



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 October 2025

by **G Robbie BA(Hons) BPI MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M4320/D/25/3368561

22 Burbo Bank Road North, Sefton, Blundellsands L23 8TA

- 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 Dr Fatin Karam against the decision of Sefton Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is DC/2025/00566.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a first floor extension to the rear and a second floor extension to the side of dwellinghouse.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appellant has submitted amended plans with the appeal scheme that show a reduced extent to the top floor element of the proposal. Helpfully, the Council's decision notice confirms the drawings upon which the application was determined. The 'Procedural Guide – Planning Appeals – England' is clear that the appeal process should not be used to evolve a scheme. It goes on to state that it is important that what is considered by the Inspector at appeal is essentially the same scheme that was considered by the local planning authority and interested parties at the application stage. I have therefore determined the appeal on the basis of the scheme set out on the drawings referred to on the decision notice and not the amended plans submitted with the appeal.
3. Planning permission was granted in 2024 (the 2024 scheme) at the appeal property for a similarly extensive remodelling and extension of the dwelling. The Council's delegated officer report describes and compares the 2024 scheme with the current appeal scheme.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site lies within a residential area on the seafront facing Formby beach. Housing along Burbo Bank Road North lies on the eastern side of the road and is comprised principally of detached two storey properties. However, the architectural style is eclectic with a mix of mid- to late-twentieth century dwellings of varying design interspersed by the occasional contemporary dwelling, some of which also incorporate a third storey.
6. The proposal is for the extension and alteration of the appeal property in what would amount to the substantial remodelling and extension of the existing dwelling. The result would be a dwelling of modern and contemporary design. Reference has been made by both parties to the previously approved 2024 scheme at the

appeal property, as well as a similarly contemporary approach at the neighbouring 20 Burbo Bank Road North¹ and also at No. 14. Whilst the Council's concerns are expressed in terms of the proposal's effect on character and appearance, it is clear that a contemporary design approach is not unacceptable in principle.

7. The appeal scheme follows a similar approach to the extension and remodelling as that of the 2024 scheme. It differs from that scheme however in that the proposed second floor element would be significantly larger than that of the approved scheme. The scale of the upper floor element of the building in its width and depth would be so substantial as to give the extended dwelling the appearance, scale and massing of a full three storey building. Whilst second floors are not uncommon along the street, as evidenced by the immediately neighbouring dwelling and the approved 2024 scheme at the appeal property, they are generally smaller, more modest elements of the building that appear as subservient rooftop elements. The appeal proposal would therefore effectively appear as a whole additional floor at second floor level.
8. Although it is stated that the second-floor element would not be any higher than the approved scheme and would be lower than the flat roof of the neighbouring property, it would nevertheless result in an uncharacteristically large and bulky element at the upper floor level within the Burbo Bank Road North streetscene. Whilst that harm would be felt within the Burbo Bank Road North streetscene, and appreciable in views from across the seafront, greater harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area would arise at the rear.
9. Here, the appellant accepts that a three-storey rear wall would be overbearing. I agree. The rear elevation of the appeal property is not a particularly secluded or private elevation, however, and with other properties along Burbo Bank Road North also has a significant presence in the streetscene of the residential streets to the rear such as Ward Road and Margaret Road. Indeed, No. 22 is neatly framed between the two dormer-bungalows at the head of Ward Road, sitting in an elevated position above the attached double garages of those two dwellings.
10. The proposed extension would replace the previously articulated rear elevation with a vertical, three storey slab of a rear elevation that would extend across almost all of the rear of the property. Unlike the front elevation, which at least incorporated a set-back elevation to respect vertical hierarchy within the elevation, there would be no such set-back at the rear. The result would be a visually and physically overpowering extension that would dominate the rears of properties along this stretch of Burbo Bank Road North and the smaller, more modest, neighbouring properties on Ward Road. Indeed, when viewed from the turning head of Ward Road adjacent to Nos 10 and 12 the extended appeal property would be incongruously overpowering and heavy-handed and would lack the more subtle detailing and articulation of the equally contemporary design approach taken at the neighbouring property on Burbo Bank Road North. Despite also incorporating a second floor, that property manages to do so in a way that avoids such an overpowering impact as the appeal scheme would give rise to.
11. Sefton Local Plan (SLP) Policy HC4 sets out the Council's approach to house extensions, whereby extensions will be approved where, amongst other factors, they are of a high quality of design that matches or complements the style of the

¹ LPA Ref No: DC/2024/01896)

dwelling and the surrounding area. The size and scale of extension should also be in keeping with the original dwelling and the surrounding area. SLP Policy EQ2 also seeks to secure good design, whereby amongst other factors proposals should respond and contribute positively to the form of the surroundings in terms of scale, height, form and massing. For the reasons set out, the proposed extension and alteration of the appeal property, and particularly the effects of the scale, massing and resulting form of the top floor element of the scheme, would be harmfully incongruous to the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area. The proposal is therefore contrary to SLP Policies HC4 and EQ2 and would fail to secure good, high-quality design.

Other Matters

12. Whilst I can understand the appellant's desire to seek to make the most of the proposal's upper floor and the site's elevated position and open and expansive views to the west, these do not persuade me as to the acceptability of the appeal scheme. It is also stated that the proposal would allow inter-generational living at the extended property whilst the through-floor lift to all floors would assist in providing accessible spaces throughout the building. Whilst these matters carry some weight in support of the proposal, that weight is only limited and is not sufficient to justify the level of harm in respect of character and appearance that I have identified above.
13. The Council's delegated officer report considers the effects of the proposal upon living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring properties, including those to the rear of Ward Road, in terms of outlook, daylight and sunlight and privacy. The extensive works to the roof of the existing house were such that the effect of the proposals upon ecology were also considered by the Council. It is noted however that these matters did not form a reason for refusal, and I have not been presented with any compelling evidence to lead me to reach a different conclusion. The absence of harm in these respects is however a neutral matter and weighs neither in support of nor against the proposal.
14. The appellant has expressed frustration with the constraints of the Council's pre-application advice service and to difficulties in contacting and communicating with the Council. These are however matters that the appellant may wish to pursue separately with the Council outwith the scope of an appeal under section 78 of the Act.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons set out, and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

G Robbie

INSPECTOR