



Delegated Report

Planning Application

Planning Application No: 20220230

Location: 19 Edwin Street Gravesend Kent

Description: ****REVISED DESCRIPTION & REVISED DRAWINGS****
Application for a minor material amendment to planning permission reference no. 20181276 for the erection of two storey building in the former garden with basements and rooms in the roof space to provide 4no. one bedroom maisonettes; to allow changes to the front elevation and internal layouts.

Applicant: Mr Rapinder Cheema

Site Visit Date: 22 April 2022

Submitted Documents/Plans

- Application form;
- Drawing no. 2211-PA-EL-01 Rev. A – Elevations: Proposed Alterations to Front Elevation;
- Drawing no. 2211-PA-EL-02 Rev. A – Elevations: Proposed Alterations to Front Elevation Behind Boundary Wall;
- Drawing no. 2211-PA-PL-00 – Plans: Basement Plan as Proposed;
- Drawing no. 2211-PA-PL-01 – Plans: Ground Floor Plan as Proposed;
- Drawing no. 2211-PA-PL-02 – Plans: First Floor Plans as Proposed; and
- Drawing no. 2211-PA-PL-03 – Plans: Second Floor Plan as Proposed.

~~Drawing no. 2211-PA-BT-01 – Planning Application: Sections: Plans, Section and Elevations As Built.~~

Relevant Planning History

Application No.	Description	Status	Decision
20181276	Erection of two storey building in the former garden with basements and rooms in the roof space to provide 4no. one bedroom maisonettes.	Permitted	01.08.2019

Development Plan

Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (September 2014):

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

Gravesham Local Plan: First Review (1994)

- P3 – Vehicle Parking Standards
- TC3 – Development Affecting Conservation Areas

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

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

Other material considerations

Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance

National Planning Policy Framework (2021)

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

Supplementary Planning Guidance

- 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)
- King Street Conservation Area Character Appraisal (2009)
- Management Plan – Gravesend Town Centre Conservation Areas (2009)

Consultations, Publicity and Representations

Consultees

No responses from:

- KCC Heritage
- Natural England

Neighbouring properties

10 surrounding properties were consulted plus site and press notice – overall consultation expiry date was 1 April – no responses.

No re-consultations were carried out on the revised plans as the changes to the front elevation were not considered to be of a level which needed re-consultation.

Officer's Analysis

Planning permission was granted for the erection of a two storey building in the former garden with basements and rooms in the roof space to provide 4no. one bedroom maisonettes on 1 August 2019 under ref. 20181276. The development has not been carried out in accordance with the approved plans (listed in condition 2) and none of the conditions were ever discharged. The application as originally submitted proposed retention of the building as built but officers advised that the changes to the approval as built

were not acceptable in terms of design, character and appearance and impact on the Conservation Area and that revised plans would need to be submitted to address the unauthorised changes in order to improve the appearance of the building.

The principle issues in the assessment of this application are:

- Design, Character, Appearance and Heritage
- Amenity of Occupiers.

Design, Character, Appearance and Heritage

The approved front elevation and floor plans are as follows (20181276):r



The building which has been constructed on site however, is not in accordance with the approved plans and is as follows:



The drawing which was originally submitted with this application showed changes to the approved drawings but they did not reflect the building that had been built on site.

Following the site visit the agent was advised that the building as built is unacceptable for a number of reasons as set out in detail below. This is as a result of the building not being built in accordance with the

approved plans and none of the planning conditions being discharged.

Window and door openings

The window and door openings differ from that approved (ref. 20181276). The windows are of different proportions, there is additional brickwork detail above them, the doors are in slightly different positioning and the fanlights above are much deeper than shown on the approved drawings. The deep fanlights are of particular concern and are considered harmful in visual amenity terms and to the character and appearance of the King Street Conservation Area. The agent was advised to amend the proportions of the windows and fanlights to as approved.

Utilities and Pipework

Condition 3 (viii) of the approval requested details of the location of any flues, vents, meter boxes or other plant and services on the new building hereby permitted within one month of the commencement of development. Condition no. 4 of ref. 20181276 stated that no satellite antenna, apparatus, meter boxes, vents, flues or other external pipe work or plant/services shall be erected or installed on the front exterior of the building as permitted unless approved as required by any condition pursuant to the permission. No approval of conditions application was ever submitted.

There are four utility boxes which have been installed on the front elevation which have pipework going through the surfacing and down to basement level. There are also various other bits of pipework which have been installed on the front elevation including the pipework coming out from underneath the utility boxes and entering into the building and down through the front garden surface to the basement. There is also the pipework coming up through the front garden surface and then up and around the two central front doors and back down again. Lastly two yellow pipes are coming out of the front boundary wall. The agent was advised that the utility boxes and pipework are not considered acceptable in terms of visual amenity and are considered harmful to the Conservation Area and was asked to remove them entirely or relocate to more discreet and sympathetic locations but they cannot remain on the front elevation of the building as they are now.

Front boundary wall

The approved scheme showed a sympathetic dwarf wall and railings along the front boundary which was considered sympathetic to the Conservation Area. Condition 9 requested full details of boundary treatments. The agent was advised that the wall which has been built on site is not acceptable as it would not provide a sympathetic a boundary treatment and it would be harmful to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The agent was asked to amend the drawing to show the front boundary wall and railings as approved.

Lightwells

The approved scheme showed a sash window with a narrower sash window next to it under both light wells on the front elevation however, as built there is a uPVC door. The agent was advised this is not acceptable due to the location of the site in the Conservation Area. The grilles that have been installed over both lightwells are also not acceptable given their material and design and are not sympathetic to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The agent was advised that the drawing should be revised to show the two windows as approved under each light well and details of a more appropriate lightwell including a more appropriate finish to the edges of the lightwell opening is needed.

Surfacing and landscaping

Condition 3 (vi) of the approved scheme requested details of surface treatments and finishes to the pedestrian accesses, steps and stairs and other amenity areas within one month of the commencement of the development. Condition 10 requested details of a soft landscaping scheme which included the front garden planting strip. The development as carried out has paving slabs which are not considered

sympathetic to the Conservation Area and the soft landscaping as approved had not been carried out. With the extent of hardsurfacing carried out it does not appear any soft landscaping is to be proposed. The agent was asked to amend the plan to show a more sympathetic surfacing treatment for the front garden area and also to show the soft landscaping strip in the front garden as approved.

The agent originally responded with some proposed amendments in order to rectify matters but these were not considered to address the issues identified with the building as built and the impact on the Conservation Area. The agent was asked to come up with some ideas as to how the matters identified with the building could be addressed.

The agent responded with a number of ideas to address the breaches as follows:

- (1) Arched timber inserts to fanlights to reduce perceived size and improve the appearance.
- (2) Glazing bar pattern altered to diminish the 'squat' impression given by the glass panes which currently appear squashed and horizontal.
- (3) Fixed window boxes added to windows to increase the perception of height and to add to the soft planting options.
- (4) Brick-on-edge coping removed and railings added to the top of the boundary walls to reduce 'solidity' and soften the appearance.
- (5) Copper pipes removed from the outside and rerouted internally.
- (6) Permanent planters fixed to the rear of the boundary walls with hedges planted in them to increase soft planting.
- (7) Pipe cover hoods to the gas pipes/valves to match the colour of the brickwork.
- (8) Where currently visible, utilities boxes are to be disguised in slatted timber housings.
- (9) The steps down to the street will also be better finished, with a paved edge.

Apart from a few areas, the ideas all appeared acceptable and went a long way to addressing the breaches. The agent was asked to clarify on what the proposed planter boxes would be attached to if it was proposed to remove the brick-on-edge coping and install railings on top, to ensure the utility boxes would not be visible. It was also questioned whether the utility boxes behind the wall are to remain or whether they are to be removed. It was also noted that there had been no response on the unacceptable grilles or basement uPVC doors.

The agent advised that the planters to the rear of the front boundary wall would stand on the block paving but would be securely bolted to the back of the wall and the meter boxes would need to be lowered. The meter boxes would be housed in timber slatted housings like those proposed for the meter boxes on the front of the building. In response to the grille, the agent asked if the request for a more sympathetic grille could be reconsidered and also the request to change the uPVC basement doors to a sash window as per the approval. The case officer advised the agent that the planters and wall all now appeared acceptable and the existing unacceptable grille would need to be replaced. An example of an appropriate one was provided to the agent and revised plans received showing a sympathetic grille type. With the regards the uPVC doors at basement level, given their limited visibility and that sympathetic grilles are now proposed which would mostly obscure them from sight and that this is a new build, then they were considered acceptable on this occasion.

Revised plans have now therefore been received showing a number of changes to the front of the building which will satisfactorily rectify the unacceptable way the front elevation of the building has been constructed. In respect of design, character, appearance and heritage the proposal is therefore considered compliant with Policies CS19 and CS20 (LPCS) and saved Policy TC3 (LPFR).

Amenity of Future Occupiers

The flats are not changing in size but there are alterations to the layouts. On the lower maisonettes the living room is being relocated from the ground floor to the basement (in place of the walk in closet). This is considered acceptable as the room would be served by a large opening and lightwell and the unit of accommodation would still be a maisonette and so the whole unit would not be underground. The

bathroom which was originally to be in the basement is now to be up on the ground floor. On the upper maisonettes the kitchens as shown in the approval will now become a kitchen/diner and the bathroom will be moved to a slightly different location. All flats would still be the same size as approved and no smaller. Overall the internal changes are considered acceptable and the amenity of future occupiers would still be protected. In respect of the amenity of future occupiers the proposal is therefore considered compliant with Policy CS19 (LPCS).

Amenity of Neighbouring Properties

The proposed changes in terms of elevational changes and internal layouts would not cause any harm to the amenity of any neighbouring properties and in this respect the proposal is considered compliant with Policy CS19 (LPCS).

Any Other Material Planning Considerations

None.

Conclusion & Recommendation

On the basis of the revised plans received which show a number of changes to the front of the building which will satisfactorily rectify the unacceptable way the front elevation of the building has been constructed, together with the changes to the internal layout, the proposal would be acceptable in respect of design, character, appearance and heriage and the amenity of future occupiers. As such permission is recommended.

(For detailed conditions and informatives, see draft Decision)

Case Officer:	Ms Rebecca Harrison	Team Leader:	Miss Faye Hobbs
Signed:	<i>Rebecca Harrison</i>	Signed:	
Dated:	18 October 2022	Dated:	18 October 2022