



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 November 2022

by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/C1435/D/22/3297395

Trycot, Queens Road, Crowborough TN6 1PZ

- 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 Adam Walker against the decision of Wealden District Council.
 - The application Ref: WD/2021/3134/F, dated 21 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 6 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is the part demolition of a double garage, addition and extension with pitched roof to convert into a one bedroom annexe.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area, and whether the annexe would be ancillary or a separate independent dwelling unit.

Reasons

3. The area comprises a mixture of styles and ages of properties. Trycot is a white rendered 19th Century cottage at the junction of Queens Road and Herne Road. The main elevation faces due south, and an attached rear projection forms a separate dwelling, South End Cottage, with its garden adjacent to Queens Road. The garden to Trycot occupies the other half of the corner plot adjacent to Herne Road. The separation between the cottages and the neighbouring chalet bungalow to the north, Hollymead, provides a sense of spaciousness and even with the presence of the flat roofed garage the gap permits views through to the street beyond.
4. The annexe would be created through alterations and extension of the existing garage. It would infill that existing gap and project forward of Hollymead. The pitched roof would be prominent adding significant bulk, and its hipped form would be at odds with the prevailing gable design of most roofs in the area. The resultant building would have a depth greater than the host property, a larger footprint and present a sizable elevation containing two windows to the road. Thereby, whilst it would be single storey, I agree with the Council that the annexe would not appear subservient to the host property.
5. Additionally, and in contrast to Hollymead and the other properties to the north the corner is already subdivided. The restricted garden space to the appeal property would be further reduced and, in my view, the proposal would result

in an overdevelopment of the plot with the building having a contrived relationship with both the host and neighbouring properties. Due to its siting the proposed annexe, like the existing garage, would be read in the street scene separately to the host property. Also, high hedging to the site boundary and along the edge of the driveway creates a further visual separation.

6. The submitted plans show that the annexe would have a living space which includes a dining area and kitchen, and a separate bedroom and bathroom. It would therefore contain all the facilities required for day-to-day living. Whilst it is indicated that the annexe would be occupied by the appellant's daughter there are no details before me of any functional reliance on the host property and given the comparable size of the two buildings the interrelationship is unclear.
7. I accept that an annexe can be detached and that the building is designed with the entrance door and a window directly on to the garden. Nonetheless, due to its siting and form it could be occupied independently and easily segregated from the host property. Given the limited physical and functional relationship I share the Council's concerns with the potential difficulties of monitoring and enforcing a condition restricting the building to ancillary accommodation.
8. Whilst in this regard the Council have referred to Wealden Local Plan 1998 (WLP) policy DC19, which indicates that an annexe should normally be physically attached to the dwelling, this policy relates to extensions to dwellings outside development boundaries which is not the location here.
9. Notwithstanding this, I find that the scale, design, and siting of the annexe neither positively relates to the host property nor would be in keeping with the surroundings. As such, overall, it would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
10. Accordingly, the proposal conflicts with WLP saved policies EN1 and EN27, objective SPO13 and policy WCS14 of the Wealden Core Strategy Local Plan 2013 and the design advice within the Wealden Design Guide and the National Planning Policy Framework. Together, and amongst other things, these seek to ensure that the scale, form, site coverage and appearance of development leads to a high standard of design and respects the character of the adjoining area.
11. The reason for refusal also cites conflict with WLP saved policies EN8, DC17 and DC19, however, as these relate to the protection of the countryside, I do not find conflict with these policies, or that they are directly relevant to the appeal proposal.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out and having regard to all other matters raised the appeal is dismissed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR