



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 April 2025

by **C McDonagh BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A4710/Y/24/3354535

Lightlie Royd, Lightcliffe Royd Lane, Barkisland HX4 0BU

- 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 Andrew Gregson against the decision of Calderdale Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00603/LBC.
 - The works proposed are single storey extension and raised patio to south elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve the Grade II listed building or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Reasons

3. Section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) states that in considering whether to grant listed building consent for any works the local planning authority or the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Special Interest and Significance

4. The appeal property is Grade II listed¹ as 'Barn 25 metres to east of Lightcliffe Royd' and comprises a converted barn of 17th century origin. The building is formed of dressed stone, a stone slate roof and includes fine detailing such as stone quoins, kneelers, and ventilators.
5. There is nothing before me from the appellant to establish the special interest and significance of the listed building. Paragraph 207 of the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework') states that in determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance.
6. From my own observations on the site visit, the special interest and significance of the listed building as a designated heritage asset is derived predominantly from its

¹ List Entry Number: 1232131

age, its simple form, use of traditional materials, surviving historic fabric, its vernacular character and the contribution it makes to the rural and agricultural heritage of the area. Furthermore, the barn has identified group value along with the other buildings in the host terrace. Evidently two of these are also listed, although I do not have details of these before me. As such, the host listed building derives further significance from the association with this close grouping of buildings and historic functional relationships.

Effects of the Proposed Works

7. Although the host building has clearly evolved over time due to its conversion into a dwelling, it has retained much of its agrarian heritage. This is evident in the pleasing simple form and retained features, including the traditional stonework and most tellingly the cart entry, albeit this is now used as an entrance with double glass doors. The extension would be of significant scale and cover a large section of the south facing elevation. Although the design approach is not explained, the apparent inverse roof form sits awkwardly against the host pitch while the height is excessive given it rises above first floor level. This seems to be dictated by the addition of the patio and the proposed form appears contrived as a result while also complicating the pleasing simple form of the host building.
8. Moreover, the extension would introduce overtly modern materials including a large expanse of modern glazing. This would see a significant proportion of the facing wall replaced by glass. This would be compounded by a glazed link wrapping around both sides of the extension and across the proposed roof where the new structure would be joined to the host building. Although the glass would allow a degree of permeability, the south facing elevation has retained a high solid to void ratio traditionally seen in agricultural buildings. The proposed extensive use of modern fenestration would appear incongruous set against the more traditional proportions of the existing openings of the barn and further erode its agrarian character by introducing an overtly domestic and modern feature.
9. There would also be a limited loss of historic fabric caused by the proposed new door opening into the extension. Although the appellant advises that the quoins would remain intact, the proposed plans show that stonework would be required to be removed below the existing window opening to create a door. Regardless of whether the windows are original or not, the loss of historic fabric would harm a key feature of the special interest of the listed building. The barn is listed as a whole rather than the quoins themselves.
10. In light of the above, I conclude that the proposal would not preserve the Grade II listed building. As such, it would not meet the requirements of the Act and would harm the special interest and significance of the listed building.

Heritage Balance

11. As per paragraph 212 of the Framework, when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. I agree that the harm would be less than substantial in the parlance of paragraph 215. This advises that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

12. There is no reference to any public benefits arising from the proposal, although this may include a minor economic boost derived from the construction process. However, this would be very limited and worthy only of an equivalent limited amount of weight in favour of the proposal. Much of the benefits of the scheme would invariably be private to the appellant.
13. As such, in the absence of sufficient public benefits that would outweigh the harm identified, which weighs against the proposal considerably, the proposal would be contrary to section 16(2) of the Act and the provisions within the Framework as detailed above, which seek to conserve and enhance the historic environment.
14. Applications for listed building consent are not subject to assessment against the development plan, albeit they can be a material consideration. The proposal would therefore also be contrary to policy HE1 of the Calderdale Local Plan 2018/19 – 2032/33 Written Statement (LP), which seeks to ensure that development proposals should conserve, and where appropriate, enhance, the historic environment especially those elements which make a particularly important contribution to the identity, sense of place and local distinctiveness of Calderdale. This includes historic farmsteads and barns.

Other Matters

15. The Council references other decisions nearby which it considers to be unsympathetic and harmful to the area. I do not have details on these, and it is unclear as to why this has occurred if they are considered harmful. In any event, this has not affected by consideration of this proposal, which I have assessed on its own merits.
16. The appellant seeks to revert to an earlier set of plans in the event that the appeal was successful. For the avoidance of doubt, I have assessed the proposal based on the plans and drawings which were refused by the Council. I have dismissed the appeal regardless, although I do not have the other proposal before me, and I will remind them that the appeals process should not be used to evolve a scheme.

Conclusion

17. I have found that the proposed works would fail to preserve the listed building in conflict with the requirements of the Act, Framework and the development plan as a whole. The benefits are not sufficient to outweigh that conflict. Accordingly, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

C McDonagh

INSPECTOR