



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 16 December 2025

by Mr R Walker BA HONS DIPTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 December 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/A4710/W/25/3372545

1 Great House Barn, Midgley, Luddendenfoot, Halifax HX2 6UH

- 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 Ms A Ruck against the decision of Calderdale Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00582/HSE.
 - The development proposed is new door and window opening.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/A4710/Y/25/3372552

1 Great House Barn, Midgley, Luddendenfoot, Halifax HX2 6UH

- 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 Ms A Ruck against the decision of Calderdale Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00583/LBC.
 - The works proposed are new door and window opening.
-

Decision

1. **Appeal A:** The appeal is dismissed.
2. **Appeal B:** The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. These decisions address both planning and listed building consent appeals for the same site and the same scheme. To reduce repetition, and for the avoidance of doubt, I have dealt with both appeals together within a single decision letter.
4. As the scheme relates to a listed building, I have had special regard to sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act).

Main Issue

5. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve the Grade II listed buildings, known as Barn approximately 18 metres to west of Great House and Great House Cottage and Great House and Great House Cottage or their settings, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess.

Reasons

Special interest and significance of the listed buildings

6. Great House and Great House Cottage was originally one farmhouse dated to the mid seventeenth century, which was subdivided in the nineteenth century. The appeal premises, the separately listed barn approximately 18 metres to the west of

them, dates to the mid eighteenth century. It is built from a coursed rubble with a stone slate roof and is now converted to a dwelling.

7. Although now converted, the former barn's form, lack of chimney stacks, fenestration pattern and more simple style of openings remain distinct from the domestic appearance of the original farmhouse. In contrast, the original farmhouse has, amongst other things, a cross-wing plan form, external chimney stack and double-chamfered mullion windows.
8. From the evidence available to me, the special interest/significance of the listed barn, insofar as it relates to these appeals, is largely derived from the barn's simple vernacular and plan form, traditional construction techniques and materials, high solid to void ratio, style and pattern of fenestration. In so far as it is relevant to these appeals the special interest and significance of the listed building known as Great House and Great House Cottage resides in its age, plan form, high quality of its architectural detailing, traditional construction techniques and materials, including the fenestration. These elements make important contributions to the respective aesthetic and historical values of the listed buildings.
9. The contrasting characteristics between the listed buildings illustrate the historic functionality of the farmstead and the lifestyles of the household. In this regard, the appeal premises, and its agrarian aesthetic and historical values contribute positively to the overall setting, and thus significance of the Great House and Great House Cottage listed building.

Appeal proposal and effects

10. The loss of the two small non-opening windows on the first floor of the barn and their replacement with a casement window and door with the metal balustrade would diminish the value of the original southern gable of the barn and weaken the legibility of its historical use. With their first floor location, and design of opening and balustrade feature on the door they would have an overtly domestic appearance. This would be at odds with the agrarian character, and pattern of openings on this prominent elevation of the host building facing the road.
11. That the openings are not original does not alter or outweigh my findings on this matter, given that the existing openings are of a simple vent window design that is in keeping with the host building. Moreover, the use of traditional timber materials and stone surrounds to match the existing openings would also not mitigate the harm I have identified.
12. Overall, the proposal would not harmonise with the more agrarian traditional appearance of the barn. In doing so it would also erode the contribution that the barn's agrarian character makes to the setting and thus the significance of the Great House and Great House Cottage.
13. Overall, the proposal would fail to preserve the special interest of the Grade II listed buildings, known as the Barn approximately 18 metres to west of Great House and Great House Cottage and Great House and Great House Cottage and their setting. As a result, the expectations of the Act have not been met, and the proposal would harm the significance of these designated heritage assets.

Public benefits

14. Paragraph 212 of the Framework advises that great weight be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). Paragraph 213 goes on to advise that significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting and that this should have clear and convincing justification.
15. With reference to paragraphs 214 and 215 of the Framework, in finding harm to the significance of the designated heritage assets, the magnitude of that harm should be assessed. Although, for the purposes of undertaking the heritage balance, the Framework does not require the decision maker to place the harm on a spectrum, I acknowledge that within each category of harm, the extent of the harm may vary.
16. In this instance, as the harm would be confined to one elevation of the listed building, albeit a highly visible elevation, the harm to the overall listed barn and the setting of the adjacent listed building would be 'less than substantial' and at the lower end of the spectrum but, nevertheless, of great weight. Under such circumstances, paragraph 215 advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposed development.
17. There would be some economic, social and environmental benefits resulting from the construction works, the general investment into the property and improvements to the local housing stock. This includes the environmental benefits from increased natural ventilation, brighter internal spaces, and solar gain, as well as from the proposed bat and swift boxes. These outcomes assist the delivery of the main objectives of the planning system as outlined in the Framework. However, the scale of these public benefits would be limited by the modest extent of the proposed development/works.
18. The Planning Practice Guidance advises¹ that harmful development may sometimes be justified in the interests of realising the optimum viable use of an asset, notwithstanding the loss of significance caused, and provided the harm is minimised. However, the continued viable use of the appeal property as a residential dwelling is not dependent on the proposal as the building has an ongoing residential use that would not cease in its absence. Moreover, even if I accept the need for increased ventilation in the building, there is no substantive evidence before me, which demonstrates that similar public benefits could not be achieved by a scheme, which would be less harmful to the significance of the designated heritage assets. In these respects, clear and convincing justification has not been provided for the identified harm.
19. Drawing the above together, the weight that I ascribe to the public benefits that would result from the proposal, would not be sufficient to outweigh the great weight that I attach to the harm I have identified. Accordingly, the proposal would be contrary to the requirements of the Act, the Framework and Policy HE1 of the Calderdale Local Plan. These say, amongst other things, 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.

¹ Paragraph: 015 Reference ID: 18a-015-20190723

Conclusion

20. **Appeal A:** Although there would be benefits associated with the proposal, there are no material considerations of such weight that lead me to the conclusion that the proposal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, Appeal A is dismissed.
21. **Appeal B:** For the reasons given, Appeal B is dismissed.

Mr R Walker

INSPECTOR