alterations in connection with the demolition of existing extension and erection of a replacement single storey rear extension to form a utility room and bathroom/wc and conversion of first floor storeroom into a wc involving provision of soil stack at the rear.	Permitted	12.06.2008

19910730	Erection of a detached garage at the rear.	Permitted	10.01.1992
19840200	Application for Listed Building Consent for demolition of single storey rear extension.	Withdrawn	09.08.1984
19840199	Erection of two storey extension at the rear to form kitchen at ground floor level and bedroom over and erection of storm porch at side	Withdrawn	09.08.1984
19830374	Erection of a detached double garage incorporating an oil store	Permitted	19.12.1983

Development Plan

Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (September 2014):

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

Gravesham Local Plan: First Review (1994)

- P3 – Vehicle Parking Standards
- TC2 – Listed Buildings
- TC3 – Conservation Areas
- TC7 – Other Archaeological Sites

Gravesham Local Plan Regulation 18 Stage 1 Consultation Part 2: Development Management Policies Document April 2018

The following draft policies are relevant to the consideration of this application:

- Proposed Policy DM 6 - Extensions, Replacement Buildings and Ancillary Development in the Green Belt
- Proposed Policy DM 26 - Residential Space Standards
- Proposed Policy DM 28 - Domestic Extensions, Outbuildings and Other Development
- Proposed Policy DM 35 - Light Pollution
- Proposed Policy DM 36 - Sunlight and Daylight within New Development
- Proposed Policy DM 42 - Development Involving Heritage Assets
- Proposed Policy DM 43 - Listed Buildings
- Proposed Policy DM 44 - Conservation Areas
- Proposed Policy DM 45 - Archaeology

Other material considerations

The Council has a statutory requirement under Section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 in considering whether to grant listed building consent for any works to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Under Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, as amended, the Council has a statutory duty in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, as amended, states that

with respect to buildings or other land in a conservation area, special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.

Paragraph 33 of the NPPF (2023) 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 (2023), the Council will also seek to replace these.

National Planning Policy Framework (2023)

- Section 2 – Achieving Sustainable Development
- Section 4 – Decision-making
- Section 8 – Promoting healthy and safe communities
- Section 9 – Promoting sustainable transport
- Section 11 – Making effective use of land
- Section 12 – Achieving well-designed and beautiful places
- Section 13 – Protecting Green Belt land
- Section 15 – Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
- Section 16 – Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

Supplementary Planning Guidance

- Church Street Higham Rural Conservation Area Appraisal Supplementary Planning Document (2017);
- Management Plan Rural Conservation Area Appraisals Supplementary Planning Document (2017);
- Listed Buildings A Guide for owners and occupiers (2020);
- 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);
- Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide (2021); and
- Gravesham Landscape Character Assessment (2009).

Other Guidance

Historic England Traditional Windows Their Care, Repair and Upgrading (2017)

Consultations, Publicity and Representations

Consultees

GBC Conservation Officer

I've had a look at this and have some concerns about the size of the extension on the side of this listed building. The existing extension is modest and in proportion with the main house, being a simple lean-to structure that does not project beyond the flank wall of the main house, it is also in character with the vernacular of host building and its rural setting adjacent to the listed church. The proposal appears oversized for the house, projecting out beyond the eastern elevation and closing the space between it and the adjacent garage, which is critical to the visual separation of the garage block (in close proximity) from the main house. Furthermore the proposal extends beyond the flank wall of the main house, which in this instance further detracts from the listed building. The decrease in the roof pitch to achieve the increase in plan form of the proposal also contributes to its modern appearance, particularly when viewed from the east

when combined with the large patio doors. The amount and style of glazing introduced to the proposal, along with rooflights, also contributes to a proposal that appears more suited to a modern suburban building than one associated with a listed vernacular timber framed.

On balance the proposal does not preserve or enhance the listed building and the conservation area, resulting in harm that would be contrary to local and national policy.

GBC Conservation Officer (verbal comments given on proposal to convert first floor room to bathroom)

Can the pipes be internally located? The ventilation could be via the ceiling and under the eaves. Needs a section drawing to show the construction and see if its possible.

Higham Parish Council

As a Parish Council, we would like to express our concerns about the above-mentioned planning permission for the erection of a single-storey rear extension and a conversion of a first-floor room into a bathroom.

We feel the proposed extension would alter the aspect of this Listed Building and if approved, believe it could set a precedent for similar buildings in the village and surrounding areas.

Dickens Country Protection Society

The Society has no objection in principle to the house being extended and modified internally (without structural alterations) but considers that it would be preferable for the rear extension to not be visible from Church Street and to be more compatible with the style of the original building through having a lesser area of glazing than presently proposed. There is potential for archaeological findings during excavation works.

No response from:

- National Amenity Societies

Neighbouring properties

20240178 - 10 surrounding properties were consulted plus site and press notices – overall consultation expiry date was 19.04.2024 – no responses received.

20240179 – Site and press notices - overall consultation expiry date was 19.04.2024 – no responses received.

Officer's Analysis

The application site consists of a two storey detached dwelling with detached garage. The property is grade II listed, situated in the Church Street Conservation Area, in an Area of Archaeological Potential, in the Green Belt, Higham Arable Farmlands Landscape Character Area and Flood Zone 3.

The proposal is for planning and listed building consent for erection of a single-storey rear extension and the conversion of a first-floor room into a bathroom. The existing single storey rear element would be removed and the proposed single storey rear extension would be constructed in its place but to a larger footprint. The proposed extension would be 3.37m in depth, 5.97m in width and 3.53 to the highest point of the mono pitched roof. The extension would have a window and bi-fold doors in the rear elevation and rooflights in the rear roofslope. In the west flank elevation there would be one large window, there would be no windows in the east flank elevation or in the part front elevation. The extension would extend out 1.28m from the west flank of the building. The extension would be faced with 'slate roof tiles' for the roof, off-white weatherboarding on the rear and east flank elevations and black weatherboarding on the west flank elevation. The bi-fold doors and west gable end window would be aluminium, the window in the rear elevation would be timber and rooflights would be conservation rooflights.

Whether the proposed development is inappropriate development in the Green Belt

The application site is located within the Green Belt where inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances (Paragraph 152 of the NPPF 2023).

Paragraph 153 of the NPPF (2023) states that when considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

Paragraph 154 of the NPPF (2023) states that a local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are:

- a) buildings for agriculture and forestry;
- b) the provision of appropriate facilities (in connection with the existing use of land or a change of use) for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation, cemeteries and burial grounds and allotments; as long as the facilities preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it;
- c) the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building;
- d) the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces;
- e) limited infilling in villages;
- f) limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the development plan (including policies for rural exception sites); and
- g) limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would:
 - not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development; or
 - not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt, where the development would re-use previously developed land and contribute to meeting an identified affordable housing need within the area of the local planning authority.

In this case point (c) is relevant. Any extension to the property must not result in disproportionate additions over and above the original building.

Saved Policy C13 of the Gravesham Local Plan First Review 1994 states:

Extensions to dwellings will be considered on their merits but the Borough Council will expect the following criteria to be satisfied:-


- (i) The existing dwelling must be an "original dwelling"* in permanent use as a dwelling.
- (ii) There will be an overall limit of one third of the gross floor area of the original dwelling (measured externally) prior to any later extension or alteration, unless the increased floorspace has no overall effect on the existing bulk and appearance of the dwelling.
- (iii) Those extensions which provide essential basic amenities such as a bathroom, toilet or kitchen, which are currently not available or are clearly inadequate, will normally be permitted.
- (iv) The extension shall not be in a form which would facilitate the future formation of a separate residential curtilage.
- (v) The dwelling to be enlarged must have sufficient curtilage to accommodate the extension without undue visual intrusion into the open countryside.
- (vi) The appearance, massing, scale, form and materials of any extension shall be appropriate to the existing dwelling and the Green Belt setting.
- (vii) Proposals for domestic garages and for other outbuildings will be considered on their individual merits but will be required to be well designed, discreetly sited and subservient to the scale of the main dwelling on the plot.

Development Management Policies Document April 2018 (a document that has been subject to consultation but is not adopted) contains Proposed Policy DM 6 which relates to extensions, replacement buildings and ancillary development in the Green Belt. Although the weight that can be attached to this document/policy is limited, it does illustrate the Borough Council's most recent approach to the type of development proposed at the application site.

With regard to extensions, Proposed Policy DM 6 outlines that the following will be taken into account in determining whether an extension in the Green Belt is proportionate;

- its footprint, floorspace and volume compared to the original building; and whether its scale, mass and height is subservient to the original building.

From the listing description it can be seen that the property is a 16th century cottage and therefore the original dwelling for the purposes of Green Belt assessment will be as it was at 1 July 1948. From an assessment of the Kent Historic Environment Record the map of 1929-1952 (and as a matter of fact all of the previous maps of 1871 – 1890, 1897 – 1900, 1907 – 1923) show the dwelling to be as follows:



As can be seen this is the same as the existing footprint. Therefore, although the existing single storey rear element is clearly an extension to the original 16th cottage, for the purposes of the Green Belt assessment and calculations it will be calculated as part of the original dwelling and not an extension.

Floorspace calculations

Original Dwelling

Ground floor original floorspace – 63.9 sq.m

First floor original floorspace – 53.3 sq. m

Total floorspace of original dwelling = 117.2 sq. m

Proposed extension (which would be built on site of existing single storey rear element)

Additional amount over and above existing single storey rear element which is part of the original dwelling for the purposes of the Green Belt calculations = 9.75 sq. m

Total percentage increase of dwelling over original (9.75 divided by 117.2 x 100) = **8.3%**

From the above assessment the proposed extension, taking into account that the existing single storey rear element is part of the original dwelling for Green Belt assessment, the floorspace of the original dwelling would be increased by 8.3% which is much less than the one third (33%) limit set out in saved Policy C13 (LPFR).

Floorspace is just one calculation which can be used to assess whether a development is a disproportionate addition however, other such measures include footprint, volume etc.


The proposed single storey rear extension would be built on the site of the existing single storey rear element which is to be demolished so the actual additional footprint would be 9.75 sq. m. The extension would extend out from the west flank elevation by 1.28m and would be 1.1m greater in depth than the existing single storey rear element.

In terms of volume, below is the existing and proposed dwelling:

Existing Dwelling:



Proposed Dwelling:



The proposed extension would result in an increase in built form at the side of the dwelling and increase its depth.

The proposal would therefore add additional floorspace, footprint, volume and increase the width and depth of the dwelling. The increase in floorspace would be modest and well under the one third limit set in saved Policy CS13 (LPFR). The increase in footprint would be modest as it would be mostly built on the footprint of the existing single storey rear element. The volume is considered modest and the extension would be subserviently designed in comparison to the host dwelling. Overall therefore based on all factors the proposed single storey rear extension is not considered a disproportionate addition.

The proposal would therefore not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. As such, the proposal is compliant with Policy CS02 (LPCS), Saved Policy C13 (LPFR) and paragraph 154 of the NPPF (2023).

Effect on the openness of the Green Belt



Paragraph 142 of the NPPF (2023) states that the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open.

As stated, due to the modest increase in the footprint of the extension and its single storey nature it is considered that the extension would not harm the openness of the Green Belt. The proposal is therefore considered to not have an adverse impact on the openness of the Green Belt.


Whether the proposal would protect the architectural and historic interest of this grade II listed building and whether the character and appearance of the Church Street Conservation Area would be preserved

Extension


The existing single storey rear extension has been there for some time as evident from a review of the historic map regression. In 2008 planning and listed building consent were granted for removal of this existing single storey element and erection of a single storey rear extension (refs. 20080356 & 20080357) although these permissions were not implemented in respect of the extension:



SIDE ELEVATION (WEST)



SIDE ELEVATION (EAST)



This current proposal is again for removal of the existing single storey rear element and erection of a replacement single storey rear extension. The extension would have some changes compared to the approval. Whereas the previous extension would have been built in line with the west flank wall now it is proposed for it to project 1.2m out from it. Also it would be 300mm greater in depth as in the approval the extension was 3m in depth and in this application it would be 3.3m. Rooflights are now proposed whereas in the previous application they were not. The fenestration would also be different as it would consist of aluminium bi-fold doors and a timber window in the rear elevation and a large aluminium window in the west elevation instead of the approval which had a traditional timber window and door in the rear elevation and a traditional timber window in the west flank elevation. In respect of materials the approval was to have natural slates and painted weatherboarding to match existing and in this current proposal it is proposed to use slate tiles and off-white and black weatherboarding to match existing corresponding elevations.

The building is a 16th century cottage which is grade II listed and situated in the Church Street Conservation Area. As such the Council's Conservation Officer has been consulted on the proposal and they have advised that the proposal is unacceptable relating to matters of scale, design, character and materials. The Conservation Officer notes how the existing single storey rear extension is modestly sized and in proportion with the main house and is a simple lean-to structure which does not project beyond the flank wall of the main house and is in character with the vernacular of the host building and its rural setting adjacent to the listed church (St Mary's to the north). The Conservation Officer advises however, that the proposed extension is over-sized for the main house, projecting out and closing the space between the house and garage which is critical to the visual separation of detached garage which is in close proximity to the house. Also, that the extension extending beyond the flank wall of the dwelling would detract from the listed building. Further matters of objection relate to the roof pitch and the amount and style of glazing including the rooflights which the Conservation Officer advises would all lead to a proposal that would be more suited to a modern suburban building rather than a listed vernacular timber framed building. The Conservation Officer advises that the proposal does not preserve or enhance the listed building or the conservation area and would result in harm.

The 2008 planning and listed building consents (refs. 20080356 and 20080357) permitted a single storey rear extension which was 3m in depth and therefore 800mm greater than the existing single storey rear extension. The 2008 permissions would therefore have reduced the gap between the house and the detached garage. This current proposal would reduce it slightly further as it would be 3.3m in depth.

Although it would only be an additional 300mm which is a minimal amount it would not be appropriate to reduce the gap any further than what has been permitted.

The 2008 approval was built in line with the flank wall on its west side and did not project beyond it whereas the current proposal would do so by 1.2m. Whilst this projection may be acceptable on an unlisted property which is not in a Conservation Area, on this 16th century listed cottage consideration needs to be given to the siting and design of an extension. The significance of this listed building is particularly based on its simple vernacular form and character. There is a later extension to the property (from a review of the historic map regression on the Kent Historic Environment Record the earliest map of 1871-1890 shows an extension in that place) but it is modest and the scale and character of the listed building has been retained; as advised by the Conservation Officer it is in keeping with the vernacular of this listed building. The proposal to off-set the extension such that it would project 1.2m beyond the western flank wall would appear incongruous to the plan form of this listed building and also undermine and diminish the character of the listed building as a rear extension would be visible from the front of the dwelling. It is appreciated that the existing gate, boundary fence, landscaping and level difference between the house and the road would mean that the extension would have reduced visibility from the road however, it would be visible as the top part would be seen above the gate and fencing and in any case as this is a listed building for which great weight should be given to its conservation (paragraph 205 of the NPPF 2023) if something is not publicly visible it does not mean it is not still harmful to the listed building. The projection beyond the west flank wall would therefore be unacceptable as it would be harmful to the significance of this listed building and also the Conservation Area.

In respect of fenestration the approved extension had sympathetic fenestration with a simple timber window and door in the rear elevation and timber window in the flank elevation which was in keeping with the character of the building. However, in this current proposal the fenestration would not reflect the fenestration in the host dwelling in respect of its size, style and materials. The listed building has similarly sized and shaped square and rectangle windows which align with each other and are a sympathetic timber material. The proposed aluminium bi-fold doors in the rear elevation and large aluminium window in the west flank elevation would by virtue of their size, design and materials be completely out of keeping with the fenestration in the existing dwelling and harmful to the character of the conservation area as would the rooflights.

In summary the proposed extension by virtue of its size, siting and design including fenestration would be out of keeping with the scale and character of this sixteenth century timber framed cottage and its rural setting and would therefore cause harm to the significance of this grade II listed building and would not preserve the character or appearance of the Church Street Conservation Area but would cause harm to it. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policies CS19 and CS20 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (2014), saved Policies TC2 and TC3 of the Gravesham Local Plan First Review (1994) and sections 12 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).

The harm that would be caused is considered to be less than substantial, in such circumstances the NPPF (2023) advises that where a proposal would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The Design & Access Statement & Heritage Impact Assessment states that the extension would create valuable additional space for the property and in the application form it is stated that the proposal would be in place of the existing rear extension in order to reconfigure the layout and optimise the available space instead of adding on to the existing layout which would result in a larger overall footprint. However, whilst the additional space would be a benefit to the applicant, for the reasons as set out above this is not considered to outweigh the harm that would be caused to the significance of this listed building and the conservation area. Owners of listed buildings are custodians of them for future generations and the NPPF (2023) advises that when considering the impact of proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. For the reasons given above, it has been found that the proposed replacement extension would cause harm to the significance of this grade II listed building and would not preserve the character or appearance of the Church Street Conservation Area but would cause harm to it. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policies CS19 and CS20 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (2014), saved Policies TC2 and TC3 of the Gravesham

Local Plan First Review (1994) and sections 12 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).

Conversion of existing study at first floor level into bathroom

Previous application ref. 20080356 included conversion of a first floor storeroom into a wc involving provision of a soil stack at the rear. Although the 2008 permissions were not implemented in respect of the extension they were in respect of the wc. as can be seen from the existing plans submitted with this application. It is now also proposed to convert the existing study at first floor level to a bathroom. The study is located in the front corner of the dwelling when viewed from the street. No details have been provided of vents or soil or vent pipes etc. The Conservation Officer advises that it may be that pipes can be internally located and ventilation could be under the eaves but it needs a section drawing to show the construction and see if it's possible. The provision of a bathroom in this location may therefore be possible but further details would be required to know for sure that ventilation and pipework could be done in a sympathetic manner as if they cannot then it may not be acceptable.

Landscape Character

The application site is located in the Higham Arable Farmlands Landscape Character Area.

The area the site is located is rural in character but with some more sporadic development along this part of Church Street. There is St Mary's church to the north, farmland to the east and a row of houses to the south. The proposal would result in an increase in the footprint of the dwelling over and above the existing single storey rear extension but it is considered it would not result in an increased prominence of the existing dwelling in the wider landscape. It is therefore considered that the proposal would protect the local landscape character and as such in respect of this matter the proposal is compliant with Policies CS12 and CS19 (LPCS) and section 12 of the NPPF (2023).

Amenity of Occupiers

The dwelling would remain a two bedroom dwelling and the proposed replacement extension would be of a larger footprint than the existing however, the dwelling would still maintain a garden area and rear garden depth that would far exceed the minimum standards as set out in SPG2 (2020) for a two bedroom dwelling. As such in respect of the amenity of occupiers the proposal is considered compliant with Policy CS19 (LPCS).

Neighbouring Amenity

Due to the siting of the extension and its distance from the nearest neighbouring property to the west no. 4 Church Cottages, there would be no harmful impact on the amenity or privacy of no. 4. As such in respect of neighbouring amenity the proposal is compliant with Policy CS19 (LPCS).

Parking and highway safety

The proposal would not increase the number of bedrooms at the property which would remain at two, therefore no impact on parking demand and there would be alteration of the existing parking situation where there is space for a number of vehicles. In respect of parking and highway safety the proposal would therefore be compliant with saved Policy P3 (LPFR).

Archaeology

The site is located in an area of Archaeological Potential but given that the proposed replacement extension would be built on the site of the existing extension it is considered that the proposals are unlikely to have a significant below-ground archaeological impact. A watching brief condition could be added should permission be forthcoming. In respect of archaeology the proposal is therefore considered compliant with saved Policy TC7 (LPFR).

Flooding

The site is located in Flood Zone 3, the proposed replacement extension would be on the site of the existing extension which is to be removed but on a slightly larger footprint and at the same ground level. As such there are not considered to be any issues with the proposal concerning flooding and in that respect the proposal is compliant with Policy CS18 (LPCS).

Any Other Material Planning Considerations

None.

Conclusion & Recommendation

The above discussion sets out that the proposed development would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, would not impact on openness, would be acceptable in respect of landscape character, occupier and neighbouring amenity, parking and highway safety, archaeology and flooding. However the proposal would not preserve the significance of this grade II listed building or the character or appearance of the Church Street Conservation Area but would cause harm to them. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policies CS19 and CS20 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (2014), saved Policies TC2 and TC3 of the Gravesham Local Plan First Review (1994) and sections 12 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).

Recommendation:

20240178 – Refusal
20240179 - Refusal

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

Case Officer:	Ms Rebecca Harrison	Team Leader:	Miss Faye Hobbs
Signed:		Signed:	
Dated:	7th May 2024	Dated:	07 May 2024