



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 January 2023

by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/B1930/D/22/3311002

13 Normandy Road, St Albans, Hertfordshire AL3 5QG

- 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 Rory Page against the decision of St Albans City Council.
 - The application Ref 5/22/1921 dated 29 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 12 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as dormer loft conversion with one new front rooflight and internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character of the area of the conservation area and the Locally Listed Building.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a two storey semi-detached property, within the St Albans Conservation Area and is identified as a Locally Listed Building. In accordance with the statutory duty imposed by section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990; I am required to have special regard to the effect of the proposed development on the character or appearance of the area.
4. The Conservation Area in the vicinity of the appeal site is characterised by predominantly residential properties. Blocks of terraced properties and pairs of semi-detached properties in the area vary in design and detailing however the coherence of features on sets of properties is evident. Whilst some of the original features appear to have been lost on some buildings, the harmony in built form adds to the significance of the area.
5. Whilst local listing does not impose any additional planning controls, the fact that the appeal site is on a local list means that it has an established value and its conservation is consequently a material consideration, as defined in paragraph 203 of the Framework.
6. I observed during my site visit that roof designs in the immediate area are varied however rear dormers were not obvious. The proposed rear dormer would be large covering the majority of the rear roof slope of the property.

7. The proposed development would be a prominent addition to the area and would appear incongruous to the building, unbalancing the pair of semi-detached properties.
8. My attention has been drawn by the Appellant to dormer window developments within the area, however substantive details have not been provided to allow me to assess these schemes against the proposal before me. Notwithstanding this the design before me does not appear to be a common feature and I am not persuaded that this form of development would conserve or enhanced the area. In any event each development must be considered on its individual merits, and I have reached my conclusion based on the individual merit of the appeal proposal.
9. Paragraph 199 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) (the Framework) states that great weight should be given to the conservation of a designated heritage asset when considering the impact of a proposal on such an asset. This is irrespective of the level of harm. Any harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification based on Framework paragraph 200.
10. I find that the proposed development would lead to less than substantial harm of the significance of the Conservation Area. Paragraph 202 of the Framework states that where a development leads to less than substantial harm to the significance of a heritage asst this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. I find that there are no public benefits which would outweigh the harm caused by the proposed development.
11. The proposed development would be an unsympathetic addition to the host property and immediate area. I find that the proposed development would diminish unacceptably the character and appearance of the conservation area and would be out of keeping with the appeal property which is a Locally Listed Building.
12. There is conflict with Policies 69, 72, 85 and 87 of the St Albans District Local Plan Review (1994) which seek amongst other things to ensure development have regard to setting and character of an area ensuring the historic environment is conserved.
13. There is also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) which seeks amongst other things to ensure developments are of good design appropriate and sympathetic to their surroundings and that the historic environment is protected.

Conclusion

14. For the above reasons I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

C Pipe

INSPECTOR