

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 October 2024

by P Eggleton BSc(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4310/D/24/3351651

29 High Street, Wavertree, Liverpool L15 8HE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Aldo Hoxha against the decision of Liverpool City Council.
 - The application reference is 24H/1517.
 - The development proposed is a garage/storeroom.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area.

Reasons

3. The property lies within the Wavertree Village Conservation Area. The proposal would result in a large modern flat roofed garage that would extend close to the boundary wall alongside Grove Street. Despite the high roadside wall, the garage would be clearly evident above it. Its position would ensure that it would sit forward of the terraced properties behind which also lie within the conservation area. It would also result in the removal of the existing tree which currently makes a limited, but positive, contribution to the character and appearance of the area.
 4. The building would be of a design and scale that would not be in keeping with the character of the host property or the properties beyond, within Grove Street. It would be harmful to the setting of these properties and it would detract from the openness of this rear garden area. It would represent a large new building with little design interest that would detract from the historic layout and detailed designs of these properties. Whilst there are other garage structures locally, these do not suggest that a new building, that would be out of keeping and of poor design in this context, should be accepted.
 5. Despite the screening afforded to parts of this development and the proposal to use reclaimed brickwork, the garage would nevertheless, detract from the character and appearance of this area and would represent poor design. It would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the
-

conservation area. It would also be at odds with the design and heritage requirements of policies H8(a & b), UD1(a, b, d, e, f & i), UD2(1b, i & l) and HD1(3b) of the Liverpool Local Plan 2013-2033 (2022). I am also mindful that the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 imposes a duty requiring that special attention be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas.

6. The *National Planning Policy Framework* 2023 is clear that any harm to a heritage asset, such as a conservation area, should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The harm to the conservation area would be less than substantial. However, whilst it is suggested that the boundary wall could be re-built in reclaimed brickwork which would offer some benefits to the area, I am not satisfied that this, or any of the other matters referenced, would result in sufficient public benefits to outweigh the harm.
7. The appellant has suggested that an alternative roof design could be considered but such a proposal is not before me. Whilst I acknowledge that the building would bring benefits with regard to storage of garden furniture and household maintenance items, the benefits put forward do not outweigh my concerns. I therefore dismiss the appeal.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR