



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 September 2018

by J D Westbrook BSc(hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28th September 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/R4408/D/18/3207807

15 Darton Hall Drive, Darton, Barnsley, S75 5AG

- 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 and Mrs M Kelitt against the decision of Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2018/0630, dated 21 May 2018, was refused by notice dated 2 July 2018.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a detached single-storey granny annexe.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed annexe on the character and appearance of the area around Darton Hall Drive.

Reasons

3. No 15 is a semi-detached dwelling situated on a corner plot on Darton Hall Drive. It is aligned approximately east-west on its site, whilst the adjacent No 11 is set at right angles, such that there is a large portion of land around these corner plots that is occupied by garden and garages serving the two dwellings. No 15 has a flat-roofed detached garage with access from the side boundary of the property. It also has a parking area to the side of the garage and a further vehicular access with parking area to the front of the property. In common with other dwellings along this part of the road, it has a small front dormer window and, in addition, it has a larger rear dormer window.
4. The proposed development would involve the demolition of the existing detached garage and the erection in its place, and on a larger footprint, of a detached granny annexe. The annexe would be around 8 metres deep and 5.8 metres wide with a hipped roof at its southern end and a gable end to the north, facing the side elevation of the bungalow. It would be some 2.4 metres high to the eaves and 4.4 metres high to the roof ridge.
5. The Council contends that the proposed annexe would be contrary to its Core Strategy (CS) Policy CSP 29 and Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 'House extensions', in that its size would appear as an unduly discordant feature in the street scene to the detriment of visual amenity. Policy CSP29 sets overarching design principles for the borough to ensure that development is appropriate to its context. The SPD indicates that an

annexe building may be permitted in a rear garden where it would not occupy a disproportionate amount of the garden and would not have its own separate access or garden area. An annex should normally have a close physical relationship with the host dwelling, be single storey and in all circumstances it should only have 1 bedroom and no more than 3 rooms in total.

6. The appellants contend that the proposed annexe is needed for an elderly relative and is of the minimum size necessary to enable that relative to have a degree of independence. Furthermore, it has been designed to fit in with the basic design and materials used in the main dwelling. Finally, the appellants contend that the annexe would comply with the requirements of the SPD, with the exception of its location to the side of the dwelling and not in the rear garden.
7. I have sympathy with the appellants' desire to have their relative living in close proximity yet with a degree of independence. I also acknowledge that the rear garden of the dwelling is configured in such a way to make the provision of a suitable annexe difficult. However, the appearance of the area round Darton Hall Drive and Darton Hall Close is one of a relatively open residential estate. Moreover, corner plots such as that occupied by the appeal property and No 11, along with a similar plot between No 8 and No 2 Darton Hall Close, are characterised by a large expanse of curtilage occupied only by gardens and small, low garage buildings which maintain the sense of openness.
8. In this case, the small garage at the appeal property would be replaced with a much larger building that would have a footprint over twice the size, and that would be around twice the existing height to ridge level. Moreover, it would appear that the annexe would have a footprint around 70% the size of the existing main dwelling. For this reason, I consider that the proposed annexe would be of such a scale and location that it would be a discordant feature on this prominent corner plot, and that it would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. It would not appear subservient to the existing dwelling and would be out of context with its surroundings.
9. On the basis of the above, the proposed annexe would fail to comply with the provisions of Policy CSP29 which requires that development should contribute towards creating an attractive neighbourhood. Furthermore, whilst accepting the limitations of the site, it would not be sited in the rear garden and therefore conflicts with the requirements of the SPD.
10. In coming to this conclusion, I acknowledge that there are elements of the design of the proposed annexe that might be considered an improvement on the existing flat-roofed garage. However, this does not compensate for the harmful impact that the overall scale and location of the building would have on the character and appearance of its surroundings.

Other Matter

11. The Council also contends that the detached outbuilding does not constitute an annexe that would be ancillary accommodation to the host dwelling due to its location, disproportionate size, the number and type of rooms to facilitate independent living, and the provision of separate access

and parking. However, with the exception of its location outside of the rear garden it would appear to conform to all other requirements of the SPD for a “granny annexe”, in that it would be in close relationship to the existing dwelling; it would not have its own separate access and parking arrangements, and it would have only 3 rooms in total. However, by virtue of its location, not in the rear garden but in a prominent position on this corner plot, together with its discordant scale in relation to the main dwelling, in this case it is harmful to the character and appearance of its immediate surroundings, as discussed above.

Conclusion

12. The proposed annexe, by virtue of its scale and location, would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area around Darton Hall Drive, and would conflict with Policy CSP1 of the CS and with the requirements of the SPD. I therefore dismiss this appeal.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR