



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 April 2026

by Ann Veevers BA(Hons) PGDip(BCon) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29th April 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4310/W/25/3373405

55 Everton Road, Liverpool L6 2EH

- 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 Aeron Logan against the decision of Liverpool City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25F/0661.
 - The development proposed is conversion of a seven bedroom building to an eleven bedroom HMO (single occupancy).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have taken the description of development from the application form. Although different to that on the decision notice, no confirmation that a change was agreed has been provided.
3. The appeal relates to a Grade II listed building¹. An associated application for listed building consent to carry out minor works to the building to facilitate the proposed change of use was approved by the Council on 11 September 2025². For the avoidance of doubt, my decision relates solely to this appeal made against the refusal of planning permission for the proposed development.
4. The planning application form states that at the time that the application was made the change of use had not already started. However, at the time of my visit it was evident the property was in use as a house in multiple occupation (HMO). As I was unable to access some of the rooms, I cannot be certain how many people occupy the property or whether the use of rooms is in complete accordance with the submitted plans. Therefore, in determining the appeal I have assessed the proposal as shown on the submitted plans.
5. My attention has been drawn by the Council to Policy H7 in the emerging 'Local Plan 2025-2041 Consultation Draft' (ELP). The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that the weight given to relevant policies in emerging plans should be according to their stage of preparation, the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies and the degree of consistency of the plan with the Framework. The ELP is at consultation stage, and I am not aware of whether, and if so to what extent, there are any unresolved objections to the policy. Consequently, I do not give weight to it in my decision.

¹ National Heritage List for England. List Entry Number: 1068232

² LPA Ref: 25L/0735

Main Issues

6. The main issue is whether the proposal would result in the harmful loss of a family-sized dwelling.

Reasons

7. The appeal site comprises a three storey plus basement terraced property set back slightly from Everton Road behind railings. The adjoining properties Nos 57 to 65 (odd) were vacant at the time of my site visit and in an advanced state of disrepair. Evidence suggests the adjoining property No 53 Everton Road is in use as a large HMO. The wider area is predominantly residential in character. The proposal would result in the creation of an 11-bedroom HMO from the existing property, which the main parties agree was occupied as a single family dwelling until 2020 before being vacated and subsequently allegedly used as an HMO without the benefit of planning permission.
8. Policy H10, of the Liverpool Local Plan 2013 - 2033, adopted January 2022 (LLP) sets out the Council's policy in relation to the conversion of dwellings and buildings. Part 2 of this policy states that planning permission will be granted for the conversion of, amongst other types residential accommodation, HMOs, providing several criteria are met. Criterion 'n' requires that the development would not cause the loss of a dwelling that is suitable in size, design, layout and location for continued use as a family dwelling.
9. The justification text to Policy H10 explains that a mix of housing to meet the needs of different groups in the community should be provided in the area. This approach aligns with the Framework insofar as paragraph 61 sets out that in boosting the supply of homes, an area's identified housing need should be met, including with an appropriate mix of housing types.
10. In this regard the Council advise that the most recent Strategic Housing Market Needs Assessment, May 2025 (SHMNA) identifies an underlying shift towards demand for larger family homes in the city of 4 or more bedrooms. While I give no weight to the ELP at the current time for the reasons set out above, the SHMNA is a technical document that includes up-to-date data and analysis in relation to the area's housing need. It is used to inform the preparation of a local development plan or to assist in decision-making and was publicly available during the determination of the planning application. As such, I attribute it significant weight. Of particular note is the information within the SHMNA highlighting the low supply of larger homes relative to the need for 4 or more bedroom accommodation where it is estimated the supply is only around 16% of the need arising each year.
11. There is no disagreement between the parties that the last use of the appeal property prior to its purchase by the appellant was as a single family home. It is clear its conversion to an HMO would result in the loss of a large dwelling. However, the key consideration of criterion 'n' is whether or not the property remains suitable for continued use as a family dwelling, having regard to its size, design, layout and location.
12. No definition of a family dwelling or how many bedrooms constitutes a family dwelling is provided in the LLP. It is therefore a matter of planning judgement. To my mind the ordinary meaning of a family home is a single household occupied by one or more people and where the occupants have a close relationship with each

other and share some facilities. There is no limit on the number of rooms or bedrooms a family dwelling could constitute, even if it would exceed the size of an average or large family home in the UK³.

13. The appellant argues that the appeal property is too large in terms of the number and size of rooms to appeal to families, that it would not be affordable for families, that the costs of maintaining the old large building would be prohibitive, and that there is no demand for such large properties in this location. However, this claim is not supported by any objective evidence such as marketing information relating to the appeal property or other similar large properties in the area. Whilst my attention has not been drawn to any policy that requires this specific information, the evidence before me and my site visit confirms that the area is predominantly residential and the property has only relatively recently been used as a family dwelling.
14. The appeal property is located adjacent to an HMO and I recognise that the derelict condition and appearance of the adjoining properties to the north may not appeal to families. However, this would also be the case for residents of an HMO who should expect no less a quality of accommodation. On the basis of the information provided, there is no reason to believe the area is unsafe or that the proposal would be the only way to retain and improve the property. Taking all these factors into account, and in the absence of compelling evidence to confirm otherwise, I cannot be certain that the appeal property would be difficult to sell or let as a large family dwelling.
15. I recognise there is not a high concentration of HMOs in the area and that such accommodation is an important source of housing for students and those on low incomes and those seeking temporary accommodation. Evidence submitted with the appeal also suggests the need for small to median-sized households is expected to grow. I note the justification text to Policy H10 of the LLP advises that a significant demand for housing provision stems from single person households. However, it is clear that the need to provide more housing of all sizes and tenures across the country, including in Liverpool, is a key objective of the government. Indeed, the appellant's evidence at Table 42 of the appeal statement indicates the need for 4+ bedroom properties is expected to grow to 2033, albeit by significantly less than the need for smaller properties. In this regard, the proposal would undermine the delivery of the Council's strategic housing objectives, which are focused on retaining and increasing the supply of family housing.
16. It is put to me that all the properties along the row have been converted to more manageable sized homes or hotel accommodation but little information about these other properties has been provided. In any event, while the appeal property is similarly old and large, it benefits from off-road parking and private outdoor space, and I saw that it is in an accessible location close to public transport, services and amenities. Therefore, it is suitable for occupation by a large family, or an extended family where the Council is seeking to protect the supply of family housing and, on the available evidence, for which there would be a demand. From the information available to me, I find nothing to robustly demonstrate that the appeal property is inherently unsuitable for continued use as a family dwelling, having regard to its size, design, layout and location.

³ Appellant's Appeal Statement information from Statista, Office for National Statistics 2024, Area Insight 2025 and CLG Household Projection Data

17. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would result in the harmful loss of a family dwelling. Therefore, it would conflict with Policy H10 of the LLP, which, amongst other things, seeks to prevent the loss of dwellings that are suitable in size, design, layout and location for continued use as family dwellings.

Other Matters

18. As the appeal site concerns a listed building, I have a statutory duty under Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservations Areas) Act 1990 to pay special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.
19. From the limited information before me and observations at my site visit, I find the special interest and significance of the listed building to be mainly derived from its architectural and historic interest as a domestic property from the early 19th century. Important contributing factors in this which are pertinent to the appeal are its use of traditional methods of construction and materials, surviving historic fabric and the legibility of its historic plan form including the formal hierarchy between its floors, rooms and spaces. It also has group value as part of a terrace of listed buildings with which the list entry details it was formerly listed as Nos 47 to 67 (odd) and No 71.
20. The Council does not allege that the proposal would have an adverse effect on the listed building or its setting and from all that I have seen, I agree. On that basis, I also find that the appeal proposal would preserve the listed building, its setting and its significance as a designated heritage asset. While the proposal would provide a use for the property, there is nothing before me to indicate that its use as a family dwelling would not be possible in order to ensure the long-term viable use of the listed building.
21. The Council have not refused the application on the basis of the effect on the living conditions of neighbouring residents, the character of the building or the area, or in relation to highway impact. Even if I were to agree that there are no unacceptable effects in terms of these matters, they are general requirements for such a proposal and are therefore neutral considerations.
22. The Council's handling of the planning application has not affected my findings on the planning merits of the scheme.

Conclusion

23. The proposal conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole. There are no other considerations, either individually or in combination, that outweighs the identified harm and associated development plan conflict.
24. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

Ann Veevers

INSPECTOR