
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 August 2025

by **Paul Martinson BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/Y/25/3358473

Bagshawe Arms, Norton Avenue, Sheffield S14 1BP

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Stonegate Pub Group against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/02498/LBC.
 - The works are described as: 'Provision of replacement roof tiles on a Grade II Listed Building (Retrospective application)'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed and listed building consent is refused for provision of replacement roof tiles on a Grade II Listed Building.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal is against the refusal of listed building consent for works to a listed building. I have therefore had special regard to section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act).
3. The application was submitted after the works to replace the roof tiles had been carried out. For avoidance of doubt, in coming to my decision I have taken into account the details submitted with the application, limited to those matters for which consent is sought, namely the provision of replacement of roof tiles to the main part of the building only.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether the replacement tiles preserve the Grade II listed building of Bagshawe Arms Public House.

Reasons

Special Interest and Significance

5. The Bagshawe Arms is a public house dating to 1770, that is constructed of coursed square stone. It fronts Norton Avenue and with its distinctive projecting pedimented central bay, ashlar banding, and symmetrically arranged fenestration, it is an imposing and prominent building in the locality. Occupying a T shaped plan, the building extends some distance into the site with the two storey rear wing abutting the edge of the car park. This wing is finished in a smooth grey painted render and is less formal in its arrangement of fenestration.
6. Owing to the depth of the gable of the building, the height of the ridge, and its pitch, the roof is a prominent feature of the building. The roof is also an important

component of the architectural composition of the building, particularly to the front elevation, where the expanse of roof 'frames' the central pediment in views from street level.

7. Pertinent to the appeal, based on the limited evidence before me, the special interest and significance of the Bagshawe Arms derive from its architectural and historic interest as an eighteenth century public house with late nineteenth and twentieth century alterations. Key contributors in these regards are: the careful composition of its front elevation, the surviving historic fabric and the use of local and traditional materials.

Proposals and Effects

8. The list description sets out that the main part of the building is roofed with Welsh slates with stone slates to the rear wing. I have been provided with limited evidence of this removed roof covering. However, as natural, traditional, authentic materials these slates would nonetheless have made a positive contribution to and reinforced the special interest and significance of the listed building, particularly having regard to the importance of the roof to its architectural composition.
9. The appeal scheme seeks listed building consent for the replacement of the previously existing slates to the main part of the building with fibre cement tiles. The fibre cement tiles and ridge tiles that have been installed have a regularity and uniformity in size, shape, colour, texture and finish that is not present in a natural roofing material such as Welsh slates. As such, it is readily apparent that the tiles are modern replacements. On this basis the works have compromised the architectural integrity of the building, to the detriment of its careful composition, and have impaired its historic legibility and authenticity. Harm has also arisen from the loss of historic fabric in the form of the slates and ridge pieces.
10. On this basis, the replacement tiles fail to preserve the Grade II listed building of Bagshawe Arms Public House or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. This would be contrary to the requirements of section 16(2) of the Act. For the same reasons the proposal would cause harm to the significance of this designated heritage asset.

Public Benefits and Balance

11. Paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) sets out that, when considering the impact of a proposal on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Given the extent and nature of the proposed works, I find that the harm in this instance is 'less than substantial' but, nevertheless, of considerable importance and weight. Under such circumstances, Paragraph 215 advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
12. The appellant sets out that the roof was in a poor state of repair and comprised of 'original slates, man made and fibre cement roof tiles'. However, no condition survey of the roof has been submitted with the appeal which limits my ability to make an assessment in this regard.
13. Nonetheless, I appreciate that roofing materials weather over time and that their wholesale replacement can often be justified, with sufficient supporting evidence, in the interests of safeguarding the future of the building. The maintenance of the

building and the continuation of the public house use would comprise a public benefit. However, it is unclear what led the appellants to choose the tiles that have been installed or why a more appropriate authentic material such as Welsh slate or other natural or traditional material could not have been installed. This limits the weight I can give to this matter as a public benefit.

14. The Framework sets out that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of designated heritage assets should require clear and convincing justification, which, in all of the respects outlined above, I find not to be the case in the appeal before me.
15. Thus, the limited weight arising from the public benefits is not sufficient to outweigh the considerable importance and weight I attach to the identified harm to the significance of the listed building, a designated heritage asset.
16. The replacement tiles fail to preserve the Grade II listed building of Bagshawe Arms Public House or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. Overall, the proposal would be contrary to the clear expectations of section 16(2) of the Act and the provisions within the Framework which seek to conserve and enhance heritage assets.
17. Insofar as they are a material consideration, there would also be conflict with Policies BE15 and BE19 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (1998) which together seek to preserve designated heritage assets including listed buildings.

Other Matters

18. Whilst I acknowledge concerns raised in third party comments, I have not been provided with any details of works to roof timbers, or other building operations to the roof that were carried out as part of the works. As set out above, my assessment is limited to the matters for which consent is sought, which is limited to the replacement of the tiles.

Conclusion

19. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Martinson

INSPECTOR