



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 September 2025

by J Moore BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4310/W/25/3368337

99 Belle Vale Road, Liverpool L25 2PE

- 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 Alan Benson against the decision of Liverpool City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25F/0445.
 - The development proposed was originally described as loft conversion with rear dormer and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal form refers to the property address as 99A Belle Vale Road. However, the application form and submitted plans clearly refer to the address of the proposal as 99 Belle Vale Road, and I am unable to locate 99A on the Royal Mail Post Code Finder. I have therefore used the address as it appears on the application form in my banner heading above.

Main Issues

3. The Council's first reason for refusal refers to Policy 'UD' of the Liverpool Local Plan 2022 (LP). However, no such policy has been submitted to the appeal. Having regard to all policies submitted to the appeal and the Council's officer report which considered the application, it seems to me that LP Policy UD1 is relevant, and I have taken account of this policy in my reasoning accordingly.
4. The main issues are
 - the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area; and
 - whether the proposal would provide acceptable living conditions for existing and future occupiers of the development, with particular regard to outlook, levels of daylight and sunlight, and private amenity space.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. The appeal scheme concerns a first floor flat above the southerly end of a two-storey terraced row (the host terrace) in a designated primary residential area in the LP. The host terrace appears as a shopping parade at ground floor level facing

Belle Vale Road, with flats above. The flats are accessed via external stairs and a terrace/walkway along the rear of the host terrace.

6. The host terrace is sited such that its southerly end forms an angled relationship to a nearby two storey terraced row of flats along Wambo Lane (the Wambo Lane terrace). The nature of the highway network is such that Wambo Lane runs in part parallel to Besford Road and is narrow before terminating near the host terrace and near the junction at Belle Vale Road and Besford Road. The two terraces are closely sited at this junction and appear in prominent view. The narrow gap between the two terraces at this point is filled by a brick wall, leaving a gap above at the upper level which provides relief between the two closely sited terraces. Part of Wambo Lane also forms a vehicular access to the rear of the host terrace, where the rear of the host terrace can be seen in public view.
7. The proposal would result in a single storey extension with a flat roof that would project across the rear walkway/terrace of the host terrace, with the addition of a dormer within the rear roof plane and further accommodation in the roof space.
8. Due to its siting, scale, width, height and depth, the proposed dormer would occupy almost the full width and depth of the roof plane of its host, and it would not conform to the set-in distances sought in the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 1: House Extensions (SPG1). Consequently, the proposed dormer would dominate the roof plane and not appear subordinate to its host. Furthermore, and in the absence of any other dormers in the immediate area, the proposed dormer would appear highly discordant to the consistent hipped roofscape of the two closely sited terraces. The side flank of the dormer would appear in prominent view within the street scene at the junction of Belle Vale Road and Besford Road, and the dormer would appear within public view within that part of Wambo Lane to the rear of the host terrace.
9. Due to the scale, height, width and depth of the proposed single storey extension, the proposal would result in extended built form that would overwhelm the existing gap at the upper level between the two closely sited terraces. The two terraces would thus appear conjoined at the upper level, creating an oppressive appearance at a prominent location within the street scene. This effect would be exacerbated by the sheer scale and presence of the proposed dormer. Consequently, the proposal fails to respect the space between terraced built forms.
10. The proposed fenestration to the single storey extension, dormer and flank elevation to the converted loft space would not respect the scale, proportions and alignment of existing fenestration, in conflict with SPG1.
11. The appellant suggests that Belle Vale Road includes varied rooflines and architectural styles, including those extended with dormers and roof alterations. However, no specific examples are before me. Moreover, during my visit I saw no dormer extensions and/or similar terraced/flat forms in the immediate area with similar development to that proposed. Even though the proposal is confined to the rear of the host terrace, it would appear in prominent view within the street scene.
12. For the reasons above, I therefore conclude that the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area. It conflicts with LP Policies H7, H8, UD1, UD2 and UD7. Among other things, and taken together, these policies seek to ensure that development respects local character and distinctiveness, and

that residential extensions and alterations are of high-quality design and visually harmonise with the area and existing dwellings, taking account of various factors including but not limited to context, form, scale, proportion, and roofscape. The proposal also conflicts with the objective of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) to achieve well designed places.

Living conditions

13. The proposed single storey extension would accommodate a living area, where the only outlook would be via a set of French windows. Consequently, this window arrangement plays an important role in the well-being of existing and future occupiers of the development. The French windows would be about 1.5 m from the angled flank elevation of Wambo Lane terrace, which comprises a blank gabled elevation of brick. This would not provide an acceptable outlook for occupiers of the development. Due to the relationship and proximity of the French windows to the tall gabled flank of the Wambo Lane terrace, and in the absence of any substantive evidence to demonstrate otherwise, I am not satisfied that this arrangement would provide sufficient levels of daylight and sunlight to the proposed living area.
14. The Council considers that the window serving bedroom No 4 in the proposed roof accommodation appears small in scale, such that it would not provide sufficient levels of daylight and sunlight to occupiers of that bedroom. In the absence of any substantive evidence to the contrary, I find no reason to disagree.
15. Due to the scale and siting of the proposed single storey extension, the quantum of the remaining terraced area for use as private amenity space would be significantly reduced. The space would be of an irregular, narrow and largely triangular shape, and it would be overshadowed by the proposed extension. These factors would significantly reduce its useability. Consequently, the remaining private amenity space would not be of an adequate quality for occupiers of the development.
16. For the reasons above, I conclude that the proposal would not provide acceptable living conditions for existing and future occupiers of the development, with particular regard to outlook, levels of daylight and sunlight, and private amenity space. The proposal conflicts with LP Policies H7, UD2 and UD7. Taken together, these policies seek to ensure that development does not result in adverse impacts on residential amenity for existing and future occupiers, including outlook, levels of daylight and sunlight and usable private amenity space. The proposal also conflicts with the objective of the Framework to achieve well designed places.

Other Matters

17. The proposal would result in the extension and alteration of an existing two-bedroom flat to create a four-bedroom flat. This would assist in meeting the government's objectives for the efficient use of land. However, the benefits of additional bedrooms and enhanced accommodation would be limited, and largely of a private nature to the owners and/or occupiers of the development. Such benefits would not outweigh the harms that I have found. It is not clear how the appellant considers the proposal would align with what are described as urban sustainability goals.

18. While window placements would not result in adverse impacts upon the privacy of neighbouring occupiers, and the proposal would not adversely affect levels of daylight and sunlight to neighbouring occupiers, these are policy requirements of development and not a benefit of the proposal.

Conclusion

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

J Moore

INSPECTOR