



Delegated Report

Full Planning Application

Planning Application No:	20220764
Location:	TRM Meats 40 Old Road West Gravesend Kent
Description:	Retention of the shop front and re-positioning the entrance to the first floor flat.
Applicant:	Mr S Medes, TRM Meats Ltd
Site Visit Date:	2 August 2022

Submitted Documents/Plans

Application form
Drawing no. 001 Rev. A (Original Plan, Elevation and Section)
Drawing no. 002 Rev. A (Existing Plan, Elevation and Section)
Drawing no. 003 Rev. A (Proposed Plan, Elevation and Section)
Drawing no. P2 Rev. A (Cross Section of Doors)

Relevant Planning History

Reference	Description	Decision	Decision Date
20210464	Retention of new shop front and access to enable self-containment of the upper floor flat.	Refused Dismissed on Appeal	29.06.2021 26.05.2022

Development Plan

Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy 2014

- CS01 – Sustainable Development
- CS02 – Scale and Distribution of Development
- CS08 – Retail, Leisure and the Hierarchy of Centres
- CS19 – Development and Design Principles

Gravesham Local Plan: First Review 1994

- TC9 – Shopfronts

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
- 7 – Ensuring the vitality of town centres
- 12 – Achieving well-designed places

Supplementary Planning Guidance

- SPG3 Advertisement Control (2020)
- SPG4 Security measures for shopfronts (2020)
- Shopfront design sheets (2020)

Consultations, Publicity and Representations

Neighbouring properties

The application has been advertised by individual neighbour letters to 8 properties. The consultation period expired on 4 August 2022. Additional consultations were sent out and a site notice was put up and these consultation periods expired 18 and 26 August 2022.

No letters of representation have been received.

Local Ward Councillors were also consulted and no responses were received.

Officer's Analysis

Proposal

This is a full application for the retention of the shop front and the re-positioning of the entrance to the first floor flat.

The shopfront has already been replaced by a UPVC unit providing a double access into the shop with a separate UPVC frame and door to provide access to the flat. A brick division is now proposed between the shopfront and the flat access, and the door to the flat would be recessed by 500mm.



Background

As set out in the Planning History above, application 20210464 was refused on 29 June 2021 for the following reason:

The poor design and materials of this retrospective shopfront, together with the loss of the remaining traditional bay features of the previous shopfront, and the lack of any resemblance to the adjoining traditional shopfronts at Nos. 42-44, are considered to significantly harm the character and appearance of the application building and the surrounding area. The proposal therefore fails to comply with the requirements of saved Policy TC9 of the Gravesham Local Plan 1994, Policy CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy 2014 and paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

The case went to appeal and was dismissed on 22 May 2022. The Inspector stated that “the detailed design of the replacement shopfront and its use of chunky glazing bars and white UPVC results in demonstrable harm to the appearance of the host building”, and also commented that the proposal “failed to take the opportunity to enhance the built environment”.

Previously, the main issue was the effect on the character and appearance of the area. This remains the same under the current revised proposal, which will be assessed in order to determine whether the previous concerns have been overcome.

Design, Character and Appearance

Section 12 of the NPPF 2021 relates to achieving well-designed places and sets out the Government’s requirements in relation to design issues. Paragraph 126 emphasises the importance of achieving high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities.

Paragraph 130 of the NPPF 2021 seeks to ensure that development will add to the quality of an area, be visually attractive, and sympathetic to local character and history. Policy CS19 of the Core Strategy 2014 reflects these aims and requires that new development is well designed and respects the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Specifically in relation to shopfronts, Policy TC9 of the Local Plan 1994 states that the Borough Council will resist developments that would result in existing shopfronts of traditional design and materials being lost, and that would result in the installation of security grills and shutters on the exterior of shopfronts.

As before, it is recognised that the previous shopfront at the application property was not particularly well designed and was at odds with the adjoining shopfronts on the adjoining units, Nos. 42-44, though it did retain some interest through the retention of a bay window element characteristic of the parade. However, this remaining vestige of interest was lost with the installation of the current flush shopfront, which continues to be of both poor design and materials.



Within the appeal decision for the previous proposal, the Inspector recognised that “there is a consistency to the design and appearance of the adjacent shop fronts... The scale and proportions of the glazing bars are also indicative that the neighbouring shopfront is of a more traditional design and appearance.” As the previous shopfront retained some traditional elements, saved Policy TC9 of the Local Plan 1994 is relevant; this seeks to resist development that would result in existing shopfronts of traditional design and materials being lost.

The Inspector stated that the detailed design of the replacement shopfront for the application property with chunky glazing and white UPVC contrasts starkly with the adjacent shop fronts, and “results in demonstrable harm to the appearance of the host building”. The scheme also failed “to recognise the character and appearance of the original building as a whole, which is still evident within the remainder of the terrace and as a result is detrimental to the wider area.”

The proposed change to the shopfront under the current application is very minor and essentially simply involves recessing the entrance door to the flat. This in no way reflects the previous and existing bay window elements found on the building. The overall design and materials of the shopfront are not proposed to be changed, and therefore the same concerns remain that were set out both within the previous refusal and within the appeal decision.

Whilst a minor change is proposed to the current shopfront, this once again completely fails to take advantage of the opportunity to enhance the building and the built environment. A well-designed replacement shopfront and flat access for this unit could be easily achieved here, reflective of the traditional design and appearance of the original building and taking into account the Council’s general principles of shopfront design set out in its supplementary planning guidance.

The proposal for the retention of the shopfront and recessed flat entrance remains contrary to the requirements of saved Policy TC9 of the Local Plan 1994 and Policy CS19 of the Core Strategy 2014, and therefore fails to overcome the previous reason for refusal or the Inspector’s subsequent concerns.

Conclusion and Recommendation

The poor design and materials of the proposed shopfront, together with the loss of the remaining traditional bay features of the previous shopfront, and the lack of any resemblance to the adjoining traditional shopfronts at Nos. 42-44, are considered to significantly harm the character and appearance of the application building and the surrounding area. The proposal therefore fails to comply with the requirements of saved Policy TC9 of the Gravesham Local Plan 1994, Policy CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy 2014 and paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.

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

Case Officer:	Mrs Katherine Parkin	Team Leader:	Miss Faye Hobbs
Signed:	<i>K. Parkin</i>	Signed:	
Dated:	30 August 2022	Dated:	31 August 2022