



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2025

by R Sabu BA(Hons), MA, BArch, PgDip, RIBA, ARB

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3rd October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J1915/D/25/3370514

24 Rib Vale, Hertford, Hertfordshire SG14 3LF

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Sam Hill against the decision of East Hertfordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref is 3/25/0856/HH.
 - The development proposed is double storey rear extension and alterations to garage roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area; and
 - the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 22 Rib Vale (No 22) with regard to light and outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. No 24 Rib Vale (No 24) is sited on a residential street that is primarily characterised by detached and semi-detached houses. The properties are moderately spaced and have similar roof forms and set back garages such that the area has a pleasant spacious character and appearance.
4. The proposed 2 storey rear extension would extend across the width of the existing building and project around 5m to the rear of the building. The roof of the extension would form a gable end feature that would also extend across most of the width of the host building.
5. The ridge would be set below the ridge of the main roof. However, given its depth, width and form, the proposed extension would add considerable bulk to the property and would visually dominate the existing building particularly when viewed from the rear including from neighbouring gardens. Therefore, the scale and form of the proposed rear extension would adversely affect the character and appearance of the host building.
6. The proposed extension would also be seen from the street from a number of directions. The proposal may not completely obscure views from the street to open

fields beyond the rear gardens, and I note that part of the proposal may be obscured by the garage. However, given its depth, width and form, the two storey bulk of the proposed extension would nevertheless be visible from the street thereby diminishing the sense of spaciousness that characterises the area.

7. The proposal would include the removal of the existing flat roof dormer and conservatory. In addition, the materials are proposed to match existing, and the proposals do not include alterations to the front elevation. However, these matters would not override the harm to the character of the host building and surrounding area that would result from the proposal.

8. Although I note the mention of other properties with extensions of a similar design, no examples are before me that enable a direct comparison. The neighbouring property at No 26 Rib Vale benefits from a part two storey, part single storey rear extension. However, its roof form includes two small gable features and a flat roof such that it is not directly comparable to the appeal scheme.

9. Consequently, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area. Therefore, it would conflict with Policies HOU11 and DES4 of the East Herts District Plan October 2018 (DP) which together seek, among other things, extensions that are appropriate to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and surrounding area, generally appear as a subservient addition to the dwelling and seek a high standard of design.

Living conditions

10. Given its depth, the proposed extension would be visible from the first floor window at No 22. While I note the evidence regarding the viewing angle, given the orientation of the window facing north-east, and the distance between No 22 and the proposal, any loss of light would be limited such that the living conditions of the occupiers of No 22 would not be unduly affected.

11. There is moderate space between the appeal dwelling and the house at No 22, with a single storey garage in between. Moreover, the rear windows and rear garden of No 22 benefit from outlook in other directions. Therefore, the proposal would not result in a sense of enclosure, nor would it dominate the view from the first floor window or private amenity area. Accordingly, the living conditions of the occupiers would not be unduly affected in terms of outlook.

12. Consequently, the proposed development would not materially harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No 22 with regard to light and outlook. Therefore, it would not conflict with DP Policy DES4 in this particular respect, which seeks, among other things, to avoid significant detrimental impacts on the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring properties.

Other Matters

13. I note concerns regarding the service provided by the Council, including those relating to re-submission fees. However, I have necessarily determined the appeal based on its planning merits and this matter has not altered my overall decision.

14. I acknowledge evidence regarding future adaptability and high speed fibre. However, these matters do not override the harm to character and appearance identified above. The Decision Notice does not directly refer to privacy or overlooking.

In any event, as I am dismissing the appeal for other reasons, I have not considered this matter further.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and in the absence of material considerations to indicate otherwise, the appeal is dismissed.

R Sabu

INSPECTOR