



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 March 2023

by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 18 April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/B1930/D/23/3314596

28 Salisbury Avenue, St Albans, Hertfordshire AL1 4TU

- 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 D and Ms S Fisher against the decision of St Albans City and District Council.
 - The application Ref 5/22/2308, dated 16 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 5 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey rear extension, single storey side extension with integral garage, loft conversion with rear/side dormer window and rooflight, first floor rear dormer extension, removal of chimney stack, alterations to openings.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. For reasons of clarity, the description of the proposed development is taken from the Council's Decision Notice and the Appeal Form.

Main Issue

3. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached dwelling situated on a spacious plot within a primarily residential area of similar types of dwellings albeit there are a variety of designs. The proposed development includes extensions at the ground and first floor levels at the rear of the property and the erection of a dormer at roof level. Although part of the ground floor rear extension's roof would be visible from Salisbury Avenue above the proposed single storey side garage, the appeal scheme would not cause material harm to the residential character and appearance of the varied streetscene.
5. At roof level, the size and siting of the proposed dormer would appear a bulky addition to the side of the gable roof. Its siting and boxy design would not be well related to this roof form.
6. The footprint of the proposed ground floor rear extension could be appropriate scale of addition to the host property. However, its design with the variations in height and the roof sloping towards the rear of the host property would

neither reflect nor respect the character and appearance of this traditionally designed dwelling. From what could be seen during the site visit, no other rear extensions of a similar design were observed within the surrounding area.

7. The existing catslide style roof would be replaced at first floor level by a dormer window and, in isolation, this could be an acceptable form of alteration to the property. However, when taken together with the rear single storey and roof extensions, the appeal scheme as a whole would represent a bulky and incompatible addition to the host property.
8. The appellant has referred to the potential for alterations to be undertaken to the property as permitted development associated with a dwelling house. However, there are no alternative proposals to enable an assessment to be made between the appeal scheme and what could be erected as permitted development. Accordingly, limited weight is given to this matter in the determination of this appeal.
9. For the reasons given, it is concluded that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and, as such, it would conflict with Policies 69(i) and 72(ii) of the City and District of St Albans District Local Plan Review 1994. Amongst other matters, these policies require residential extensions to be compatible with the original building, including by reason of roof form, and take into account the character of its surroundings. Accordingly, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR