

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 January 2026

by **T Bennett BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13<sup>th</sup> January 2026

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/B1930/D/25/3376182**

**6 Bernard street, St Albans, Hertfordshire AL3 5QW**

- 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 Nicola Jane against the decision of St Albans City Council.
  - The application Ref is 5/2025/0233.
  - The development proposed is single storey rear extension, loft conversion with L shape dormer, new rooflights, remove boiler flue from front elevation, new colour wall finish to the front, new white painted rendered walls to the rear.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey rear extension, loft conversion with L shape dormer, new rooflights, remove boiler flue from front elevation, new colour wall finish to the front, new white painted rendered walls to the rear at 6 Bernard street, St Albans, AL3 5QW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 5/2025/0233, 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 drawing nos: 224\_001, 224\_003, 224\_130, 224\_140 and 224\_141.
  - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be in accordance with the details provided on the application form and drawing no 224\_140.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and on the St Albans conservation area (CA).

### Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a two-storey, mid terrace dwelling located within a dense residential area of similar properties within the St Albans Conservation Area (CA). The property is identified as a locally listed building, a status shared by many properties in this part of the CA. In accordance with the statutory duty imposed by Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, I am required to have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area.
4. The Council's objection to the proposal relates only to the L-shaped dormer; they raise no concern with the single-storey rear extension, rooflights or painting of the external walls. From my site observations, I find no reason to reach a different

view. The rooflights would be positioned on the front roof slope near the ridge, consistent with other properties on Bernard Street and would not detract from the host dwelling. The single-storey extension would be a subordinate addition, largely replacing an existing single-storey extension. The existing dwelling is painted black, appearing at odds within the wider area, the proposed painted brickwork would match the neighbouring properties, better assimilating into the streetscene.

5. The significance of this part of the CA and the locally listed buildings, is in part, derived from its historical and architectural interest as an area of predominantly tight-knit, small-scale 19<sup>th</sup> Century planned terraced housing, that are set close to the pavement in relatively narrow streets. From the street, the properties display an attractive cohesiveness, characterised by their simple brick built form and largely unaltered pitched roofscapes on the front elevation. The locally listed status of the dwellings reflects the positive contribution they make to the heritage value of the overall CA.
6. At the rear of the site, the overall cohesive qualities seen within the streetscene, and which I consider form part of the CA's and locally listed buildings significance, are less apparent, with many properties having undergone various rear extensions. Furthermore, although many of the properties within the CA have unaltered rear roofscapes, there are examples of flat-roof rear dormers, including at No 2 Bernard Street, which was recently granted planning permission and is visible in glimpsed views from Church Street. Considering the above, I find that the back of the terrace makes limited contribution to the architectural or townscape quality of the CA or locally listed buildings.
7. The proposed flat-roof L-shaped dormer would cover a large portion of the rear roof, altering the existing simple pitched roof form. However, it would be set down from the ridge, set in from the sides and set back from both the eaves and the gable end of the two-storey outrigger, and would not be visible from Bernard Street. The inclusion of sash windows to match the existing dwelling and use of hanging tiles consistent with those used on the roof would assist in the dormer blending in to the roofscape.
8. The proposed dormer would be very similar in design and scale to the one at No 2, which the Council deemed acceptable, noting in the Officer Report that the dormer at No 2 did not alter the character of the area. The dormer would also be barely perceptible from public vantage points within the CA, screened in part by the dormer at No 2 and the outrigger at No 4. It would therefore have little effect on the street scene.
9. Paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.
10. Given the modest scale of the dormer, its siting at the rear and the established presence of a similar dormer at No 2, I find that the proposal would not appear as a visually dominant or incongruous feature on the locally listed building, wider terrace and in the CA. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not harm the significance of the CA and the character and appearance of the CA would be preserved.

11. Accordingly, the proposal would be in accordance with Policy 69 of the St Albans District Local Plan Review 1994 (LP) which requires development to take account of the scale and character of its surroundings and Policy 72 of the LP which requires compatibility with original buildings particularly in CAs. It would also accord with Policy 85 of the LP which requires development in CAs to pay attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA, and Policy 87 which relates to locally listed buildings and states that planning permission will not be granted unless features of architectural or historic interest are preserved and Policy 85 is complied with.

### **Other Matter**

12. I note that the appellant is seeking a refund of the application fee for the application which pertains solely to the single storey rear extension (Ref: 5/2025/0232). The appellant contends that the forementioned application was only necessary because of the Council's delay in determining the application, subject of this appeal. However, the limited information before me indicates that both applications were made at a very similar time. Even if they were not, the issue of a planning application refund would be a matter between the Council and the appellant. Under the appeals process, either party can make a claim for costs, but this relates only to the costs associated with the appeal. I have no such application for an award of costs before me, and I have therefore not considered this matter further.

### **Conditions**

13. In addition to the standard time limit condition, a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with approved plans is needed in the interests of certainty and for the avoidance of doubt.
14. To ensure the development has an acceptable external appearance, a condition requiring the external materials to match those detailed in the submitted plans and application form is necessary.

### **Conclusion**

15. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

*T Bennett*

INSPECTOR