



Delegated Report

Householder and Listed Building Consent Applications

Planning Application No: 20240536
20240537

Location: St Katherines Forge Lane Shorne Gravesend

Description: 20240536 - Demolition of existing conservatory and erection of a single storey side extension and terrace.

20240537 - Application for Listed Building Consent for the demolition of existing conservatory and erection of a single storey side extension and terrace.

Applicant: Mrs Kate Garner

Site Visit Date: 21 November 2023 for pre-application enquiry

Submitted Documents/Plans

- Application form;
- Location Plan;
- Drawing no. D-01 Rev. A – Block Plan, Site Location Plan As Existing;
- Drawing no. D-02 Rev. A – Ground Floor Plan Survey As Existing;
- Drawing no. D-03 – First Floor Plan Survey As Existing;
- Drawing no. D-04 Rev. A – Ground Floor Plan As Existing;
- Drawing no. D-05 Rev. A – First Floor Plan and Sections Survey As Existing;
- Drawing no. D-06 Rev. A – Roof Plan and End Elevations Survey As Existing;
- Drawing no. D-07 Rev. A – East and West Elevations As Existing;
- Drawing no. D-08 Rev. B – Ground Floor Plan As Proposed;
- Drawing no. D-09 Rev. B – East and West Elevations As Proposed;
- Drawing no. D-10 Rev. B – Roof Plan South and North Elevations As Proposed;
- Drawing no. D-11 – Block Plan, Site Location Plan As Proposed;
- Design & Access Statement; and
- Heritage Statement.

Relevant Planning History

Reference	Description	Decision	Decision Date
20200013	Open outdoor swimming pool with small detached building for plant & services for the pool.	Refused	03.03.2020
20200014	Application for Listed Building Consent for the construction of an outdoor swimming pool with small detached building for plant & services for the pool.	Refused	03.03.2020
19960714	Erection of a conservatory on the north elevation.	Permitted	02.12.1996
19960715	Application for Listed Building consent for the erection of a conservatory on the north elevation, involving relocation of door by bricking up existing external kitchen door and	Permitted	02.12.1996

	formation of new door from existing window; internal alterations and construction of external steps and patio area.		
19960585	Erection of a conservatory on the north elevation.	Withdrawn	22.08.1996
19960586	Application for Listed Building Consent for the erection of a conservatory on the north elevation.	Withdrawn	30.08.1996
19850036	Erection of a front porch	Refused	19.07.1985
19850037	Application for Listed Building Consent for for the erection of a front porch	Withdrawn	21.08.1985
19781090	Incorporating Listed Building Consent Demolition of an existing porch and one existing chimney stack and for the erection of a private garage together with internal alterations	Permitted	01.08.1979
19780284	Change of use from a residential home for nuns to a private dwelling house	Permitted	17.05.1978

Prior to submitting these planning and listed building consent applications the applicant submitted a pre-application enquiry for a replacement extension and terrace.

Development Plan

Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (September 2014):

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

Gravesham Local Plan: First Review (1994)

- P3 – Vehicle Parking Standards
- C13 – Extensions to Dwellinghouses in the Countryside
- TC2 – Listed Buildings
- TC3 – Development Affecting Conservation Areas

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

- SPG2 – Residential Layout Guidelines (2020).
- SPG4 – KCC Parking Standards (2006).
- Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide (2021)
- Technical Housing Standards – nationally described space standard (2015);
- Landscape Character Assessment (2009);
- Shorne Rural Conservation Area Appraisal Supplementary Planning Document (2017)
- Management Plan Rural Conservation Area Appraisals Supplementary Planning Document (2016)
- Listed Building A Guide for owners and occupiers Informal Guidance (2020)

Consultations, Publicity and Representations

Consultees

GBC Conservation Officer

This proposal is certainly preferable to the previous ones in terms of scale and location. I would advise that the eaves detail of the proposed roof lacks finesse and appears rather crude and bulky. The use of a pressed metal header band in particular appears heavy and bulky and the lack of detail on the quality of

materials for the glazed walls contributes to a potentially poor appearance. A lead standing seam roof supported on oak frame and oak glazed walls would offer a more appropriate material palette than metal and unspecified timber support post. It would be advisable to have a large scale cross section and plan of the proposal showing the detail construction and this really needs to be submitted prior to considering granting consent to avoid a poorly executed extension.

Shorne Parish Council

The Parish Council has no objection in principle to this application provided that the design and all materials used are compatible with the historic nature of the Grade II listed existing building.

The proposal removes the existing conservatory addition and replaces it with a larger formal, mansard roofed (lead) extension. The upper terrace is also enlarged.

The glazing design could preferably be made more compatible with the existing window designs, by having smaller panes.

Neighbouring properties

20240536 - 6 surrounding properties were consulted plus site and press notices – overall consultation expiry date was 26.07.2024 – no responses received.

20240537 – Advertised by way of site and press notices – overall consultation expiry date was 26.07.2024 – no responses received.

Officer's Analysis

The application site consists of a two storey detached dwelling situated on the western side of Forge Lane. The property is a grade II listed building situated in the Shorne Village Conservation Area, in the Green Belt, in Higham Arable Farmlands Landscape Character Area and in an Area of Archaeological Potential. The main dwelling is highlighted in the image below:



The proposal seeks planning permission and listed building consent for the demolition of the existing conservatory and erection of a single storey side extension and terrace.

The below images show the existing and proposed development:

Existing

Proposed



EAST ELEVATION - FRONT



WEST ELEVATION - SIDE



SOUTH ELEVATION



NORTH ELEVATION



Planning permission and listed building consent would be required for the proposed development.

The principle issues for consideration with this pre-application proposal are as follows:

- Principle of Development in the Green Belt
- Impact on Openness
- Landscape Character

- Design and Heritage
- Amenity of Occupiers and Neighbouring Amenity
- Parking and Highway Safety

Principle of Development in the Green Belt

The site lies within the Metropolitan Green Belt. Paragraph 142 of the NPPF (2023) states that the government attaches great importance to Green Belts and that the fundamental aim of Green Belt policies is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open with their essential characteristics being their openness and permanence. Paragraph 143 of the NPPF (2023) sets out that the Green Belt has five purposes:

- to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
- to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
- to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

Paragraph 152 of the NPPF (2023) sets out that 'inappropriate development' is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Paragraph 153 of the NPPF (2023) advises 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 the construction of new buildings should be regarded as inappropriate development in the Green Belt, but lists certain exceptions which 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 Local 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
 - 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 an area of the local planning authority

Of relevance to the proposal is (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

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.

St Katherines dates from the mid 19th century and was extended in the 1960s but the original building will be as permitted under application reference 19780284 when change of use was granted from a residential home for nuns to a private dwelling house. Since that date the only extension to the property appears to be the conservatory permitted under application references 19960714 and 19960715. The original floorspace is therefore as the existing floorspace but minus the conservatory which is to be demolished.

Floorspace calculations

Original Dwelling

Ground floor original floorspace – 235.3 sq.m
First floor original floorspace – 222.4 sq. m
Second floor original floorspace – 15.5 sq. m
Third floor original floorspace – 15.5 sq. m
Total floorspace of original dwelling = 488.7 sq. m4

Existing extensions

Conservatory but this is to be removed under the proposal so will not be counted as an existing extension.

Proposed extension (which would be built on site of existing conservatory)

Proposed extension = 19.98 sq. m

Total percentage increase of dwelling over original (19.98 divided by 488.7 x 100) = **4%**

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 4% which is much less than the one third (33%) limit set out in saved Policy C13 (LPFR).

As well as floorspace there are other factors which play a part in assessing whether a proposal is a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building which will include its footprint, floorspace and volume compared to the original building and whether its scale, massing and height is subservient to the original building. It is noted that the proposed extension would be the same depth as the existing conservatory with its corners squared off rather than angled ends that the current conservatory has and it would be slightly wider (the existing conservatory is 3.6m in width and the proposed conservatory would be 4.2m in width) however, the extension is still modest in footprint, width and depth. In terms of volume, it can be seen from the above existing and proposed images that the proposal would add a slight increase in volume to the dwelling but nothing which would affect the overall dwelling. The proposal in respect of floorspace, width, depth, footprint would be modest and only be slightly wider with squared corners than the existing conservatory. Overall it is considered based on all factors the proposed extension would not result in a disproportionate addition in comparison to the main building.

The existing terrace is 2.4m in depth from the end of the conservatory and 3.6m in width. The proposed terrace would be 3.8m in depth from the end of the extension and 6.5m in width. It would therefore be 1.4m greater in depth and 2.9m greater in width. The existing walls around the terrace range in height from 1.3m to 1.48m. The proposed terrace would have new flint walls with railings which would range in height from 1.2m to 1.5m (1.97m to 2m including the railings). The proposed terrace would be deeper and wider than the existing terrace but this is not considered to be a by a significant degree to constitute a disproportionate addition. The walls would essentially be the same height as the existing wall more or less. The railings would increase the height more than the existing but they would be an open feature and of modest height on top of the wall. Overall it is considered that the proposed terrace would also not constitute a disproportionate addition to the host building.

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).

Impact on Openness

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. It also states that the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and permanence. Paragraph 001 of the Planning Practice Guidance (2019) on Green Belts looks to assess the impact of a proposal on the openness of the Green Belt by taking into account the spatial and visual aspects of a development, its duration and remediability, and the activity levels generated.

The proposed extension would replace an existing conservatory of which it would be slightly wider than the existing conservatory and with squared corners rather than the slanted corners on the current extension. The proposed terrace would be slightly deeper and wider than the existing terrace. However, overall it is considered that the increase in the size of the proposed extension and terrace would be modest and 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.

Landscape Character

Policy CS12 (LPCS) states that the overall landscape character of the Borough will be conserved, restored and enhanced and that the Gravesham Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) will be taken into account in determining applications. Paragraph 180 of the NPPF (2023) seeks to protect and enhance such valued landscapes.

The site is located in the countryside and consists of a large detached dwelling in a spacious plot with a large amount of land particularly to the north. The site is located in the Higham Arable Farmlands Landscape Character Area. One of the main guidelines for the Higham Arable Farmlands Landscape Character Area is to safeguard the landscape, and in particular resist proposals that introduce extensive or obtrusive elements within visually sensitive areas of the open landscape.

The proposed extension would be built on the site of the existing conservatory which is to be demolished and the upper terrace would be in place where the existing terrace is. The proposed extension would be slightly wider and with a greater footprint and the proposed terrace would be deeper and wider. However, it is considered that they 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).

Design and Heritage

Policy CS19 (LPCS) states that new development will conserve and enhance the character of the local built, historic and natural environment, integrate well with the surrounding local area. Policy CS20 (LPCS) states that the Council will accord a high priority towards the preservation, protection and enhancement of its heritage and historic environment as a non-renewable resource, central to the regeneration of the area and the reinforcement of sense of place. Proposals and initiatives will be supported which preserve and, where appropriate, enhance the significance of the Borough's heritage assets, their setting where it contributes to the significance of the asset and their interpretation and enjoyment, especially where these contribute to the distinct identity of the Borough. These include amongst others the Borough's urban and rural conservation areas.

Saved Policy TC2 (LPFR) states that development involving alterations or extensions to listed buildings or affecting the setting of listed buildings, the primary consideration of the Council will be the maintenance of the integrity of the original listed building. Proposals will also need to be sympathetic to the listed building in terms of massing, scale, appearance and materials. Saved Policy TC3 (LPFR) states that development will be carefully judged for its impact and will be expected to make a positive contribution to the conservation area.

The national planning policy on heritage is set out in section 16 of the NPPF (2023). Paragraph 200 states that in determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. Paragraph 201 states that local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise and that this should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal. Paragraph 203 states that in determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets. Paragraph 205 of the NPPF (2023) states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.

St Katherines is a grade II listed mid-19th century dwelling with later extensions set within a large garden. The Chapel of St Katherines to the west originates from the 14th century with parts also dating from the 15th century and is grade II listed and Little St Katherines to the north-east is grade II* listed. St Katherines is situated within the Shorne Conservation Area. The Shorne Conservation Area Appraisal states that the grouping of buildings around St Katherines Chapel comprises a number of relatively large-scale, high quality and high status individual buildings of different dates, to either side of the road and that these stand in landscaped grounds with good boundary walls and numbers of mature and beautiful trees, all this contributing to an atmosphere of understated wellbeing.

The garden of St Katherines to the north of the dwelling is laid to lawn with levels lowering down and mature trees and shrubs along the western boundary. The NPPF (2023) Glossary confirms that setting is the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced.

The proposal includes replacing the existing conservatory on the north elevation with an extension which would be slightly greater width and footprint and the terrace would be increased in depth and width.

The existing conservatory was built in the late 1990's by the then owner. The existing conservatory was carefully sized to fit within the extended part of the main house and did not encroach onto the original building. The external wall of the extension was left un-plastered when the conservatory was built to allow for its easy removal, making it a reversible alteration. The proposed extension is slightly wider than the existing conservatory but this would be fairly modest and there would only be a small slight encroachment onto the original part of the building at eaves level. There would still be a sufficient distance between the extension to the gothic window in the north elevation at ground floor level such that the extension would respect that original part of the building and window.

The Conservation Officer raises no actual objections to the proposed extension but advises that the eaves detail of the proposed roof lacks finesse, appears rather crude and bulky, that the use of a pressed metal header band in particular appears heavy and bulky and the lack of detail on the quality of materials for the glazed walls contributes to a potentially poor appearance. The Conservation Officer advises that a lead standing seam roof supported on oak frame and oak glazed walls would offer a more appropriate material palette than metal and unspecified timber support posts. They also state that it would be advisable to have a large scale cross section and plan of the proposal showing the detail construction and that this really needs to be submitted prior to considering granting consent to avoid a poorly executed extension.

It is considered that as the Conservation Officer has no objections to the extension in itself that the matters of the eaves detail, materials and cross-section and plan showing the detailed construction of the extension could be conditioned. Subject to such conditions and the discharge of acceptable details it is considered that the proposed extension would protect the significance of this grade II listed building and would not harm but would preserve the character or appearance of the Shorne Conservation Area.

The Conservation Officer has no objections to the extended terrace and subject to conditions on materials and railing detail then it is considered it would protect the significance of this grade II listed building and would not harm but would preserve the character or appearance of the Shorne Conservation Area.

As such in respect of design and heritage the proposal is compliant with Policies CS19 and CS20 (LPCS), saved Policies TC2 and TC3 (LPFR) and sections 12 and 16 of the NPPF (2023).

Amenity of Occupiers

The NPPF (2023) states that planning decisions should aim to secure a high standard of amenity for all existing and future users (paragraph 130f). Policy CS19 (LPCS) states that new development should be located, designed and constructed to safeguard the amenity, including privacy, daylight and sunlight, of its occupants, and those of neighbouring properties and land.

In respect of garden area and rear garden depth SPG2 (2020) sets out the minimum sizes. The property would retain a garden area and rear garden depth that would far exceed the minimum standard.

As such in respect of the amenity of occupiers the proposal is compliant with Policy CS19 (LPCS).

Neighbouring Amenity

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

Parking and Highway Safety

The proposal does not involve the creation of any bedrooms or alter the existing vehicular access or parking provision; as such there would be no impact on parking or highway safety and in this regard the proposal would be compliant with saved Policy P3 (LPCS).

Archaeology

The site is located in an area of Archaeological Potential but given that the proposed extension and terrace would be on the site of the existing extension and terrace it is considered that the proposal is unlikely to have a significant below-ground archaeological impact. In respect of archaeology the proposal is therefore considered compliant with saved Policy TC7 (LPFR).

Any Other Material Planning Considerations

None.

Conclusion & Recommendation

The proposal, subject to conditions, is considered acceptable as it would not constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt, would not impact on the openness of the Green Belt, would not impact on landscape character, would protect the architectural and historic interest of this listed building and the character and appearance of the Shorne Conservation Area which would be preserved, would not harm occupier or neighbouring amenity and would not impact on parking or highway safety or archaeology.

Recommendation:

20240536 – Permission

20240537 – Permission

(For detailed conditions and informatives, see draft Decision)

Case Officer:	Ms Rebecca Harrison	Team Leader:	Richard Hart
Signed:	<i>Rebecca Harrison</i>	Signed:	<i>R Hart</i>
Dated:	8th August 2024	Dated:	9th August 2024