



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 10 September 2025

by Beverley Wilders BA (Hons) PgDURP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 October 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/A4710/W/25/3360683

Butterworth End Farm, Butterworth End Lane, Norland, Sowerby Bridge HX6 3SD

- 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 R Holroyd against the decision of Calderdale Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00571/FUL.
 - The development proposed is Conversion and extension of barn to form one dwelling.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/A4710/Y/25/3360684

Butterworth End Farm, Butterworth End Lane, Norland, Sowerby Bridge HX6 3SD

- 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 R Holroyd against the decision of Calderdale Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00572/LBC.
 - The works proposed are Conversion and extension of barn to form one dwelling.
-

Decisions

Appeal A Ref APP/A4710/W/25/3360683

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal B Ref APP/A4710/Y/25/3360684

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. The application form states that the applicant's name is Mr R Holdroyd and that name was also stated on the Council's decision notices. However, the appellant's name is stated as Mr R Holroyd on the appeal forms and the appellant has confirmed that this is the correct spelling. I have therefore used this spelling in the headings above.
4. At the time of my visit, works had taken place to the barn, both internally and externally. However, these do not correspond with the works shown on the submitted plans. For the avoidance of doubt, I have assessed the works as shown on the submitted plans.
5. Planning permission and listed building consent was granted in 2021 for the conversion of the barn to form two dwellings¹. The appellant states that these consents have been commenced and remain extant.

¹ 19/00453/FUL and 19/00916/LBC

Main Issues

6. The main issues are:

For Appeals A & B

- whether adequate supporting information was submitted in order for the significance of the barn and nearby Listed Buildings to be identified and for the effect of the proposals on them to be assessed; and
- whether the proposals would preserve the barn, a Grade II Listed Building, and any features of special architectural or historic interest it possesses.

For Appeal A

- whether the proposed dwelling would have an adequate water supply and suitable drainage facilities.

Reasons

Supporting Information

7. The applications for planning permission and listed building consent include existing and proposed floor plans and elevations and a Planning and Heritage Statement.
8. Paragraph 207 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), sets out the requirements regarding applications affecting heritage assets and requires applicants to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. It states that 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.
9. In this case, the proposal affects a Grade II Listed barn located adjacent to a Grade II Listed farmhouse. Although the submitted plans do not include sections, specifications, or method statements, and whilst the Planning and Heritage Statement does not explicitly refer to significance, I consider that adequate supporting information has been provided to understand the potential impact of the proposals on significance.
10. I conclude that adequate supporting information was submitted for the significance of the barn and nearby Listed Buildings to be identified and for the effect of the proposals on them to be assessed. It therefore meets the requirements of paragraph 207 of the Framework and allowed the Council to assess the significance of affected heritage assets and the effect of the proposals on them.

Listed Building – Special Interest and Significance

11. The barn is positioned to the west of a small group of buildings comprising Butterworth End Farm. The group of buildings is set back and down from Butterworth End Lane in an open setting primarily comprising agricultural fields. The barn, adjacent farmhouse and cottage are included on the Statutory List at Grade II². The barn is described in the List Description as Barn, mid C19. Coursed squared stone, stone slate roof. 3 bays. Central basket-arched cart-entry with

² List entry numbers 1300457 and 1134557

Venetian window above. Plain stone surround doorway to either end. Plain gutter brackets on table. Included for group value.

12. The barn is a former agricultural building positioned close to the adjacent farmhouse with which it was historically associated. It is a simple, robust building constructed primarily from coursed square stone under a stone slate roof. The main rectangular section of the barn is two-storey in height, and it has a lower, less formal single storey section with an asymmetric roof to the rear. This rear section appears to be older than the front section.
13. In the main, existing door and window openings are simple in form and modest in size with the exception of the large cart doors and venetian window to the north elevation and small arched windows to the south elevation of the rear section. The barn has a high solid to void ratio with minimal openings at first floor. Whilst some elevations display some symmetry, others do not.
14. The submitted floor plans and the List Description indicate that the front section of the barn previously comprised of three bays, with the rear section comprising of two bays. However, as stated, at the time of my visit, some works had taken place to the barn, and this includes the re-configuration of the front section including the demolition and construction of walling and the construction of new floors and ceilings.
15. Insofar as is relevant to the appeal proposals, the significance and special interest of the barn derives from its historic agricultural use associated with the adjacent farmhouse. This is reflected in its simple, robust appearance and architectural composition including features typical of an agricultural building of this type such as the large cart doors, limited modest window and door openings and its internal layout which was reflective of this former use. The setting of the barn as part of a wider farmstead set within an open, rural landscape contributes positively to its significance.

The proposals

16. The proposals are for the conversion of the barn to form one dwelling. In addition, the proposals include the partial demolition of and alterations to existing detached outbuildings for use as a garage and the formation of a new driveway to the barn through the existing garden area to the farmhouse.
17. It appears that the proposals were amended prior to the Council making its decisions on the applications.

The effect of the proposals

18. The proposals include a number of internal and external alterations to the barn. Externally, alterations are proposed to some of the existing door and window openings including all the doors to the north elevation with the existing primarily vertically boarded timber doors to be replaced by full glazing in the case of the large cart doors and part glazing of the smaller doors. A part glazed door is also proposed to the southern elevation with a fully glazed door opening proposed to the western elevation.
19. The appearance of the northern and western elevations would be dramatically altered with the proposed insertion of five first/second floor window openings. These would be in addition to the proposed alterations to existing openings in

these elevations and to new proposed rooflights. New rooflights are also proposed in the southern and eastern elevations with what appears to be an altered position of an existing window opening to the southern elevation of the rear section.

20. Cumulatively, the number, size, detailing and positioning of the proposed new and altered window and door openings means that the existing simple, robust appearance and architectural detailing of the barn, reflective of its historic use, would be significantly undermined and there would be a resulting loss of historic fabric. The fact that some existing elevations are symmetrical and that the new openings would provide additional light to the rooms of the proposed dwelling does not justify the level of alterations and harm proposed.
21. Internally, the three bays shown on the submitted existing plans and as referred to in the List Description are not retained and the existing internal wall in the rear section dividing it into two is to be partially removed. It also appears that a new, wider opening is to be formed between the front and rear sections. It is unclear from the evidence whether the front section of the barn was originally fully open to the roof. The proposed plans show that three floors are to be formed within the dwelling together with a number of staircases and new internal sub-divisions to form a large number of bedrooms, en-suites and wardrobes. The ground floor is to have a more open layout, with some internal sub-division, though not utilising pre-existing internal walling.
22. At the time of my visit, a new concrete floor appeared to have been formed within the barn, with any pre-existing flooring apparently having been removed. It appears from the evidence that the flooring was previously formed by flagstones, but it is unclear whether this is to be re-instated.
23. The proposals would result in a significant change to what appears to be the original three bay plan form and layout of the barn and would result in significant subdivision of the upper part of the barn, albeit that a full-height section would be retained adjacent to the cart doors.
24. Externally the effect of the proposals would be to diminish the simple form and appearance of the barn and would result in it having a more domestic appearance. Internally the three bay plan form would be lost, and the internal space would contain a significant amount of sub-division into smaller spaces, particularly at first and second floor level. The proposals would result in the significant loss of historic fabric.
25. On the basis of the submitted plans and details and taking the above matters into consideration, mindful of the duties imposed by the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, I conclude that the barn, a Grade II Listed Building, and its features of special interest would not be preserved by the proposals.

Heritage Balance

26. The Framework anticipates that once a finding of harm to the significance of a heritage asset, such as a Listed Building, has been reached, then the magnitude of that harm should be assessed. In this case, I conclude that the proposals would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the Grade II Listed Barn. Based on the evidence before me, the extent of less than substantial harm would be moderate. Paragraph 212 of the Framework sets out that great weight should be given to a heritage asset's conservation irrespective of whether any potential

harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance. Moreover, at paragraph 215 the Framework states that the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of a proposal. Such benefits could include circumstances where a proposal would secure the optimal viable use of a building.

27. The only benefit referred to by the appellant is that the proposals would ensure the future of the barn, which has no agricultural use. However, it has not been demonstrated that the proposals would be necessary to secure the optimal viable use of the building, particularly given that the appellant's view is that extant permissions already exist for its conversion to two dwellings. Under these circumstances, and in the absence of any other public benefits being put forward, it has not been demonstrated that the proposals would result in public benefits sufficient to outweigh the heritage harm identified.
28. The proposals therefore conflict with the Framework insofar as, amongst other things, it requires heritage assets to be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance. For the same reasons, there is conflict with Policy HE1 of the Calderdale Local Plan 2018/19 – 2031/33 adopted March 2023 (CLP). This policy, amongst other things, seeks to conserve heritage assets including historic farmsteads and barns.

Water Supply and Drainage

29. The application form states that foul sewage is to be disposed of by a package treatment plant and that surface water is to be disposed of by a soakaway system. The location of the package treatment plant is shown on the submitted plans and would be positioned to the south-west of the barn. A Foul Drainage Assessment Form and a Surface Water Drainage and Flood Risk form were also completed and submitted with the application.
30. Concerns have been raised by the Council's Flood Risk Manager and Environmental Health department regarding the drainage system to be used by the dwelling and the source of its water supply. The appellant has drawn my attention to the existence of a water pipe adjacent to the barn and to the fact that the adjacent farmhouse has recently had its water supply renewed. Be that as it may, given the lack of information regarding the water supply to the barn, and the suitability of soakaway in this location and noting the concerns of consultees, it has not been demonstrated that a suitable water supply and suitable drainage can be provided for the proposed dwelling. I do not consider that these matters could be adequately addressed by the imposition of conditions given the lack of information regarding them and noting that not all questions on the relevant forms were fully completed.
31. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies CC2 and CC3 of the CLP. These policies seek, amongst other things, to ensure that new development has an adequate means of water supply, sufficient foul and surface water drainage and sewage treatment capacity.

Other Matters

32. The appellant has drawn my attention to the 2021 permissions which he considers to be extant and partially completed. I have not seen a copy of these permissions or any previously approved plans, but a document attached as Appendix B to the

appellant's statement of case compares the proposed elevations to the existing building and previously approved plans. I have seen no details of the approved internal alterations.

33. I have no reason to doubt the appellant's assertion that the previous permissions remain extant. However, based on the limited information before me in Appendix B regarding the approved conversion scheme, some of the works on site do not appear to correlate with the approved plans. Moreover, externally, the proposals before me do not represent an improved scheme when compared with the previous approvals. Both schemes appear to result in a similar number of external openings with some elevations having fewer new openings and others having more. As stated, I cannot compare the internal alterations. Taking all of this into account, I attach limited weight to the purported fallback position, and it does not justify the harm that would result from the proposals.
34. As previously stated, the barn forms part of a wider farmstead which contains other Listed Buildings. As with the barn, the significance of the other buildings derives from their architectural composition and historic use as part of the farmstead. The proposals include the provision of a new driveway through an existing garden area to the north of the farmstead. Whilst some concerns were raised by the Council's Conservation Officer about the effect of this on the setting of the Listed Buildings, the proposed driveway is reasonably short in length, and an area of garden would be retained between it and the Listed Buildings. Therefore, subject to appropriate detailing which could be secured by condition, the proposed driveway would not adversely affect the setting and significance of any of the Listed Buildings.
35. The proposals also include alterations to existing single storey outbuildings opposite the barn to form a garage. It appears from the evidence that these buildings are more modern structures but that they were present at the time of listing. On this basis, the Council's Conservation Officer considers that they are curtilage listed. Even if this were the case, and based on the evidence before me, I consider that the alterations proposed to these buildings which involve the demolition of the more modern structure, and the re-configuration of the older building would not be harmful and would preserve the significance of the Listed Buildings.
36. I note that the appeal site is located in the Green Belt but that the Council raised no concerns in this regard noting that planning permission has previously been granted for the residential use of the barn. Given this and the fact that I am dismissing the appeals on other grounds, I have not considered this issue further.
37. In reaching my decision, I note that there is some support for the proposals from a local Councillor who notes that the barn has been vacant for a considerable period of time and that many such barns have been converted to residential use without harm to the area. I also note the length of time that the appellant has been dealing with the Council on this matter and the purported difficulties that he has had in this. Nonetheless, this does not justify the proposals which, for the reasons stated, would be harmful.
38. The proposals would provide an additional dwelling. However, any social and economic benefits associated with this would be limited given the number of dwellings proposed and would not be sufficient to outweigh the harm identified.

Conclusion

39. Whilst I consider that adequate supporting information was submitted in order for the significance of the barn and nearby Listed Buildings to be identified and for the effect of the proposals on them to be assessed, the proposals would not preserve the barn, a Grade II Listed Building, and any features of special architectural or historic interest it possesses and it has not been demonstrated that a suitable water supply and suitable drainage can be provided for the proposed dwelling
40. For the above reasons and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeals should be dismissed.

Beverley Wilders

INSPECTOR