



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: 5 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4310/D/25/3362014

7 Hawthorns Grove, Liverpool L12 1NE

- 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 Max Langley against the decision of Liverpool City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24H/3163.
 - The development proposed is described as “Alterations to the existing exterior of the house. New render to all facades and change of colour to windows and doors. Construction of new outbuilding to rear of property”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for alterations to the existing exterior of the house, with new render to all facades, change of colour to the windows and doors, and construction of new outbuilding to the rear of the property at 7 Hawthorns Grove, Liverpool L12 1NE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24H/3163, dated 26 November 2024, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with Drawing No: DR02 P01 Proposed Plans & Elevations.

Main Issue

2. The Council has not raised any concerns regarding the proposed outbuilding to the rear of the property. From the evidence before me, I see no reason to disagree with the Council’s position with respect to the outbuilding. The reason for refusal refers only to the proposed materials to the main dwellinghouse. Therefore, the main issue is the effect of the proposed alterations to the existing exterior of the house on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached 2-storey house set within a spacious and generously landscaped cul-de-sac containing similar sized and aged properties.
4. I observed a mixture of external materials to the properties within the cul-de-sac including red brick, light coloured render, and dark coloured hanging tiles or cladding to the elevations, whilst the colour of the windows were either white or a dark colour. A similar variety of materials was evident to the properties on North

Drive, close to its junction with Hawthorns Grove, as well as those on Beech Park, which were visible from Hawthorns Grove between Nos. 6 and 7.

5. The house currently consists of red facing brickwork with dark brown coloured windows and doors. The proposal would render the property in an off-white / light grey colour, except for the chimney breast and a section of the ground floor under a canopy to the front elevation and around the garage door which would be rendered in a charcoal / black colour. The proposed windows and doors, as well as fascia boards and rainwater goods, would be black coloured PVCU.
6. The variety to the external materials on the houses within the cul-de-sac contributes to the overall character and appearance of the area. The proposed materials and colour finish would be generally consistent with those found in the street and the wider area. The appeal property would be fully rendered, whilst most of the houses with render on the cul-de-sac are partially rendered. Whilst this would alter the appearance of the appeal property, it would not be to such an extent that it would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area. Accordingly, I find no conflict with Policy UD1 of the Liverpool Local Plan (LLP), that requires development proposals to, amongst other things, take into account materials, colours, tones and textures, which should be appropriate to the characteristics of the local area.
7. The decision notice states that the proposed materials to the main house would fail to comply with Policy H8 of the LLP. However, this policy relates to house extensions and as such the proposed alterations to the existing exterior of the house would not conflict with this policy.
8. Reference has been made to some properties in the cul-de-sac not having planning permission for rendering. Notwithstanding this, there are other properties in the cul-de-sac with render that are not subject to this claim. I have therefore considered the appeal before me on its individual merits.

Conditions

9. In addition to the standard time condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plan, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of clarity.
10. The Council proposed a condition requiring the use of materials matching those used in the existing building. As the existing house has no render and the proposal includes the rendering of the property, this is not relevant to the development to be permitted and as such has not been attached. The approved plan includes the details of the external materials and a further condition to cover this matter is not necessary.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

P Barton

INSPECTOR