
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 August 2025

by **C Livingstone MA(SocSci) (hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W4515/W/25/3367106

Flat 3, 6 Percy Gardens, Tynemouth, North Tyneside NE30 4HG

- 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 Ms Amanda Clarke against the decision of North Tyneside Council.
- The application Ref is 25/00108/FUL.
- The development proposed is alterations to form a new dormer to the front roof pitch and form new bedroom spaces.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property, including whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Tynemouth Conservation Area (TCA).

Reasons

3. The TCA includes the historic core of Tynemouth, Northumberland Park and the seafront which overlooks King Edwards Bay. The significance of the TCA is defined in part by its historical evolution which is evident in its high quality architecture and the remains of Tynemouth Priory and Castle which dates from the 7th Century. Percy Gardens is an attractive row of dwellings positioned on a prominent private crescent facing the seafront. These dwellings are unified in their scale and general massing but are varied in terms of design and architectural detailing.
4. The dwellings on the northern end of the crescent date from the Victorian period and include fine detailing and decorative stonework. The majority of these buildings have dormer windows, some are modest and traditional in appearance, while some are large box dormers and relatively contemporary. The Tynemouth Village Conservation Area Management Strategy Supplementary Planning Document 2014 (SPD) notes that 'subsequent insertion of dormers that are both obtrusive both in scale and detailing' detract from the architectural unity.
5. At the southern end of Percy Gardens Nos 1-6 form a terrace and reflect the southern end of the crescent in terms of design and decorative stonework. However, Priory Court neighbours Nos 1-6 and is a later addition to the crescent with a flat roof and a simple contemporary design. The contrasting design of Priory Court creates a visual separation between Nos 1-6 and the rest of the crescent. Further, as they do not have dormers on their front elevations, Nos 1-6 appear relatively unaltered. As such, the host property, along with the terrace that it forms

part of, is a well preserved example of high quality architecture and in light of this makes a positive contribution to the significance of the TCA.

6. The proposal is for the erection of a dormer extension on the front roof plane. The dormer would extend from almost the entire width of the building and would have a double pitched roof. The materials proposed include slate to match the existing roof and dark grey UPVC windows are proposed with the aim that they are recessive. However, while the pitched roofs on the dormer mimic examples of original dormers in the area to a degree, its scale and design does not reflect the modest proportions and fine detailing of traditional dormer windows.
7. The development would result in the erosion of an example of unaltered, high quality architecture within the TCA and as such would harm the character, appearance and significance of the TCA as a whole. Paragraph 208 of the Framework explains that where, as I find in this case, the harm to the significance of the TCA would be less than substantial, that harm should be weighed against the public benefits. The proposed development would provide improved living conditions for the occupants of the host property; there may also be economic benefits associated with construction. However, any specific public benefits there may be in this case, would be insufficient to outweigh the great weight I must attach to the harm I have identified to the designated heritage asset.
8. For the reasons detailed above the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property, and it would fail to preserve or enhance the character of appearance of the TCA. Therefore, it conflicts with Policies S6.5, DM6.1 and DM6.6 of the North Tyneside Local Plan, 2017 which requires that development respects the significance of heritage assets; demonstrates a positive relationship to neighbouring buildings and spaces; and conserves built fabric and architectural detailing that contributes to the heritage assets significance and character.
9. The development is also contrary to the aims of the SPD which requires, amongst other things, that developments conserve and enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Other Matters

10. My attention has been drawn to examples of dormer extensions in the area, including at 34C and 51 Percy Gardens. Both of these properties are at the northern end of the terrace where dormer extensions are more prevalent and not within the immediate area of the host property; which as detailed above is part of a terrace where none of the buildings have dormer windows on their front elevations. Further, while I do not have full details of the background to all of these examples, some of them serve to confirm the harm that alterations of inappropriate design and materials can have. They do not justify allowing further harm to be caused. I have in any event determined the appeal on its own individual planning merits.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

C Livingstone

INSPECTOR