



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 August 2022

by Mr Cullum Parker BA(Hons) PGCert MA MRTPI MCMI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Z2260/Y/20/3255834

15 Princes Crescent, Margate, Kent CT9 1LY

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (PLBCA) against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Graham Ward against the decision of Thanet District Council.
 - The application Ref L/TH/19/1259, dated as received by the local planning authority on 6 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 22 January 2020.
 - The works proposed are described as *'This submission for retrospective listed building consent for the partial repair and repainting of front elevation and sash-window casements at the named property. This application arises as a result of unregistered planning application. Please see attached documentation in support of application for retrospective consent. Repairs to masonry & windows to halt water ingress to the property. No other building work or alterations to exterior are intended.'*
 - The decision notice describes the works as: *'Retrospective application for Listed building Consent for the re-painting of building and windows to front elevation.'*
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the works on the special interest of the Grade II listed building.

Reasons

3. The appeal building is a mid-terrace three storey with basement building. It dates from the early 19th Century and the listing notes that Number 14 to 19 consecutively form a group. The street scene, which includes part of the Margate Conservation Area, mainly comprises cream, off-white coloured, light colour shades, or unpainted brickwork buildings. In particular, the adjoining buildings on the terrace are painted white, light yellow and light blue; with white painted windows frames, surrounds and flat brick arches. The result collectively is that the area has a reasonable strong visual uniformity. In part, this contributes to the significance of the listed building.
4. The works for which consent are sought result in a dramatic and stark change in the external appearance of the building. The 'Suffolk pink'-like colour is striking when viewed against the lighter colour used in the rest of the terrace. The use of this colour has significantly detracted from the colour scheme of the wider area, and in particular the group value terrace of which the listed building is a part.

5. The Appellant's *Statement & Historic Building of Significance Report* indicates that it is a historic colour from a period earlier than the Georgian era. Furthermore, it is a colour more closely associated with Suffolk, where berries or goose blood were used to achieve the colour. This is a colour also associated with 'pargetting' which is a vernacular architectural detail typical of Suffolk. My attention has also been drawn to the fact that such a colour was used in a 16th Century property in Sandwich.
6. Nevertheless, the appeal building is located in Thanet, Kent, does not have any elaborately rendered patterns on its exterior walls, and dates from the early 19th Century. These historical facts and considerations do not in themselves provide justification for the use of the colour sought.
7. The window frames have been painted in a 'Knights Armor' colour, which is a dark grey. In itself, the colour is not inoffensive and similar shades can be found on other Georgian era buildings. However, in this case, the colour acts as a highly contrasting feature which detracts from the visual uniformity of the terrace, where white painted window frames are the prevailing architectural feature. The use of the 'Knights Armor' colour for the window frames further compounds the visual incongruity of the appeal building within the terrace and has a negative impact on the special interest of the listed building.
8. The Appellant points to other examples of colour changes within the local area; including at Trinity Square and Addington Street. I have not been provided with specific details of these buildings, whether they are specifically listed, the details of any such listing, the significance of those buildings, and/or whether consent or permission would be required for those buildings. I do not find that their colour changes justify those sought at the appeal building in terms of the exterior walls. The works therefore result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the listed building.
9. In the absence of any defined public benefits, I conclude that the works fail to preserve the special historic interest of the Grade II listed building as required by s16(2) of the PLBCA 1990, as amended, and fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Margate Conservation Area as required by s72(1) of the same Act. It would also fail to satisfy the requirements of Paragraphs 199 to 202 of the *National Planning Policy Framework*, which seek to give great weight to the conservation of designated heritage assets – which include Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas.
10. I note the correspondence in support of the proposal from members of the local community. However, this does not override the harm I have identified above to the listed building.
11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should fail and listed building consent is refused.

C Parker

INSPECTOR