



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 November 2025

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M0655/Y/25/3370907

119 Bewsey Road, Bewsey and Whitecross, Warrington WA5 0JT

- 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 Mr Roger Goodwin of Goodwin Property Ltd against the decision of Warrington Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 2025/00098/LBC.
 - The works are described as 'retrospective listed building consent application for an outbuilding shed within the curtilage of 119 Bewsey Road, a Grade II listed building'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of works on the application form appears to contain arguments in support of the proposal. I have therefore used the description from the Council's decision notice and I note this was used by the appellant in the appeal submission. As such, I am satisfied that no parties' interests have been prejudiced by this approach.
3. The application was submitted after the outbuilding shed (the outbuilding) had already been erected and I was able to observe it at my site visit. I have therefore dealt with the appeal on the basis that it seeks to regularise the works. The Council's Conservation Officer refers to additional works which have also already taken place at the appeal site. However, 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 outbuilding only.
4. The appeal property forms part of a Grade II listed building, referred to on the National Heritage List for England as '119-125 Bewsey Road'¹. I have therefore had special regard to section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act).
5. I saw that the outbuilding is attached to the external yard wall, which the appellant agrees forms part of the curtilage of the listed building. The appellant has provided an aerial photograph of blurred quality that appears to indicate a building existed in the same location as the appeal outbuilding in June 1986. However, even though this pre-dates the Act, I cannot be certain from the evidence before me when the outbuilding the subject of this appeal was constructed. I have therefore considered the appeal on the basis of that which it was applied for, as an application for listed

¹ National Heritage List for England List Entry Number: 1329700

building consent. In so doing, I have also had regard to comments submitted by the appellant from the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings in relation to the outbuilding.²

Main Issue

6. The main issue is whether the outbuilding preserves the Grade II listed building, 119-125 Bewsey Road or any features of special architectural or historic interest it possesses.

Reasons

Special interest and significance

7. The listed building is a terraced row of four properties which were first listed in 1975 and, according to the list entry, date from the mid-19th Century. It is constructed of brick with a hipped slate roof. The external detailing of the front elevation facing Bewsey Road, including the symmetrical arrangement of windows with flat brick arched heads above, rectangular fanlights, and the continuous stone band below first floor windows, provide for a consistent façade. The loss of timber sash windows to each of the four properties in the row and their replacement with uPVC windows of various designs has eroded an important historic feature of the listed building. Nevertheless, the overall homogeneity of the front façade makes a positive contribution to the special interest of the listed building.
8. At the rear, 119-125 Bewsey Road has a more modest elevation, incorporating less architectural detailing of its front façade and incremental alterations and additions. The list entry refers to small gardens within the terrace and each of the properties within the listed building that I could see had modest back yards which appeared to be separated by tall brick walls and included various structures within them. Garage doors have also been inserted in the rear garden wall of the listed terrace which has somewhat harmed the uniformity that previously existed. Nevertheless, the space afforded between the rear garden wall and the building contributes positively to the cohesive character of the listed building from which to appreciate the composition of the terrace and to understand its historic layout.
9. From the 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 19th Century domestic terrace. Important contributing factors in this regard which are pertinent to the appeal are the use of traditional methods of construction and materials; its aesthetic qualities in forming an pleasant architecturally designed terrace; and as an important example of the outward spread of domestic properties in Warrington during the Victorian period.

Works and effects

10. Paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) sets out, when considering the impact of works on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. This is reflected in Policy DC2 of the Warrington Local Plan, adopted 2023 (WLP).

² Email dated 28 April 2024 in Appendix C of the appellant's appeal statement.

11. 119 Bewsey Road (No 119) is located at the end of the row that comprises the listed building. The outbuilding is used for storage and infills the full width of No 119's external yard. It extends from the rear yard wall towards the rear elevation of the property, leaving only a small paved uncovered external area. Corrugated steel sheet panels have replaced part of the rear brick wall fronting the rear access road, where access is provided to the outbuilding. Internal steel posts support a timber and corrugated sheet roof structure that is attached to a single storey outrigger and wall on one side of the yard and to the dividing brick wall with 117 Bewsey Road on the other. Inside the outbuilding, the internal-facing elevation of this wall has been rendered. A plywood and corrugated sheet elevation facing towards the rear elevation of No 119 includes a door which provides access to the outbuilding from within the yard. Evidence indicates the outbuilding also contains a former brick toilet outbuilding which the appellant suggests may hold historic value.
12. Whilst the rear gardens/yards do not play a pivotal role in the significance of the listed building and the rear of the building as a whole is generally of lesser importance, almost the entire yard of No 119 has been developed. This dominates the space which forms part of the historic character of the listed building, harming its special interest.
13. Furthermore, there is no compelling evidence before me that corrugated steel sheeting is a characteristic or authentic material commonly attributable to domestic properties during the mid-19th Century. Although corrugated steel sheeting may be of some interest as an example of a cheap and quickly applied material, its use in the context of this listed building is visually harmful. As a result of its scale and material, it weakens the architectural interest and the enduring legibility and relationship between the listed building and its exterior spaces.
14. I note the outbuilding is no higher than the boundary wall surrounding the listed building and the dividing walls between each of the four properties. However, the corrugated sheet roof is clearly visible from the first floor rear windows of neighbouring properties. The corrugated panels in the rear yard wall are visible in public views from the rear access road and from Pitt Street. In these views, the corrugated steel sheet appears as a harsh, unsympathetic and visually harmful intervention to this historic building.
15. Furthermore, there is a notable deficiency of detail regarding the construction of the outbuilding or whether/how it has been fixed to listed curtilage walls. The omissions regarding the detail of physical interventions and alterations are a deficiency and restrict a full understanding of the works and its effects. As such I cannot be certain that the outbuilding preserves historic fabric.
16. I acknowledge corrugated steel sheet structures have been constructed at other properties forming part of the listed building and there may have been a previous structure within the yard at No 119. However, I do not have full details of these other structures or whether they are or were authorised. Even if the outbuilding could be removed, part of the rear yard wall has already been removed and it is unclear from the submitted information whether the fixing of the outbuilding to the yard walls, or the internal rendering, would be reversible without causing further harm to curtilage listed walls.

17. Although the surrounding area has a mixed character and includes industrial uses and buildings that vary in their appearance, this does not justify the acceptance of the identified harm to this listed building.
18. Bringing all the above together, I find the outbuilding fails to preserve the special interest of the Grade II listed building 119-125 Bewsey Road. As a result, the expectations of the Act have not been met and the outbuilding harms the significance of this designated heritage asset.

Public benefits and balance

19. In finding harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, the magnitude of that harm should be assessed. Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) requires the category of harm to be 'explicitly identified', and the extent of harm within that category to be 'clearly articulated'³. In this case, both parties identify the level of harm to be 'less than substantial' and I agree. I consider it to be at the lower end of less than substantial. Nevertheless, this carries considerable importance and weight.
20. Paragraph 215 of the Framework advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, which includes securing the optimum viable use of the building.
21. There are likely to be economic and social benefits attributable to the use of the outbuilding since the information submitted with the appeal suggests it is used by a local resident as a workshop to facilitate a route into longer-term economic self-sufficiency. The appellant also claims that the outbuilding is used to securely store materials required for maintenance of the listed building and which ensures the remainder of the yard is free from clutter, thereby contributing to the building's preservation and preventing theft. However, I am not convinced that securing some or all of these benefits could not be achieved in a more sympathetic and less harmful way to the significance of the designated heritage asset.
22. The appellant argues the use of locally sourced materials, including internal steel framing ensures a long lifespan of the outbuilding with minimal environmental impact. However, no robust evidence has been submitted to substantiate this claim. In any event, having regard to the PPG, benefits should flow from the works, not from its regularisation.
23. Moreover, none of the material before me establishes that a continued residential use of the listed building, consistent with its conservation would be at risk if the appeal were to fail. For these reasons and taken together with my observations in the immediately preceding paragraphs, it has not therefore been established that the outbuilding would be necessary to secure the optimum viable use of the building. In these respects, the identified harm to the significance of the listed building has not been clearly and convincingly justified.
24. Overall, the weight that I ascribe to the public benefits that would accrue from the proposal is not sufficient to outweigh the considerable importance and weight that I attach to the harm I have found.
25. Accordingly, the outbuilding fails to preserve the Grade II listed building of 119-125 Bewsey Road or any features of special architectural or historic interest

³ Paragraph: 018 Reference ID: 18a-018-20190723

which it possesses. The works are 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. The outbuilding also conflicts with Policy DC2 of the WLP which seeks, amongst other things, to support proposals which conserve or enhance the historic environment of Warrington.

Other Matters

26. The appellant refers to the use of the outbuilding by a neighbour and suggests it provides purposeful accommodation that benefits their well-being. In this context, I have had regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) to which I am subject. The PSED sets out the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation, and to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it. Since there is the potential for my decision to affect a person with a protected characteristic I have had due regard to the three equality principles set out in Section 149 (1) of the Equality Act 2010.
27. The negative impacts of dismissing the appeal arise since No 119 would not be provided with the outbuilding as sought. However, this is set against the well-established and legitimate aim of the desirability of preserving listed buildings and the conservation of heritage assets in the wider public interest. The PSED considerations, when assessed proportionately, would not outweigh the harm I have identified in this case.
28. My attention has been drawn by the appellant, to several existing rear outbuildings and ancillary structures that contribute to the wider character of the area and represent a local precedent. I do not have full details of these other buildings and structures and, if authorised, the considerations at the time of them being given permission. In any event, while consistency in decision-making is important, I have determined the appeal on its own merits and concluded that it would cause harm for the reasons set out above.
29. I recognise the appellant's willingness to regularise the works. I also note no objections have been raised in relation to the outbuilding from interested parties. However, this is not a benefit of the appeal scheme, but rather a neutral factor that weighs neither for nor against the outbuilding in the planning balance.
30. The appellant suggests the external materials of the outbuilding could be changed to a natural or timber-stained cladding. However, that is not the proposal before me. This matter could not, in my view, be subject to the imposition of a condition because such a change would relate to the substance of the reason for refusal. The Procedural Guide⁴ advises that the appeal process should not be used to evolve a scheme, and it is important that what is considered by the Inspector is essentially what was considered by the local planning authority, and on which interested people's views were sought.
31. The appellant cites the disproportionate and inconsistent approach to decisions by the Council; the failure of the Council to have full regard to the public benefits associated with the works and to carry out an appropriate balancing exercise to consider these benefits against any identified harm. However, I have addressed

⁴ The Procedural Guide – Planning Appeals – England (2016)

these matters above and the Council's handling of the application, in itself, is not a matter for my consideration as part of this appeal.

Conclusion

32. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

Ann Veevers

INSPECTOR