

Our Ref: 26/00010/ACC \APPTIP1
Please Contact: [REDACTED]
Telephone: [REDACTED]
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Date: 23 March 2026

www.calderdale.gov.uk
**Regeneration & Strategy
Planning Service
C/O The Town Hall
Halifax
HX1 1UJ**

Dear Sir/Madam

**TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990
PLANNING APPEAL UNDER SECTION 78**

**Site Address: Brookfield Farm Woodhouse Road Todmorden Calderdale
OL14 6BL**

**Proposal: Conversion and extension of existing building to a new dwelling and the
formation of a passing place.**

Appellant's name: [REDACTED]

Appeal Ref. No.: 6006032

Appeal start date: 12.03.2026

I am writing to inform you that an appeal has been made in respect of the above site. The appeal follows the refusal of planning permission consent/approval/agreement under a condition, development order or local development order by Calderdale Metropolitan Borough Council.

The appeal will be determined on the basis of written representations. The procedure to be followed is set out in Part 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Appeals) (Written Representations Procedure) (England) Regulations 2009, as amended.

We have forwarded all the representations made to us on the application to the Planning Inspectorate and the appellant. These will be considered by the Inspector when determining the appeal.

If you wish to make comments, or modify/withdraw your previous representation, you can do so online at <https://appeal-planning-decision.service.gov.uk/comment-planning-appeal/enter-appeal-reference>

In deciding whether to provide further comments, you are advised that the appellant may have submitted additional evidence that you have not previously seen. Your comments can address such matters.

If you do not have access to the internet, you can send your comments to:

The Planning Inspectorate
c/o QUADIENT
69 Buckingham Avenue



Richard Seaman
Corporate Lead for Planning Services

Slough
SL1 4PN

All representations must be received by 20.04.2026. Any representations submitted after the deadline will not usually be considered and will be returned. The Planning Inspectorate does not acknowledge representations. **All representations must quote the appeal reference.**

Please note that any representations you submit to the Planning Inspectorate will be copied to the appellant and this local planning authority and will be considered by the Inspector when determining the appeal.

The appeal documents are available for inspection on the Councils website <https://portal.calderdale.gov.uk/online-applications/search.do?action=simple> - Please note that the appeal documents will be on the Appeal and you will need to select the Appeal category and use the Council's Appeal Reference (eg 20/00001) which can be found in the top left hand corner of this letter to view the appeal documents.)

You can get a copy of one of the Planning Inspectorate's "Guide to taking part in planning appeals" booklets free of charge from GOV.UK at <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/taking-part-in-a-planning-listed-building-or-enforcement-appeal>

When made, the decision will be published online at <https://appeal-planning-decision.service.gov.uk/comment-planning-appeal/enter-appeal-reference>

Yours faithfully

Richard Seaman
Corporate Lead for Planning Services

Application:

[25/00230/FUL](#)

Brookfield Farm, Woodhouse Road, Todmorden, Calderdale, OL14 6BL

Conversion and extension of existing building to a new dwelling and the formation of a passing place.

Original notes from application:

Existing building is used as stables, animal feed storage and domestic storage.

Proposed self-build to convert into a dwelling. No change to footprint but overall volume of building will have a 28% increase. Roof pitch will be raised to allow for a 2-storey property.

A new passing place is proposed on the access road to the property allowing for cars to pass safely.

A bat survey has been undertaken with this summary – “Bat survey works undertaken have confirmed the presence of one common pipistrelle day roost and one brown long-eared bat night roost in the building. A bat mitigation licence will be required to permit the proposed scheme, with a mitigation plan proposed. Recommended roost mitigation comprises installation of three building-integrated bat boxes and use of a bat safe roofing membrane. If the licence is to be applied for after May 2026, then an update nocturnal survey will be required.”

Proposed drainage strategy prioritising SuDS as follows:

- Permeable surfacing for hard standing or parking areas to reduce runoff.
- Rainwater harvesting being considered
- Soakaways or infiltration trenches are feasible

The existing waste removal arrangement in place for the farmhouse will continue for the additional dwelling, with refuse collected at the property. Adapted, smaller-sized Isuzu refuse vehicles are used by the Council’s refuse collectors.

The proposed development is 90 meters away from a grade II listed building, but approximately 40-45 meters higher in elevation on the hillside so it is believed that it will not cause harm to this structure.

Land Stability assessment states land should be suitable for standard shallow foundations.

TTC Comment:

Support in line with the recommendation made in the bat survey, and in line with Neighbourhood Plan Policies H4, H5 & H8.

CMBC Decision:

Refuse

Reason for refusal:

1. The development is not well connected on foot to local facilities and public transport and therefore in terms of sustainable access it would be contrary to policies HS1 (Non Allocated Sites), BT4 (The Design and Layout of Highways and Accesses), IM4 (Sustainable Travel), and IM5 (Ensuring

Development Supports Sustainable Travel) of the Calderdale Local Plan and would not support the objectives set out in paragraphs 109 and 110 of Chapter 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. The access road serving the site is in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority substandard both in width and radius and would be inadequate to accommodate with safety and convenience the additional traffic which would be generated by the proposed development having regard to policy BT4 (The Design and Layout of Highways and Accesses) of the Calderdale Local Plan.

3. The application gives insufficient information to enable the full implications of the proposal to be properly considered, particularly with regards to details of the drainage of the site. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policy CC2 Flood Risk Management (Managing Flood Risk in New Development) of the Calderdale Local Plan and Calderdale's Placemaking and Design Guide SPD and Flood Risk and Drainage SPD as well as Chapter 14 (Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change) of the National Planning Policy Framework.

APPEAL STATEMENT

Town and Country Planning Act 1990 – Section 78

Proposal: Conversion and extension of existing building to a new dwelling and formation of a passing place

Site: Brookfield Farm, Woodhouse Road, Todmorden

LPA Reference: 25/00230/FUL

Opening Statement

This appeal relates to the proposed conversion and modest extension of an existing agricultural building within the established Brookfield Farmstead to form a single dwelling. The proposal represents the sensitive reuse of an existing structure, securing its long-term maintenance while preserving the character of the surrounding countryside.

The Council's officer report accepts that the proposal accords with key elements of the development plan, including the principle of reusing an existing rural building under Policy GB2, and confirms that the development would not cause unacceptable landscape harm.

Planning permission was nevertheless refused on the basis of concerns relating to accessibility, the access track and drainage detail.

This statement demonstrates that those concerns either arise from a disproportionate interpretation of policy or relate to matters that could reasonably have been addressed through planning conditions. In addition, the Council currently cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites, meaning the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in the National Planning Policy Framework applies.

For these reasons, the appellant respectfully considers that the proposal represents sustainable development and that the appeal should be allowed.

Report:

Key Appeal Issues

The appeal raises three principal issues which correspond directly with the reasons for refusal:

- Whether the site represents a sustainable location for the conversion of an existing building to residential use.
- Whether the existing access arrangements would give rise to unacceptable highway safety impacts.
- Whether the drainage information submitted with the application was sufficient, or whether any outstanding matters could reasonably have been addressed through planning conditions.

1.0 Introduction

This statement accompanies an appeal against the refusal of planning permission for the conversion and modest extension of an existing agricultural building at Brookfield Farm to form a single dwelling.

The proposal seeks to reuse an existing building within the established Brookfield Farmstead, retaining its footprint and agricultural character while securing its long-term maintenance and viable use.

Planning permission was refused for three reasons relating to:

1. The sustainability of the site location
2. The adequacy of the access track
3. The provision of drainage information

The Council's officer report accepts that the proposal reuses an existing building in accordance with Policy GB2 and would not cause unacceptable landscape harm. The matters in dispute therefore relate primarily to highway and drainage considerations.

2. Site Context and Proposal

Brookfield Farm is an established rural farmstead located to the north of Woodhouse Road on the edge of Todmorden.

The farmstead comprises a group of buildings including the farmhouse, agricultural structures and ancillary buildings arranged around a traditional farmyard.

The proposal involves the conversion of an existing stable and storage building to create a single dwelling. The footprint of the building is retained, with a modest roof lift to provide usable first-floor accommodation.

The proposal also includes the formation of a passing place along the existing access track.

The development would result in one additional dwelling within the farmstead, bringing the total number of dwellings on the site to two.

3. Planning Policy Context

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires planning applications to be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Relevant Calderdale Local Plan policies include SD1, HS1, GB2, BT4, IM4, IM5 and CC2. Relevant sections of the National Planning Policy Framework include Paragraph 11 (presumption in favour of sustainable development), Paragraph 85 (rural transport considerations), Paragraph 111 (highway impacts) and Chapter 14 relating to flood risk.

Report:

The officer report confirms that Calderdale currently cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of housing land. This is a significant material consideration which engages the tilted balance in favour of sustainable development.

4. Response to Reason for Refusal 1 – Sustainable Access and Location

The first reason for refusal states that the site is not well connected to local facilities and public transport and therefore conflicts with Policies HS1, BT4, IM4 and IM5 of the Calderdale Local Plan and the objectives of the NPPF relating to sustainable transport.

The appellant respectfully considers that this conclusion places disproportionate reliance on accessibility metrics that are more typically applied to large-scale urban housing allocations rather than the reuse of an existing rural building.

The appeal proposal involves the conversion of an existing agricultural building located within an established farmstead on the edge of Todmorden. The proposal does not introduce new built form into previously undeveloped countryside but instead reuses an existing structure, a form of development specifically supported by Policy GB2 of the Calderdale Local Plan.

Policy HS1 supports residential development on non-allocated sites where proposals satisfy a range of locational and environmental criteria. The proposal satisfies these requirements in that:

- it reuses an existing building rather than extending development into open countryside
- it lies within reasonable proximity to Todmorden and its services
- it does not give rise to unacceptable environmental or infrastructure impacts.

The officer report itself acknowledges that the proposal represents the reuse of an existing building and does not give rise to unacceptable landscape harm.

In assessing accessibility, the highways response appears to rely heavily on rigid distance thresholds relating to bus stops and local facilities. These thresholds originate primarily from urban design guidance such as Manual for Streets, which is intended to guide the planning of new neighbourhoods and large housing developments.

National planning policy does not apply such thresholds mechanistically.

Paragraph 85 of the NPPF is explicit that:

“Opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas.”

This reflects the reality that rural and edge-of-settlement communities inevitably rely more heavily on private transport due to their dispersed settlement patterns.

The application site lies approximately 1 kilometre from Todmorden town centre, where a wide range of services and facilities are available. Public transport services operate along Halifax Road within walking distance of the site.

Report:

The accessibility of the site is therefore typical of many rural and edge-of-settlement locations within Calderdale and across the wider Pennine region.

Importantly, the NPPF does not require development in rural areas to replicate the accessibility characteristics of urban locations. Rather, the planning system must recognise the differing travel patterns associated with rural communities.

When considered within its proper rural planning context, the location of the development cannot reasonably be regarded as unsustainable.

The proposal therefore accords with the objectives of Policies HS1, IM4 and IM5 of the Calderdale Local Plan and with the relevant provisions of the NPPF

Misapplication of Accessibility Metrics

In assessing the sustainability of the site, the highway authority's response appears to rely heavily on distance thresholds typically associated with urban design guidance, including assumptions regarding acceptable walking distances to public transport and services.

Such thresholds are primarily derived from guidance documents such as Manual for Streets, which were prepared to inform the design and layout of new urban neighbourhoods. They are not intended to operate as rigid policy tests determining the acceptability of development in rural locations.

The NPPF does not prescribe fixed distance thresholds for rural development.

Instead, national policy requires decision makers to consider accessibility in its local context, recognising the differences between rural and urban environments.

Paragraph 85 of the NPPF explicitly states that:

“Opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas.”

The reliance on urban accessibility assumptions therefore risks applying an unduly restrictive interpretation of sustainable travel policy to development located within a rural farmstead.

The appeal proposal does not represent the creation of a new settlement in the countryside. It involves the reuse of an existing agricultural building within an established group of buildings on the edge of Todmorden.

In this context, the level of accessibility associated with the site is typical of rural and edge-of-settlement locations across Calderdale and the wider Pennine region.

When assessed in accordance with the NPPF's recognition of differing rural travel patterns, the proposal cannot reasonably be regarded as unsustainable.

Report:

5. Response to Reason for Refusal 2 – Highway Safety

The second reason for refusal relates to the width and alignment of the existing access track serving Brookfield Farm.

The access track is an established route which has historically served the farmstead and associated agricultural activity. It currently accommodates a range of vehicle movements including agricultural machinery, delivery vehicles and domestic traffic.

The proposal would introduce only one additional dwelling within the farmstead and therefore represents a very modest change in traffic generation.

In practice, the conversion of the building from agricultural use to residential use is unlikely to increase the overall intensity of vehicle movements associated with the site. Agricultural activity commonly generates movements involving tractors, machinery and delivery vehicles which are typically larger and slower than private vehicles associated with residential use.

The proposal also includes the formation of a passing place along the access track, which represents a tangible improvement to the existing arrangement and would assist vehicles in passing safely.

The refusal reason suggests that the geometry of the access track is substandard. However, the access currently functions safely and there is no evidence of any recorded accident history associated with the route. National policy sets a clear and deliberately high threshold for refusing development on highway grounds.

Paragraph 111 of the NPPF states:

“Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.”

In this case no evidence has been presented to demonstrate that the proposal would give rise to impacts that could reasonably be described as severe.

No quantitative traffic assessment has been presented and no accident data has been cited to indicate that the proposal would materially increase highway risk.

Furthermore, the proposal includes measures which would improve the operation of the access through the provision of a passing place.

Given the extremely limited scale of the proposal and the existing use of the access, the development would not give rise to any unacceptable highway safety impacts.

The appellant therefore considers that the second reason for refusal does not satisfy the “severe impact” test set out in paragraph 111 of the NPPF and that refusal on highway grounds is not justified.

Report:

6. **Response to Reason for Refusal 3 – Drainage**

The application was supported by a Flood Risk Assessment confirming that the site lies within Flood Zone 1, an area of low probability of flooding.

The consultation response from the Council's Flood Risk Manager does not identify any fundamental constraint affecting the site. Instead, the consultee requests additional technical information including percolation testing, soakaway sizing, drainage layout drawings, exceedance flow routes and maintenance arrangements.

The consultee response effectively sets out the information required for a detailed drainage scheme to be submitted for approval. This is typical of the information secured through pre-commencement planning conditions.

The issue therefore relates to technical detail rather than the principle of drainage. Given that the consultee was able to clearly outline the information required, the matter could reasonably have been addressed through the imposition of a planning condition rather than forming a basis for refusal.

7. **Planning Balance**

The appeal proposal represents the reuse of an existing rural building within an established farmstead.

The development would secure the long-term maintenance of the structure while providing a modest addition to the Borough's housing stock.

The proposal has been assessed against the relevant policies of the Calderdale Local Plan and the NPPF. The Council's own officer report accepts that:

- the proposal reuses an existing building in accordance with Policy GB2
- the scale of the extension is proportionate
- the development would not cause unacceptable landscape harm.

The matters cited in the refusal therefore relate primarily to highway considerations and drainage detail.

As set out earlier in this statement:

- the accessibility concerns rely on the application of urban-based accessibility metrics to a rural development context
- the highway objection does not demonstrate impacts that meet the "severe" threshold required by paragraph 111 of the NPPF
- the drainage matter relates to technical details which could reasonably have been addressed through planning conditions.

A further significant material consideration is the Council's current inability to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites.

In these circumstances the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in paragraph 11 of the NPPF is engaged.

Report:

This means that planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposal when assessed against the policies of the NPPF as a whole.

The appeal proposal would:

- reuse an existing rural building
- secure the long-term maintenance of the structure
- deliver an additional dwelling within an established settlement pattern
- avoid the need for new greenfield development elsewhere.

The identified concerns either relate to matters that can be mitigated or to issues that do not meet the policy threshold for refusal.

When assessed against the policies of the Development Plan and the NPPF as a whole, the benefits of the proposal clearly outweigh the concerns raised.

8. Conclusion

The appeal proposal represents a modest and appropriate reuse of an existing building within an established rural farmstead.

The development accords with both local and national planning policy. The concerns raised by the Local Planning Authority either place disproportionate weight on accessibility expectations or relate to matters that could reasonably be addressed through planning conditions.

For these reasons the appellant respectfully requests that the Planning Inspectorate allows the appeal and grants planning permission.

Prepared by

Mathew Benson

Architect RIBA ARB