



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 April 2024

by L N Hughes BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th April 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/W4515/W/23/3328277

62 Percy Park, Tynemouth, North Tyneside NE30 4JX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Ian Harris against the decision of North Tyneside Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/00370/FULH.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion with dormer to front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Revised plans were submitted prior to the Council's decision, which amended the design of 2 pitched roof dormers to a single flat roof dormer¹. While the officer's report refers to the pitched roof version, as the flat roof version was before the Council at the time of its decision, this is the proposal on which I have based my decision. I have therefore altered the description of the dormer from a 'double dormer' as originally stated on the application form.
3. The National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework') was revised in December 2023. The content of the Framework has not been materially altered in respect of the main issues before me, and therefore it has not been necessary to go back to the parties in this regard.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the streetscene, with particular regard to the preservation or enhancement of the Tynemouth Village Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

5. The site comprises the end building of a long terrace of 3 storey dwellings, constructed around the late 1890s. The terrace forms a cohesive and repetitive group due to matching materials, projecting bays, decorative door surrounds, and stone dressings. It fronts the street and a triangular green also enclosed by surrounding terraces, and the appeal property's side elevation also borders Grand Parade and the seafront beyond. The proposal is for a front flat roof dormer hosting 3 windows, with zinc cladding and a zinc roof finish.
6. The site lies within the Tynemouth Village CA, and so I have a statutory duty under section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing

¹ Reference 08 Proposed Elevations 'Revision C – Window Style Changed'

its character or appearance. Section 16 of the Framework also requires great weight to be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets. Policy DM6.6 of the North Tyneside Local Plan (LP) (2017) aligns closely with this approach.

7. The CA is centred around its medieval settlement origins and the Tynemouth Priory and Castle, surrounded by the coast and the river and including large green open spaces. Its significance derives from the quality of its historical townscape, with its character largely resulting from the mid-18th, 19th, and 20th century residential terraces, and strongly influenced by its coastal location. As such, the appeal site and its terrace group therefore make a positive contribution to the character and significance of the CA.
8. New dormers are not specifically prohibited by the development plan. However, the Tynemouth Village CA Management Strategy Supplementary Planning Document (CAMS SPD) (2014) states that dormers that are obtrusive both in scale and detailing, with flat roofs that run the whole length of the property, greatly detract from the architectural character and unity of terrace buildings. The LP Policy DM6.2 also identifies that extensions should complement the form and character of the original building.
9. The overriding characteristic for the style and form of the Percy Park roofline is a broadly cohesive extent of traditional roof slope. The proposed dormer would be dropped from the ridge and up from the eaves, with windows aligning with those on the lower floors. However, it would be relatively large and in modern materials, and would not relate to the building's traditional form. Its massing would dominate and unbalance the overall roof plane. As the end terrace, this is of particular importance due to its prominence from multiple directions and from some distance, including along the seafront. As such, the proposal would be incongruous and disrupt the continuity and balance of the terrace, and so cause harm to the strong traditional character of the street and the CA.
10. The terrace does already include several front dormers of varying styles. However, the box dormers do not indicate to me that further such departures should be encouraged. Furthermore, the circumstances of when or whether all of these gained permission have not been set out. The other dwellings also have slightly less prominence than that of the appeal site.
11. The proposal would not minimise the impact of the existing dormers, but would cumulatively add to this. The CAMS SPD also identifies that existing large box dormers that dominate the roofscape must not set a precedent or be a design cue. The presence of other dormers therefore does not set a precedent in this instance. Support from interested parties also does not indicate a lack of harm.
12. Overall, the proposed dormer would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the CA as a designated heritage asset. I give great weight to this harm, as advised by the Framework paragraph 205. Paragraph 208 advises that less than substantial harm to a designated heritage asset should be weighed against the proposal's public benefits. The identified public benefits are increased economic vitality from construction, and improving energy efficiency and insulation. However, construction would be very small-scale and only temporary. Energy efficiency would be both primarily a private benefit, and also very small-scale. Therefore, the harm would not be outweighed by these benefits.

13. Overall, the proposed development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the streetscene and to the preservation of the Tynemouth CA. It would conflict with the LP Policies DM6.1, DM6.2, and DM6.6, which amongst other matters, identify that extensions should have high design standards, and be responsive to and complement the form and character of the original building. They also require conservation of built fabric and architectural detailing that contributes to the significance and character of heritage assets.
14. The proposal would also conflict with the Tynemouth Village CAMS SPD as outlined above, and with the Design Quality Supplementary Planning Document (2018). This identifies that dormer windows should take into account the design of the dwelling and character of the area, appear visually subordinate and avoid a top heavy design, and retain the majority of the original roof shape. The proposal would also conflict with the need to achieve well-designed places as set by the Framework paragraph 135, and its section 16 on conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

Other Matters

15. Although the proposal would provide additional space for the dwelling's occupants, this is only a minor private benefit, which would not outweigh the harm. While the appellant suggests support from paragraph 203 of the Framework², the building is already conserved and in a viable use, and I have found that the proposal would not make a positive contribution to local character. I do acknowledge support from the Framework and from the LP Policy S1.4 for 'the most' effective and efficient use of available land, and for the presumption in favour of sustainable development. However, this also would not outweigh the conflict with the Framework and the development plan when read as a whole.

Conclusion

16. In conclusion therefore, the development conflicts with the development plan as a whole. With no other material considerations outweighing this conflict, for the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

L N Hughes

INSPECTOR

² Framework paragraph 197 in the 2021 version referenced by the appellant.