
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 October 2016

by Philip Lewis BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 08 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/W4515/W/16/3153395

**Marlborough House, Holywell Avenue, Whitley Bay, Tyne and Wear
NE46 3AH**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr David Shaun Brannen, Brannen & Partners for Marlborough House Maintenance (Monkseaton) Ltd against the decision of North Tyneside Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/00534/FUL, dated 24 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 24 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as to replace the existing wooden bargeboards and fascia boards surrounding the dormer windows to the front elevation with uPVC boards.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted to replace the existing wooden bargeboards and fascia boards surrounding the dormer windows to the front elevation with uPVC boards at Marlborough House, Holywell Avenue, Whitley Bay, Tyne and Wear NE46 3AH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/00534/FUL, dated 24 March 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: location plan; No BP/12/03/02; No BP/12/03/03; No BP/12/03/08 and No BP/12/03/09.

Procedural matters

2. I have taken the site postcode from the appeal form. The name of the appellant was clarified during the course of the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue for the appeal is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Monkseaton Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal proposal relates to Marlborough House which is situated on Holywell Avenue within the extensive Monkseaton Conservation Area. I saw at my site
-

visit that the Conservation Area has a mixed character, with extensive areas of semi-detached housing with some uniformity in design and appearance, areas of open space and commercial properties.

5. Marlborough House is a block of flats which I understand was constructed in about 1985, prior to the designation of the Conservation Area. Through its broad linear form, Marlborough House does not follow the established grain of the Conservation Area and whilst it reflects design elements found in the wider Conservation Area, such as through the use of bay windows and gables, I consider that it is clearly read as a modern addition and makes a neutral contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
6. The building includes three prominent wide dormers to the front, which have relatively large expanses of white coloured fascia. I do not consider these to be typical of the dormer windows found on buildings elsewhere on Holywell Avenue in terms of their size and appearance. I observed at my site visit that a significant number of windows in the front elevation of Marlborough House have been replaced in white uPVC. Whilst I concur with the Monkseaton Conservation Area Character Appraisal, in that the character and appearance of conservation areas can be derived from a range of factors including materials, I consider that although uPVC is not a traditional construction material, its present use in a number of window frames on this building of a late 20th century design does not appear incongruous.
7. In the above context, and having noted the relevant planning history, I consider that the cladding of the dormers and other fascias proposed in uPVC would not unduly affect the appearance of this modern building and would not be harmful to the host building or to the Conservation Area as a whole. Although the dormers have relatively large and prominent fascias, I do not consider that the extent of uPVC material would appear excessive on this particular building nor give rise to harm to the area in terms of increasing the prominence of its use, given that Marlborough House is a modern development and is not typical of the established urban grain or design and appearance of buildings in the Conservation Area.
8. I have had regard to the requirement set out in Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act) 1990 that special attention be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area and the need to give considerable importance and weight to any harm found. However, in this case, I find that replacing the fascias on this modern building with uPVC would have a neutral effect in terms of the appearance of the building and Conservation Area and to the character of both and therefore, would preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Monkseaton Conservation Area.
9. The appeal proposal accords with North Tyneside Council Unitary Development Plan 2002 saved Policy E16/2 which is concerned with preserving or enhancing the character and appearance, or setting of a conservation area, including through consideration being given to materials. It also accords with North Tyneside Council Development Control Policy Statement No.8 which is concerned with development within conservation areas.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above and having considered all matters raised, I consider that the appeal should be allowed.

Philip Lewis

INSPECTOR