
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 November 2025 by Elizabeth Davies BSc (Hons) MISEP, CEnv

Decision by P Hanna PGDip MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6th February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/B1930/D/25/3375184

16 Hazel Road, Park Street, St Albans, Hertfordshire AL2 2AJ

- 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 Aqeel Shakeel Kadri against the decision of St Albans City Council.
 - The application Ref is 5/25/1321.
 - The development proposed is described as a single-storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matter

3. The name of the appellant has been confirmed through correspondence with the planning agent and has been included in full in this decision notice for clarity.
4. Revised drawings were submitted as part of the appellant's appeal statement which show a mono-pitched roof arrangement rising away from 14 Hazel Road (No 14). Accepting the revised plans may deprive those who were entitled to be consulted on the application of the opportunity to make any representations. I have therefore considered the appeal on the basis of the application plans.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of No.14 with regard to outlook.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. Policy 72 of the City and District of St Albans District Local Plan Review (1994) (the 'Local Plan') seeks, amongst other things, to ensure that extensions in residential areas do not unacceptably harm the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties.
7. The appeal property is a detached single storey dwelling located in a residential area. The appeal property features a fairly substantial rear flat roofed, L-shaped extension. The current extension has been built close to the boundary with No. 18 Hazel Road, but is set away from the boundary with No.14.

8. No. 14 is similar to the appeal property and both feature long spacious gardens, but unlike the appeal property, No.14 has not been previously extended at the rear.
9. The proposal would infill the current L-shaped extension. Although the proposed extension would be single storey, it would nevertheless be clearly visible above the fence along the common boundary with No. 14. The proposed extension would cause a sense of enclosure for the occupants of No. 14 owing to its proximity, depth and height. When looking out the windows at the rear of the dwelling and using the part of the garden closest to the dwelling, the occupants would find the extension overbearing and enclosing. Overall, the impacts for the occupants of No. 14 in respect of their outlook would be significantly different from the existing situation.
10. Whilst the appellant has described the roof design of the proposed extension as mono-pitched, rising away from No. 14, a flat roof design is shown on the submitted drawings. Whilst it is acknowledged that the proposed extension is single storey, the overall scale of the proposed extension would have an imposing nature on the occupiers of No. 14.
11. The proposal would not accord with Policy 72 of the Local Plan as I find that the proposal would harm the living conditions of the occupants of No. 14 by causing an unacceptable loss of outlook. The proposal would also not accord with Policy 69 of the Local Plan which is concerned with general design and layout and requires development to comply with a number of other policies, including Policy 72. It would also not accord with the National Planning Policy Framework (the 'Framework') which seeks to ensure high standards of residential amenity.

Other Matters

12. I am aware that this proposal follows a previously refused scheme (also dismissed at appeal) for a larger proposal. Whilst the appeal proposal is more modest in scale, it is sufficiently clear from my findings above that this scheme has not been revised enough in terms of scale and design to make its effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 14 acceptable.
13. It is noted that the appeal proposal would not cause any unacceptable loss of light or privacy to No.14, and that the impact on daylight and sunlight is acceptable. The appeal property is not within a conservation area and is not a listed building. The appellant's wish to extend and improve their family home is also understood. Whilst these factors do weigh in favour of allowing the appeal, even taken together, they do not outweigh the harm I have found.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. The proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no other material considerations, including the provisions of the Framework, which outweigh this finding. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Elizabeth Davies

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

P Hanna

INSPECTOR