



PLANNING CONSULTATION RESPONSE

Application No	2026/0566
Proposal	2026 0566 Single Storey Rear Extn The Hayloft Swithen Farm Huddersfield Road Haigh
Address	Swithen Farm Huddersfield Road Haigh
Date of Consultation Reply	280726
Consultee	Tony Wiles Senior Conservation Officer

Consultation Assessment and Justification

The main consideration is: -

- Whether or not the proposal would harm the heritage significance or impact on the setting of a designated asset or other asset of demonstrable heritage significance

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

Section 66 (1): 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 213: Any harm to or loss of significance will require clear and convincing justification

Barnsley Local Plan HE1 The Historic Environment

Barnsley Local Plan HE3 Developments affecting Historic Buildings

Conservation Comments:

This application seeks permission for a single-storey, gabled rear extension to The Hayloft at Swithen Farm, Haigh. There has been no pre-application discussion in respect of the proposal. The property forms part of a converted barn historically associated with the Grade II listed Swithen House, located approximately 12m to the south-west ([NHLE 1286446](#)), listed in 1987. Although the list description principally relates to the house itself, the planning history indicates that the wider group of barns has previously been treated as having a relationship with the listed building. This includes listed building consents and planning permissions for the conversion and alteration of the barns to form eight dwellings, under references B/99/0009/DT and B/99/1234/DT/LB, submitted by Swithen Farm Developments. The decision notice for B/99/0009/DT includes an informative stating that:

'The development affects a listed building, and the applicant is advised that Listed Building Consent is required before development is commenced on site.'

This is relevant to Part I, Chapter 1, section 5(b) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, where curtilage structures may fall within the scope of listed building control. Whether ancillary structures are listed by virtue of a curtilage relationship is a matter of fact and degree. Regard for matters such as the date of the structure, its functional relationship with the principal listed building at the time of listing, the extent of physical association or separation, and ownership are relevant. In this case, and for consistency with the previous consents, I would advise



BARNSLEY

Metropolitan Borough Council

that listed building consent should accompany the planning application for the current proposal. This is mainly due to the close proximity of the barn to Swithen House, the clear functional and historic relationship between the buildings, and the earlier consent precedent. In terms of the host dwelling, it is clearly identifiable as a converted barn and, outwardly, it retains much of its vernacular character and simple historic plan form. The use of traditional detailing, construction methods and materials has helped preserve its agricultural character. It therefore continues to make a positive contribution to the setting and significance of Swithen House. I note that the adjacent property has already been extended with a single-pitch roof form projecting eastwards into the rear garden. This arrangement is not in accordance with the Barn Conversions SPD, which generally advises that extensions should be attached to the shorter gabled elevations in order to preserve the historic plan form. However, I accept that this existing extension establishes a local precedent and has been carried out with a reasonable degree of sympathy. It also reflects similar lean-to additions at The Granary and The Dovecote. On that basis, I consider that an extension to The Hayloft may be acceptable in principle. However, I object to the gabled form of the current proposal. The submitted roof form would appear at odds with the established character of the neighbouring extensions and would not sit comfortably alongside the immediately adjacent extension to The Coach House. To better preserve the simple agricultural character of the former barn range and safeguard the setting of Swithen House, the extension should instead adopt a lean-to, single-pitched roof form. This better reflects roofs and extensions of adjacent properties. The most appropriate material for the roof would be a natural sandstone slate roof covering, with conservation rooflights. Walls in coursed natural sandstone, with course heights, face dressing and pointing to match the existing building are the ideal.

Beyond the form of the proposal, I do not object in principle. However, amended plans that better reflect the host building and adjacent extensions would allow me to support this application and agree it is in accordance with S.16(2), 66(1) of the Act, Local Plan policies HE1 and HE3, and NPPF 212.

	Defer for amends/further information*	
--	--	--

*Delete as applicable

Consultation Suggested Conditions:

Consultation Informative(s):

Planning Obligations required: