



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 September 2025

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A4710/D/24/3357908

Middle Harper Royd Farm, Hollin Lane, Norland, Sowerby Bridge HX6 3QR

- 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 A. Denham against the decision of Calderdale Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00555/HSE.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Proposed solid fuel flue. Proposed extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have used the postcode provided on the Council's decision notice rather than that given on the application form as it more accurately identifies the site.
3. The appeal concerns part of a Grade II listed building referred to on the National Heritage List for England as '*Middle Harper Royd Cottages Middle Harper Royd Farmhouse*'¹. I have therefore had regard to my statutory duty under section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) to have special regard to the desirability of preserving a listed building, or its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.
4. An associated application for listed building consent Ref 24/00556/LBC for the same scheme was not determined by the Council within the statutory timeframe. An appeal under section 20 of the Act against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for listed building consent was subsequently submitted by the appellant². The appeal was dismissed and listed building consent refused. Whilst I have had regard to that appeal decision, for the avoidance of doubt, my decision relates solely to this appeal made against the refusal of planning permission for the proposed development.
5. A similar scheme for an extension and solid fuel flue has previously been granted planning permission³ and listed building consent⁴. However, the appeal scheme differs because it includes the removal of an area of masonry wall. This is the only part of the scheme in dispute, and my decision will therefore focus mainly on this matter.

¹ National Heritage List for England, List Entry Number: 1134513.

² Appeal Ref: APP/A4710/Y/24/3354399

³ LPA Ref 23/00756/HSE

⁴ LPA Ref 23/00757/LBC

Main Issue

6. 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

7. Middle Harper Royd Farm comprises the end dwelling in a row of two storey stone properties that occupy a commanding hillside position overlooking the valley below. The whole row forms the single Grade II listed building. The list entry describes the listed building as a farmhouse, now house, part a separate dwelling, and a pair of attached cottages. The oldest part of the building dates from the 17th Century and sub-divisions occurred along the row to form several cottages in the early 19th Century. Evidence suggests Middle Harper Royd Farm was converted from a barn to a dwelling in the late 20th Century. The listed building is constructed of coursed gritstone with stone slate roofs.
8. The listed building as a whole has been significantly altered over time by sub-divisions and extensions. Nevertheless, from the limited information before me and my own observations, insofar as is relevant to the appeal, the building's special interest and significance derives from its architectural and historic interest as an illustration of the development of domestic properties in an agricultural context during the 18th and 19th Centuries to house workers. Its traditional construction and use of local materials are important factors in these regards.
9. The catslide roof, horizontal alignment of windows, some with mullions, stone quoins, chimney and roof edgings contribute considerably to the significance of Middle Harper Royd Farm as part of the cohesive character of the whole listed building. While the relatively recently added southern bay, rear dormer, single storey utility room and timber sun room have somewhat diminished the ability to appreciate the special interest and significance of the building, its historic plan form is clear.
10. Paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) sets out, 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. Paragraph 213 further advises that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification.
11. Much of the side wall of the catslide projection at Middle Harper Royd Farm would be removed to create direct access from the existing kitchen to the proposed extension. Both parties agree that this wall was rebuilt at the time the building was converted from a barn to a dwelling. Photographs submitted by the appellant indicates the wall was rebuilt in block work with a stone outer leaf and thus is not of historic fabric. However, that does not mean that the wall is not of value in demonstrating the historic plan form of the building, which contributes to its significance. Furthermore, the proposed wide opening would be a clearly modern alteration which would be discordant with the historic pattern of internal openings.
12. While I find the proposed extension in and of itself would be acceptable as a replacement for the existing timber sun room, from the information before me, the removal of the side wall of the catslide projection would weaken the special interest in the evolution of the building and its historic plan form. As such it would

further diminish the special interest of the listed building as a whole and harm its significance as a designated heritage asset.

13. In finding harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, the magnitude of that harm should be assessed. Given the nature and extent of the development proposed, I find the harm to the significance of the listed building would result in a low level of 'less than substantial' harm. Nevertheless, this is of considerable importance and weight. In such circumstances, paragraph 215 of the Framework confirms that the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, which includes securing the asset's optimum viable use.
14. The proposal would be likely to generate economic benefits while the works are carried out, and social benefits in the improvements to the local housing stock. There would also be a small heritage benefit to the removal of the existing relatively unsympathetic lean-to sun room extension and its replacement with a modern glazed extension. These outcomes would flow from the proposed development and are of a nature to be of benefit to the public at large. The weight they carry in the balance is moderated by the limited extent of the proposed development but, nonetheless, weigh in favour of the appeal.
15. However, from the limited information presented, I am not persuaded that the only way of securing such public benefits is by means of the opening as proposed. Moreover, no substantive evidence is before me which demonstrates that such an intervention would be necessary for the continued viable use of the dwelling. In these respects, clear and convincing justification for the harm to the listed building's significance arising from the proposal has not been provided.
16. In giving considerable importance and weight to the harm to the significance of this designated heritage asset, I find that this would not be outweighed by the public benefits that the proposed development would generate.
17. Drawing all of the above together, I conclude that the proposed development would not preserve the Grade II listed building known as Middle Harper Royd Cottages Middle Harper Royd Farmhouse or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. As such, it would harm the significance of this designated heritage asset, and this would not be outweighed by the public benefits generated by the proposal. Consequently, there would be conflict with the statutory presumption set out in section 66(1) of the Act. There would also be conflict with Policy HE1 of the Calderdale Local Plan 2018/19 – 2032/33, adopted March 2023 which sets out, amongst other things, that development proposals will be expected to conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance. It would also not comply with the provisions within the Framework which seek to conserve and enhance the historic environment.

Conclusion

18. For the reasons set out above, the proposed development conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

Ann Veevers

INSPECTOR