



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 December 2021

by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

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

Decision date: 28 January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/R4408/D/21/3281775

4 Meyrick Drive, Darton, Barnsley S75 5PL

- 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 & Mrs Lee Horbury against the decision of Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2021/0567, dated 16 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 09 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is: Proposed front dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development given on the application form was 'proposed front dormers' and the appellant's appeal statement confirms that 'the application the subject to this appeal was for the construction of two dormer windows to the front facing roof slope'. However, the proposed plans also depict a rear dormer which is not currently in situ and the Council altered the description of proposed development on the decision notice to 'Dormers to roof'. The delegated officer report identifies that the Council considered the rear dormer to form part of the proposal.
3. It is not clear if the Council unilaterally changed the description or if there was any correspondence with the appellant over the matter, as is required. Notwithstanding the fact that a rear dormer is also depicted on the drawings, it seems clear that the application sought permission for the front dormers only and I have proceeded on that basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area

Reasons

5. The appeal property is situated within a row of chalet style bungalows at Meyrick Drive which appear to have been designed with an upper floor room, presently served by side facing windows in the gable end. The property is within a run of three matching pairs of semi-detached dwellings and three similarly matching semi-detached dwellings of the same design sit on the

opposite side of the street. That symmetry forms a pleasing part of the streetscape. The sweeping rooflines of the dwellings gradually step down in height as one moves along the street and are a prominent feature, punctuated only by the regularly spaced chimney stacks which provide a regular rhythm. Aside from a single velux rooflight the frontages appear to be unaltered and the consistency in design and pleasing symmetry enhance the character of the area.

6. The proposed front dormers would disrupt that uniformity and add clutter to the prominent roofline and would appear as an incongruous addition given the hitherto unaltered design. I recognise that an attempt has been made to design the dormers sensitively, through the use of pitched roofs, setting in the dormers from the eaves and sides of the property, and alignment to match the fenestration at ground floor level. Nonetheless, those measures would not overcome the jarring impact when set against the pleasing consistency of the front elevations of the bungalows when seen from public vantage points in the street.
7. Whilst dormer windows are present on properties further down Meyrick Drive, there is a distinct change in character between the older bungalows and more modern 'mock Tudor' properties in the cul-de-sac at that end of the street. The Council's House Extensions and Other Alterations Supplementary Planning Guidance (2019) states that to assess whether dormer windows will be appropriate on the front or principal elevation the roofs of surrounding buildings should be examined. Whilst dormers are present in the modern development at the end of the cul-de-sac, they are notably absent from the run of bungalows of which the appeal site forms a part. Architecturally and visually, the appeal site undoubtedly relates to the surrounding bungalows rather than the modern estate. The two parts of the street have very separate and distinct characteristics and do not read as one entity. Having regard to the distinct design of the bungalows the proposal would represent an alien and harmful addition. The fact that the Council approved dormer windows elsewhere in different contexts, as in the examples referred to by the appellant, does not alter my conclusion in that regard.
8. In view of the above the proposal would represent poor design that would fail to reflect local character, contrary to the aims of policy D1 of the Barnsley Local Plan (2019) and the design related aims of the National Planning Policy Framework, particularly paragraph 130(c) which requires new development to be sympathetic to local character and the surrounding built environment.
9. For those reasons and having regard to all other matters raised, I shall dismiss the appeal.

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR