



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 October 2025

by **P B Jarvis DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/B1930/D/25/3374307

5 St Julian's Road, St Albans AL1 2AZ

- 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 A Eveleigh against the decision of St Albans City and District Council.
 - The application Ref. is 5/25/1229.
 - The proposed development is rear side extension to ground floor.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for rear side extension to ground floor at 5 St Julian's Road, St Albans AL1 2AZ in accordance with the terms of application ref: 5/25/1229, and the plans submitted with it, and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1:1250 site location plan, drawing no: A-STJ25-EX-01 Rev. A (existing plans, elevations / sections and site plan), drawing no: A-ST25-PR-01 Rev. B (proposed plans, elevation and block plan).
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used on the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjoining property, No. 7 St Julian's Road.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a modest two-storey terraced dwelling, probably dating from around the turn of the last century, with two-storey 'outrigger' to the rear, common with a number of its neighbours. The attached neighbour to the south-west, No. 7, is of similar design also with a two-storey 'outrigger', both of which are set away from the common side boundary a similar distance. Additionally, there is a single-storey addition to the rear of the outrigger on the appeal site. The dwellings share a covered alley which provides access to the rear gardens with close boarded fence marking the boundary.
4. The proposed extension would be sited to the rear of the dwelling, adding to the side of the existing two-storey rear projection and providing a new rear element to

replace the existing single storey building attached to the rear of the outrigger to provide an enlarged kitchen and family area. This would result in a long, single storey flank wall being sited much closer to the common boundary between the two properties, albeit the proposed extension would not extend any deeper into the rear garden than the existing buildings.

5. There are ground floor windows in the side and rear facing elevations of the adjoining property, with one directly facing towards the flank wall of the proposed extension. However, whilst affecting the outlook from these windows to some degree, only the upper part of it would be visible above the existing boundary fence with a gap, albeit small, retained from it, and the roof of the proposed extension would slope away from this boundary.
6. Whilst extending to a greater depth than the buildings on the adjoining property, the siting and design of the proposal would allow for a partial outlook above the extension to be retained, as well as a reasonable level of light, with the outlook from the rear facing wall of the outrigger down the long rear garden area being little affected. Overall, I consider that the proposed extension would not have an unacceptably overbearing impact.
7. I therefore find that the proposed extension would not have a harmful impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 7 and it would thereby comply with policies 69 and 72 District Local Plan Review (1994) which, amongst other things, seek development of a high quality design that in the case of residential extensions should not result in adverse impacts on neighbouring properties.

Other Matters

8. The site lies within the St Albans Conservation Area and I am thus obliged to consider the duty under S72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. The extension would be well-designed and would complement the host dwelling and wider area. As such, I find that the character and appearance of the conservation area would be preserved.
9. For the above reasons, the proposal would also satisfy the National Planning Policy Framework, the policies of which seek to ensure that the historic environment is conserved and that well designed development that provides a high standard of amenity is achieved.

Conditions

10. A condition to refer to the approved plans is necessary in the interests of clarity and proper planning and a condition to require matching materials is also necessary in the interests of visual amenity and the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

11. I therefore conclude that this appeal should be allowed.

P B Jarvis

INSPECTOR