



PLANNING CONSULTATION RESPONSE

Application No	2026/0132
Proposal	2026 0132 LBC Removal and Replacement GF Wall & Removal of Internal FF Flue Far Westhorpe Farm Halifax Road Penistone
Address	Far Westhorpe Farm Halifax Road Penistone
Date of Consultation Reply	26.03.26
Consultee	Tony Wiles Senior Conservation Officer

Consultation Assessment and Justification

The main consideration is: -

- Whether or not the proposed alterations would harm the special architectural or historic interest or impact on the setting of the listed Building

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

Section 16 (2): The local planning authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest

Policy

NPPF 207/208: Identify and assess heritage significance including the setting and the effect of a proposal

NPPF 212: Great weight given to an asset's conservation, irrespective of the degree of harm

NPPF para 213: Any harm to or loss of significance will require clear and convincing justification

Barnsley Local Plan HE1: The Historic Environment

Barnsley Local Plan Policy HE3: Developments affecting Historic Buildings

Conservation Comments:

This application follows pre-application 2024/ENQ/00039 which broadly outlined the repair and refurbishment of Far Westhorpe farmhouse, and redevelopment of the barns circa 10m to the west. An initial response to the pre-app was provided in Feb 2024 to owner. Subsequent informal discussions and site visits have taken place between September to October 2025, with David Uhlar of Robin Ashely Architects LLP. This application does not relate to the wider redevelopment of the site but instead covers remedial / essential short notice works to the farmhouse. A tandem separate listed building consent (under ref. 2026/0133) covers essential works to the adjacent barns. Essentially these two applications cover preparatory works needing to be done straight away before the main phase of redevelopment which will be detailed in a forthcoming application.

The submission concerning the farmhouse comprises a heritage statement outlining the significance of the relevant buildings, providing details of the proposed works, and assessing their prospective impacts. The statement incorporates a structural report as an appendix and contributes to the justification for the proposed works. In summary, this application requests consent to:

- demolish a non-load bearing wall between the existing kitchen and dining room
- demolish a later unbonded chimney flue at first floor level.



The downstairs wall is tightly positioned beneath an oak beam that supports the floor joists. Made of thinly bedded sandstone, it has a noticeably narrow cross-section and lacks strong lateral support, with only informal restraint at the top where it meets the beam. This wall seems to have been built more recently and belongs to a different construction phase than the original structure. The main reason for considering its removal is the threat of collapse, as it could easily be pushed over due to insufficient restraint. Nevertheless, the wall may hold heritage value and removing it may cause minor harm. Overall, I believe this minimal impact is outweighed by its limited significance and the necessity of ensuring safety.

Regarding the first-floor flue, this has also clearly been retrofitted, with the stonework not bonded into the adjacent wall. The flue serves the downstairs southern fireplace, but at first floor ceiling height the flue terminates and steps sideways connecting into the original chimney to the north. The fire surround at ground floor includes a cracked lintel and appears somewhat less finely finished to the fireplaces on the northern side. On the reverse side of the party wall, there are ground and first floor fireplaces that vent into the stack. This arrangement suggests the southern fireplace and flue were inserted at a later date. The GF fireplace remains in situ, but the flue at first floor level has been removed, with stonework salvaged and palleted. I understand this work was undertaken due to very real concerns for the stability of the structure and recommendations from the Structural Engineer. Whilst it would have been preferable to wait for consent, I accept the justification for the removal as failure could have damaged other structures beneath.

In general, I believe the proposed works are modest in scope and essential for safety. Although they may cause minor—less than substantial harm, I consider them justified and do not object. During discussions with the applicant, I acknowledged that previous owners appear to have made several twentieth-century changes to the farmhouse, resulting in some negative impact on the building's historic significance. Additionally, I recognise the owner's broader intention to repair and restore the property, in a sympathetic manner which seems both necessary and overdue. Nevertheless, I have already noted that conducting a historic building recording exercise is now needed. This process will help clarify how the building has developed over time and how past modifications have impacted it. It also offers transparency and could justify any changes suggested in future proposals and may be seen as crucial to accord with HE2 and NPPF 207. As such I've suggested the standard two-part condition below. I'd would be happy to discuss this further with the applicant, and the level of detailed required.

NO OBJECTION*

*Delete as applicable

Consultation Suggested Conditions:

Part A (pre-commencement)

No development, including any demolition and groundworks, shall take place until the applicant, or their agent or successor in title, has submitted a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) that sets out a strategy for archaeological investigation, and this has been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The WSI shall include:

- The programme and method of site investigation and recording.
- The requirement to seek preservation *in situ* of identified features of importance.
- The programme for post-investigation assessment.
- The provision to be made for analysis and reporting.
- The provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the results.
- The provision to be made for deposition of the archive created.
- Nomination of a competent person/persons or organisation to undertake the works.
- The timetable for completion of all site investigation and post-investigation works.

Part B (pre-occupation/use)

Thereafter the development shall only take place in accordance with the approved WSI and the development shall not be brought into use until the Local Planning Authority has confirmed in writing that the requirements of the WSI have been fulfilled or alternative timescales agreed.



BARNSLEY

Metropolitan Borough Council

Reason:

To ensure that any archaeological remains present, whether buried or part of a standing building, are investigated and a proper understanding of their nature, date, extent and significance gained, before those remains are damaged or destroyed and that knowledge gained is then disseminated.

Consultation Informative(s):

Planning Obligations required: