
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 May 2025

by **P Barton BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4310/W/25/3359257

150A Belmont Road, Liverpool L6 5BJ

- 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 Ms Mojdeh Moteali against the decision of Liverpool City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24F/1953.
 - The development proposed is new dwelling house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Government published a revision to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) on 7 February 2025. Those parts of the Framework most relevant to this appeal have not been amended. As a result, I have not sought comments on the revision to the Framework, and I am satisfied that no party's interests have been prejudiced by taking this approach.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area; and
 - whether the proposed development would provide acceptable living conditions for future occupants, with regard to internal living space.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The wider area the appeal site falls within, to the north of Belmont Road, consists of linear terraced streets, with a strong degree of harmony to height, scale, materials, architectural detailing, fenestration and proportions. The southern side of Belmont Road has a distinctively different feel, consisting of predominantly 2-storey, terraced post-war, and more modern, housing that sit perpendicular or at an angle to Belmont Road, as well as single storey commercial units and associated service yards.
5. The appeal site is a rectangular parcel of land, enclosed by hoardings, positioned between 148 Belmont Road, a 2.5-storey terraced property, and 150 Belmont

Road, a 3-storey terraced property, that wraps around the junction with Breck Road.

6. The proposed house would appear significantly smaller than the adjoining terraced properties with the flat roof being at the approximate height of the mid-point of the first-floor windows at No. 148. Consequently, the proposal would appear as a short addition to the existing terrace that would be at odds with the prevailing uniformed character and appearance of the northern side of Belmont Road.
7. There is a variety of external materials on the northern side of Belmont Road, including red and buff brick, as well as a number of properties with light coloured painted brickwork and render. The use of render would broadly accord with the locality, though the use of timber cladding would not reflect materials used elsewhere in the surrounding urban context. The short appearance of the new house next to the adjacent terraced properties would heighten this contrast in material.
8. Evidence before me illustrates that a single storey garage building with an external roller shutter previously occupied the appeal site. Whilst the proposed new house would be taller than this structure, it would appear as a separate dwelling attached to the end of a long and uniformed terrace. The appearance of the previous building on the site, including its scale and height, does not overcome the harm that I have otherwise found.
9. For the above reasons, the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. This would conflict with Policies H3, UD1 and UD2 of the Liverpool Local Plan (LLP), which together seek to promote and protect high standards of design as well as require development proposals to take into account, amongst other things, form, scale, and storey and absolute height. The proposal is also in conflict with the Framework, which seeks to ensure that development is sympathetic to local character.

Living conditions

10. The proposed house would provide 2 bedrooms on the first floor and the Nationally Described Space Standard (NDSS) require a minimum gross internal floor area of 70 sqm for a 2-bedroom, 3-person, 2-storey dwelling. The Council have calculated that the gross internal floor area would be 61sqm, which has not been challenged by the appellant, and this falls short of the requirement of the NDSS. Consequently, the new house fails to provide an acceptable standard of accommodation with regards to internal living space that could reasonably be expected for a 3-person property.
11. Whilst I recognise that it might be possible to overcome the shortfall by extending the size of the building's footprint, I have determined the appeal on the basis of the proposal before me.
12. Accordingly, I conclude that the development fails to provide acceptable living conditions for future occupants, with regard to internal living space. This is contrary to Policy H12 of the LLP, which seeks all new homes to meet the NDSS. It also conflicts with the Framework, which seeks to ensure that developments create places with a high standard of amenity for future occupiers.

Other Matters

13. It is claimed that: it would not be possible to build a 3-storey property on the site as the width would not allow a stair to work; a 2-storey option on the site with high ceilings to match No. 148 would be an environmentally inefficient solution; and a building of the same height as No. 148 on the site would be much more domineering to the properties on Breck Road. However, in the absence of substantive evidence before me on these matters, I have given them limited weight and dealt with the planning merits of the proposal that is before me.
14. Within the officer report the Council identifies that Policy GI8 of the LLP requires one tree to be planted for a new dwelling, either on site or off-site by means of a financial contribution. However, as I am dismissing the appeal for other matters, I have not considered this matter further.

Conclusion

15. The proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

P Barton

INSPECTOR