

Response to Conservation Officer's Comments

18/08/2022

1) Removal of the basement staircase

Comment: - The staircase is in its original position and forms part of the historic layout of the plan form. Its removal will harm the significance of the listed building.

Response: The staircase will be retained.

2) Removal of the second floor ceiling to create a mezzanine with ladder stair access.

Comment: - The ceiling forms part of the historic fabric of the listed building. Its alteration and removal will harm the significance of the listed building.

Response: The gallery has been removed from the planning submission.

3) Insertion of ensembles and kitchens

Comment: - It is not clear from the drawings if partitions are full height for the proposed ground floor kitchen. There is no door between the ground floor bedroom and kitchen/living area. The location of the ensuite in the original hall area will alter the plan form causing harm to the significance of the listed building.

Response: The partition is not full height as it is not in the position of the original dividing wall between front and rear rooms. The unit is therefore a studio flat.

The bathroom has been moved from the hall area as requested.

4) Creation of rear light well

Comment: - Acceptable subject to detail design

5) Opening up of the front forecourt to create an external basement access

Comment: - The drawings do not reflect the original forecourt layout, which has now been revealed next door. These need revising to match the original stair access to the basement.

Response: The revised front entrance shows reinstatement of the original door in the bay, as the owner of 195 Parrock Street described what he found on excavation. This will be revised if excavation shows 196 to be different.

6) Installation of front boundary railings on a low wall

Comment: - These do not reflect an appropriate design, adopting modern mild steel railing sections on a wall that is too high. (See Caxtons, 48 Windmill Street for acceptable railing design and wall height)

Response: we have reduced the wall height as requested. We have not changed the design of the railings yet. Please let us know what information is available on the original railing design. The spear head design on a round pole was submitted because it appears to be a common feature of older buildings in Gravesend. Are the product codes and manufacturers details of the railings to Caxtons available?

7) Location of wheelie bins in the front forecourt area

Comment: - These are poorly located and screened on the front of the building, causing harm to the setting of the listed building.

Response: It turns out that we have more land to the rear of the building than we originally understood. Accordingly we have moved the wheelie bins to the rear.

8) Window and door alterations/replacement/re-hanging

Comment: - Drawing PS 033 is diagrammatic and lacks detail. The joinery for the bowed window frame should be curved and not segmental.

Response: The current understanding of the original bay at basement level judging by what was found at 195 is that it is mostly brick, although most of this has been removed at 195. There was a door in the centre with brick piers either side, slender glass panes either side of the piers, beginning approximately 400mm from ground level and brick either side of the glass panes. This is shown on drawings PS 010 and PS 011. More precise details are expected to become evident on excavation, but drawing PS 033 is clearly redundant. The original curved brickwork will be retained, indeed if possible all of the original brickwork.