

# Heritage Impact Assessment

Site Location:

Land between, Roberttown Lane  
and Lumb Lane,  
Roberttown

Site reference number:

H442

On behalf of

**Kirklees Council**

# CONTENTS

## 1.0 Introduction

- Scope of the study
- Relevant policy - NPPF
- Impact of the proposed development on the significance of the Asset

## 2.0 Methodology

- General approach
- Identifying the heritage asset
- Assessing the contribution of the setting
- Assessing the impact on the proposed development
- Assessing the options for mitigation and/or enhancement
- Glossary

## 3.0 Site assessment

- Brief history of the site
- Area of search
- Designated heritage assets within area of search

## 4.0 Assessment of the heritage asset and the contribution of the setting

- Assessment of significance of the heritage asset
- Assessment of the contribution of the setting to the heritage asset

## 5.0 Assessment of the potential impact of the allocated site on the asset(s)

## 6.0 Options for mitigation / enhancement

- Appendix A - List Descriptions  
Appendix B - Site Plans / Drawings  
Appendix C - Historic Maps

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

### Scope of the Study

- 1.1 This study has been carried out on behalf of Kirklees Council by Farrell and Clark Architects LLP. At the time of writing, the Council have identified sites in the Kirklees area for inclusion in their 2015 Kirklees Local Plan which has recently been approved. Following consultation with the relevant statutory bodies the Council have identified a selection of allocated sites which may have a potential impact on the Historic Environment. A number of these sites have been rejected as they were deemed to cause significant harm to a heritage asset which could not be mitigated. The remaining sites require independent assessment of the potential impact on the Historic Environment.
- 1.2 Farrell and Clark Architects have been appointed to assess this impact and, where possible, to advise on any mitigation which may be required. Kirklees Conservation Officer, Nigel Hunston, Historic England and West Yorkshire Archaeology Advisory Service (WYAAS), have been consulted on the proposed allocations.
- 1.3 This report has been informed by a review of historic mapping and secondary source material in addition to undertaking a site visit. The conclusions made as part of this report relate solely to the impact of the development on the Historic Environment.

### Relevant Policy - National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF):

- 1.4 This statement has taken into account Chapter 126 of the NPPF which provides guidance for local planning authorities on the strategy for site selection/allocation and states:

*“Local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats. In doing so, they should recognise that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and conserve them in a manner appropriate to their significance. In developing this strategy, local planning authorities should take into account:*

- *the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;*
- *the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits that conservation of the historic environment can bring;*
- *the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness; and*
- *opportunities to draw on the contribution made by the historic environment to the character of a place.”*

- 1.5 This statement has been prepared in accordance with the requirements under paragraph 129 which states:

*“... Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of*

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION cont.

*any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this assessment into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.*

1.6 In addition to the above the NPPF states that :

*"...local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance..."*

1.7 In the case of sites which have the potential to contain archaeological finds, the NPPF advises that the developers of the site submit an appropriate desk based assessment and where necessary a field evaluation.

1.8 The NPPF indicates that when assessing impact, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation and that this should be proportionate to the importance of the asset. Significance can be harmed not just by a material change to the asset but also to it's setting which can be of great value to the significance. If the proposal is deemed to cause harm to the asset, a robust justification will need to be presented to and assessed by the local planning authority.

1.9 If the development will lead to substantial harm, paragraph 133 indicates that the development should be refused consent by the local planning authority, unless it can be proved that the loss or damage to the asset can be outweighed by substantial benefits to the public OR if the proposal can demonstrate all of the following:

- the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and
- no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and
- conservation by grant-funding or some form of charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and
- the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.

1.10 If the development leads to less than substantial harm, paragraph 134 indicates that this harm still needs to be assessed against the public benefit of the scheme and whether or not the viability of the site is being optimised.

## 2.0 METHODOLOGY

### General approach

2.1 This report has been prepared in accordance with “The Setting of heritage assets” published by Historic England and seeks to assess the impact on a heritage asset using four steps:

- Step 1:** Identify the heritage assets and their settings affected by the allocation.
- Step 2:** Assess the contribution of the setting to the heritage asset.
- Step 3:** Assess the effect of the proposed allocation on the significance of the asset.
- Step 4:** Assess the options for mitigation in order to maximise the enhancement and minimise harm.

### Identifying the heritage asset

2.2 As part of the consultation process Historic England, WYAAS and the Conservation team at Kirklees Council Identified the allocated sites which had the potential to affect the Historic Environment. This report has assessed the potential impact of the development of the allocated site on the heritage asset(s) identified.

### Assessing the contribution of the setting

2.3 Once the asset has been identified as having the potential to be affected by the development, the significance of the asset is assessed in order to determine the contribution of the setting to the significance. The significance of the heritage asset has been assessed in accordance with “Conservation Principles Policies and Guidance for the sustainable management for the historic environment”. This document advises that in order to understand the significance of the Asset, it is necessary to first understand the perceived “heritage value” of the Asset.

2.4 These heritage values can be arranged in four groups, which may be attached to places. These are:

- Evidential:** The potential of a place to yield evidence about past human activity.
- Historical:** The ways in which past people, events and aspects of life can be connected Through a place to the present – it tends to be illustrative or associative.
- Aesthetic:** The ways in which people draw sensory and intellectual stimulation from a place.
- Communal:** The meanings of a place for the people who relate to it, or for whom it figures in their collective experience or memory.

2.5 Once the heritage value has been ascertained, the significance of that heritage value to the asset can be determined in order to assess the contribution the setting has to the significance. In the case of large numbers of listed buildings the significance of the setting will be presented in table form. If the site is particularly large it may not be possible to assign a single level of significance to the whole site and as such the varying levels of significance will be shown on a map.

## 2.0 METHODOLOGY (cont.)

- 2.6 The general level(s) of significance of the contribution made by the overall setting to the asset will be discussed and assessed in terms of a positive or negative contribution to the asset.

### Assessing the potential impact of developing the proposed allocated site

- 2.6 The purpose of this Heritage Impact Assessment is to provide guidance with regards to the potential impact of developing the allocated site. It is not possible to assess the impact of the various aspects of the design such as the form and appearance of the development as this has not yet been determined but it is possible to provide guidance on the likelihood that the development will harm the heritage asset. This will in turn will assist Kirklees Council to ascertain the level of justification required should an applicant wish to submit a planning application on the site.
- 2.7 In order to assess the level of harm of the development or elements of the development, the level of significance of the contribution made by the allocated site will be assessed and defined as follows:

- Negligible:** The allocated site provides little or no contribution to the heritage asset.
- Slight:** The allocated site provides some contribution to the heritage asset but not to the extent that any alteration will cause harm.
- Moderate:** The allocated site is important to the significance of the asset and requires assessment with the assumption that any harm will be less than substantial and can be mitigated.
- High:** The allocated site is very important to the significance of the asset and careful consideration is required to assess if the harm is substantial or less than substantial and whether the harm can be mitigated .
- Considerable:** The allocated site is essential to our understanding of the significance of the heritage asset with the assumption that any harm to that setting would be constitute substantial harm to the heritage asset and would require full justification.

- 2.8 For the larger sites it is possible that the contribution of the site will vary depending on the proximity of the site to the heritage asset. In this situation the contribution of the various areas of the site will be shown on a plan of the site.

### Assessing the options for mitigation and/or enhancement

- 2.7 Options for enhancement and mitigation are considered in response to the particular needs of the heritage asset and as such vary from site to site. It is important that these are assessed at this stage so that any decisions made regarding the setting of the asset can be used to agree the scope and form of the development. The options outlined in this assessment are by no means finite and further discussions should be held with Kirklees Planning and Development team in order to ascertain the potential options for this particular site.

## 2.0 METHODOLOGY (cont.)

2.8 Options for enhancement include:

- Removing or re-modelling an intrusive building or feature
- Replacement of a detrimental feature by a new and more harmonious one
- Restoring or revealing a lost historic feature or view
- Introducing a wholly new feature that adds to the public appreciation of the asset
- Introducing new views (including glimpses or better framed views) that add to the public experience of the asset, or
- Improving public access to, or interpretation of, the asset including its setting.

2.9 Options for mitigation include:

- The creation of buffer zones within the area for development
- Limiting building heights within certain areas of the site
- The use of sensitive design including the use of vernacular materials

2.10 Screening is also an option which can be considered when assessing the options available for mitigating the negative impact of a development on a heritage asset. Screening should only be used in addition to other options for mitigation and should not be used as a substitute for good design or buffer zones. Screening requires careful consideration with regards to the impact of the screening on the heritage asset. This can potentially have a greater impact on the asset than the development itself, if used incorrectly or insensitively.

### Glossary

2.11 The following terms have been used in this report with the definitions taken from the NPPF and from the Historic England publication “ The Setting of Heritage Assets”

#### **Conservation area**

‘An area of special architectural or historic interest, the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance’, designated under what is now s69 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

#### **Designated heritage asset:**

A World heritage Site, Scheduled Monument, Listed Building, Protected Wreck Site, Registered Park and Garden, Registered Battlefield or Conservation Area designated under the relevant legislation.

#### **Historic environment record**

Information services that seek to provide access to comprehensive and

## 2.0 METHODOLOGY (cont.)

dynamic resources relating to the historic environment of a defined geographic area for public benefit and use.

### **Setting of a heritage asset**

The surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral.

### **Significance (for heritage policy)**

The value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. That interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting.

### **Value**

An aspect of worth or importance, here attached by people to qualities of places.

### **Harm**

Change for the worse, here primarily referring to the effect of inappropriate interventions on the heritage values of a place.

## 3.0 SITE ASSESSMENT

### Site Location

- 3.1 The site is located in Roberttown district. There are a number of roads surrounding the site, these are Roberttown Lane to the north west and north sides, Richmond Park Avenue to the north, Huddersfield Road to the east and Sunnyside Avenue and Lumb Lane to the south. The land surrounding the site is largely of residential use along with Liversedge Cricket Club at the south west boundary and agricultural land beyond Roberttown Lane to the north. The boundary along Roberttown Lane is demarked by a dry stone wall.
- 3.2 Residential estates surround the site to the north east and south. There is a single row of residential buildings facing the site along Roberttown Lane, this also includes a Grade II Listed building, Old Hall Farmhouse. The site is also within approximately 315 metres of Pogg Myres Farmhouse and approximately 220 metres Duxbury Hall and Cottage, both Grade II Listed.
- 3.3 Within the site is divided into separate fields with small fences and lines of trees marking the borders. Much of this is open land with some sections used for grazing. The site falls gradually to the north and north east. These characteristics are external to the Historic Impact assessment and nothing inside the boundary is included in the National Heritage List of England.




Figure 1 - Site plan

## 3.0 SITE ASSESSMENT (cont.)

### Brief site history

- 3.4 Roberttown is located within the township of Liversedge and also includes the hamlets of Millbridge, Littletown, Hightown and the Heights. Roberttown developed as a compact village with public houses, a cotton and wire mill (Balm Gate Mill), a school which served the township, a leatherworks, churches and chapels. The main industry for this area was coal mining.
- 3.5 This area began to be developed in the 17<sup>th</sup> Century with the appearance of farms such Bullace Trees and Lowfold to the north-west.
- 3.6 Coal mining was prevalent in Roberttown and a high proportion of the village residents were principally employed in the mining industry. Numerous coal pits were located to the north of Roberttown Lane with other scattered in the surrounding countryside to the north and to the south west of Roberttown. By 1854 there were 8 coal pits to the north of the site but are then listed as air shafts and old shafts on the 1894 OS map. Collieries were opened by the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> Century with one located directly to the north of the site and another to the east of Huddersfield Road (Southfield Colliery).
- 3.7 Sandstone quarries are also found within the area, with a quarry being listed to the north-east of the site beside Liversedge Hall in the mid-19<sup>th</sup> Century.
- 3.8 Housing developments did not appear in this area until the early 20<sup>th</sup> Century, by 1934 houses had been constructed on the northern side of Roberttown Lane creating a continuous line of development between Roberttown and Old Hall Farmhouse (to the west of the site). Sunnyside Avenue and Stanley Road (which borders the site to the south) had been built by 1947. Robert Court (which borders the site to the north) was developed in the late 20<sup>th</sup> Century (c.1980s) and replaced Providence Buildings which were located on the southern side of Roberttown Lane.
- 3.9 Historically, the site has not been developed upon and has been used for agricultural purposes only.

### Identification of heritage assets

- 3.10 There are a number of heritage assets within the vicinity of the site as shown on the site plan . The majority of these assets are located to the north and north-west of the site. The designated heritage asset that has been identified as requiring assessment by Kirklees Council following consultation, is the Grade II\* Old Hall Farmhouse (List entry number 1135409) .
- 3.11 The listing description of Old Hall Farmhouse, Roberttown Lane states:  
*“Large farmhouse. C.17. Deeply coursed hammer dressed stone. Gabled stone slate roof with chamfered copings with large finials. Two stone spouts with carved*

### 3.0 SITE ASSESSMENT (cont.)

*faces. Two storeys and attics, with continuous drip mould over ground and 1st floor openings. Square plan with 2 gables to each elevation. Symmetrical facade with central doorway with moulded surround, classical impost and square headed lintel with moulded arched panel. To left and right, ground floor, is 8-light window with King mullion, and to 1st floor a 6-light window, all double chamfered. One blind 2-light window, in each gable, with drip mould. To extreme right, ground floor, is a doorway, enlarged from a 2-light window. Left elevation has projecting chimney breast, tall cross window for stairs, and 5 and 3-light windows. Right elevation has Tudor arched doorway and 4 and 3-light windows. Small C.18 addition to rear. Some detailing has been repaired with mortar. Some oak panelling inside. A good example of its type.”*

## 4.0 ASSESSMENT OF THE HERITAGE ASSET AND THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE SETTING

### Old Hall Farm, Lowfold Hall

4.1 Stone house of mid-late 17th century. Frank Peel (Peel, 1893. *Spen Valley: Past and Present*) records that the house, then called Lowfold Farm, was built by a clothier, Richard Green. The house gives a large 'U' shaped block on plan and is of two and a half storeys, with a two-gabled façade on three fronts (east, west and south). The south front façade is in well-finished coursed stonework, in contrast to the coursed rubble stonework of the other walls. The windows throughout most of the house have recessed splayed mullions (except at the rear and in the outshut). Continuous drip courses run over the ground and first floor windows on the south front, and the façade is ornamented with gable and valley finials and gutter spouts with grotesque faces carved on the ends. The main door is sited centrally in the south front and has a shaped lintel with the initial 'RMG' (badly eroded). The hall (south-eastern room on ground floor) retains some square panelling and two surviving beams. The panelling over the fireplace in the east wall, shows carved spindles (supposedly a symbol of involvement in the cloth industry), and a small closet, contained in a 2-storey projection at the corner of the house may be a possible original garderobe. To the west of the hall was the parlour (now featureless), and at the rear were probably service rooms. The first-floor was not fully inspected. Peel reports that one chamber (the south-west?) has an elaborate plaster ceiling. The main chamber at the south-east corner has a bolection-moulded fireplace and bolection-moulded raised panelling: both presumably date from an early-18th century re-fitting. *(Text edited from Giles, 1979)*



Figure 2 - View of the Hall from Roberttown Lane



Figure 3 - View of the barns from Roberttown Lane



Lowfold Hall, Robert-town.

Figure 4 - Sketch of the hall from Peel, 1893. *Spen Valley: Past and Present*



## 4.0 ASSESSMENT OF THE HERITAGE ASSET AND THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE SETTING

sister Mrs Ann Senior who appears to have had a shop on the premises. According to the “Summaries of the Liversedge Deeds 1706 - 1830” Mr Thomas Brooke was a Millbridge Maltster who appears to have passed away shortly after 1803 when this map and list of owners was compiled. It appears that the premises at Old Hall Farm / Lowfold Hall and the surrounding land was jointly owned by Mr Thomas Brook and Mrs Ann Senior which then passed to Ann upon her brother’s death.

4.5 In addition to Lowfold Hall, Mr Thomas Brook also owned a number of other plots of land, most notably 3no plots of land in the centre of Millbridge which adjoined a House and Malt Kiln which were also under the ownership of Thomas. This area of land adjacent to the Malt Kiln could have been used to grow the hops required for the malt but it is also possible that they were grown on the land surrounding Lowfold Hall but this is uncertain. We do know that in 1803 the land was in the same ownership as the Hall and that the land was in use as agricultural.

4.6 The first edition OS map dated 1854 shows that the structures on the site were slightly different to the structures that subsequently appeared on the 1908 map which reflect the existing arrangement (see figure ? Where the red structures are as shown on the 1854 map). It is evident from the earlier map that the existing structure to the rear extended further to the east and that there was a large structure which sat to the south of this wing. On the ownership deeds of 1803 the wing to the rear was listed as “homestead etc.” with the main hall being listed as “Mrs Senior’s shop”. It is possible that this has been incorrectly labelled but it never the less indicates that this range to the rear was of some importance. The large structure to the south has not been named in the ownership deeds but it is possible that this structure was an agricultural building of some sort, or it could have been related to the hop drying process.




Figure 7 - Excerpt from the hand drawn version of the 1803 ownership map

Brook	Thomas	34	Croft
Brook	Thomas	42	New Ley
Brook	Thomas	63	House & Malt Kiln
Brook	Thomas	199	Pt House etc
Brook	Thomas	569	Dove Cote Ing (Near Pond Close (Tenter Croft))
Brook	Thomas	574	
Brook	Thomas	580	
Brook	Thomas	582	
Brook	Thomas	583	

Figure 8 - Excerpt from the list of owners




Figure 9 - Current plan with 1854 overlay

## 4.0 ASSESSMENT OF THE HERITAGE ASSET AND THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE SETTING

- 4.7 **Evidential Value** - The extant Hall has been thoroughly researched, including elements of the building that have now been lost and as such there is limited opportunity for the extant structure to yield any further evidential value. There may be further evidential value in the area to the east of the hall in the former location of the early 19th century structures.
- 4.8 **Illustrative Historical Value**—The age, form and design of the Hall give the asset illustrative historical value as a good quality example of a 17th century hall. The former barns to the rear, (although later than the Hall and now converted to housing and a children’s day nursery) provide a link to the former agricultural use of the Hall and the surrounding land.
- 4.9 **Associative Historical Value** - The maps of 1803 provide a clear indication of the agricultural nature of the land and its connection to the Hall. There is also be a connection to the Maltster industry with the former owner Mr Thomas Brook. This connection could be an associative connection or it could be a physical connection depending on whether the land was used in the production of the barley required to produce the hops.
- 4.10 **Aesthetic Value** - Following the repair and alteration works that were undertaken towards the end of the 20th century, the traditional form and detailing of the building has, been retained and provides aesthetic value. The stone details such as the mullioned windows, hoodmoulds and the gargoyles, which have in recent years been repaired, and in some areas restored, contribute to the aesthetic value of the building.
- 4.11 **Communal Value** - The house has communal value due to its links with the agricultural, mining and the Maltster industries.

### Level of importance

- 4.12 The building is included on the List of Buildings of Special Architectural or Historic Interest at Grade II\* and as such is of national importance and more than special interest.
- 4.13 Of the values listed above it is the illustrative historic and aesthetic values that most strongly contribute to the significance of the building.

### Immediate setting

- 4.14 As mentioned above there is the likely hood that there is evidential value in the land to the east of the heritage asset where the rear wing extended and the large structure was located.
- 4.15 The Hall gardens and the garden boundary have high levels of both associative and illustrative



Figure 10 - Excerpt from the hand drawn version of the 1803 ownership map

historical value. On the Ownership map of 1803 the garden as split into an orchard to the north, a formal garden adjacent to the south elevation, and a plot of land containing tenter frames between the garden and the road (identified as plot 467 on the above plan).

- 4.16 These areas also contribute to the aesthetic value of the Hall and are important to the setting of the asset.
- 4.17 The barns and associated structures to north-east of the Hall have high historic and aesthetic value to the asset as they define the public/agricultural areas of the setting and are in contrast the more private garden and orchard spaces to the south-west of the hall. These structures are essential to our understanding of the agricultural history of the Hall as is this differentiation between these two areas.

### Extended setting

- 4.18 It is interesting to note that the area on the opposite side of the road to the barns appears to have been relatively built up as far back as 1803 when the structures are shown on the ownership map. It appears that the access into the land was between plots 540 and 541 which would have been opposite the farm buildings and would have provided a direct link between these structures and the land. This is further emphasised by the name of this field as “Close before Door” which indicates that it was the last field before entrance into the barns.
- 4.19 The area noted on the plan as plot 539 has been defined as “waste”. This is interesting as it appears that the connection between the Hall and the land was (at least in 1803) a purely functional relationship, the Hall was not designed to have an aspect overlooking the land. This would be supported by location of the Hall next to the road (which is historic and can be seen on the Jeffrey’s Map of 1771) which separates the Hall from the land.

## 5.0 ASSESSING THE IMPACT OF THE ALLOCATION ON THE ASSET


- 5.1 The exact form of the development is not yet known so the following is a general assessment of the effect of developing H442 and whether or not this will cause harm to the heritage asset.



- 5.2 In general the fields which form the allocated site are significant to the history of the site as we are able to link the ownership of the Hall to the ownership of the land. The asset no longer has an agricultural identity and as such the link to this area of land has been weakened. The views to and from the asset are still of significance and they are historic views and enable us to appreciate the former agricultural setting of the Hall and its surroundings.
- 5.3 **Field boundaries: Considerable significance** - These field boundaries are historic field boundaries and relate directly to the former agricultural use of the land which in turn relates back to the former agricultural identity of the hall and the outbuildings. Loss of these field boundaries would cause significant harm to the asset and as such they should be retained.
- 5.4 **Land directly adjacent to the heritage asset: Moderate significance** - Although this area of land is visually separated from the asset by the belt of trees located in the Hall gardens adjacent to the road, these are not permanent features and they cannot be assumed to be a buffer zone. This land is of high significance to the heritage asset as it contributes to the agricultural history and to the setting of the Hall. This land also forms the setting to the historic views to and from the Hall. The effect of developing this area of land has been carefully considered and if this open area of land was to be lost there is the potential for it to cause less than substantial harm to the asset. If this area is carefully designed the harm could be mitigated.
- 5.5 **Extended setting : Moderate significance** - The areas of the allocated site to the east and south of the high significance area are of moderate significance as they provide a rural / agricultural setting. They also contribute to historic views from the asset and provide the rural setting for the historic footpath leading through the allocated site to the asset.

## 5.0 ASSESSING THE IMPACT OF THE ALLOCATION ON THE ASSET

5.6 **Extended setting : Slight significance** - The remaining areas of the allocated site are of slight significance as they provide a rural / agricultural setting.



## 6.0 OPTIONS FOR MITIGATION / ENHANCEMENT

- 6.1 The advice below has been given in order to provide guidance on how the harm to the heritage assets may be mitigated. Each one of these options needs to be explored further as part of the design process for the site but this list is not exhaustive and alternative options should also be considered. Any mitigation / enhancement options need to be discussed and agreed with Kirklees Planning and Development. All development in any area of the site which is deemed to have any significance to the asset, however slight, should be treated as being within the setting of a heritage asset and should be in accordance with policy PLP35 of the Kirklees Local Plan.
- 6.2 The areas of the site that have been identified as having moderate significance are important to the significance of the asset and require assessment with the assumption that any harm will be less than substantial and can be mitigated. This mitigation is required in order to retain the views of the heritage asset from the road and from the footpath and to retain the open agricultural setting.
- 6.3 Any development in an area of moderate significance needs to be in keeping with the scale, height, massing and alignment of the historic buildings in the vicinity with particular attention paid to the immediate setting of the heritage asset. The design should seek to make use of traditional or sympathetic building materials and techniques and the proposed use of the buildings in should respect the traditional character of the setting of the adjacent heritage asset which is in this case agricultural.
- 6.4 It is essential to retain the footpath and the field boundaries within the allocated site.
- 6.5 Areas of the site which have been identified as having slight significance to the heritage asset have been assessed as providing some contribution to the asset. It is the opinion of this report that despite the slight significance of the area, it is still considered to be within the setting of a heritage asset and as such any proposals for this area should be in keeping with policy PLP35 of the Kirklees Local Plan, as stated above, in order for there to be no harm to the heritage asset.

LIST DESCRIPTIONS



Historic England

# OLD HALL FARMHOUSE

## List Entry Summary

This building is listed under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended for its special architectural or historic interest.

Name: OLD HALL FARMHOUSE

List entry Number: 1135409

## Location

OLD HALL FARMHOUSE, ROBERTTOWN LANE

The building may lie within the boundary of more than one authority.

County:

District: Kirklees

District Type: Metropolitan Authority

Parish:

National Park: Not applicable to this List entry.

Grade: II\*

Date first listed: 12-Jan-1967

Date of most recent amendment: 13-Jan-1984

# Legacy System Information

The contents of this record have been generated from a legacy data system.

Legacy System: LBS

UID: 341069

## Asset Groupings

This list entry does not comprise part of an Asset Grouping. Asset Groupings are not part of the official record but are added later for information.

## List entry Description

### Summary of Building

Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

### Reasons for Designation

Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

### History

Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

### Details

SE 12 SE SPENBOROUGH MB ROBERTTOWN LANE ROBERTTOWN 3/162 Old Hall Farmhouse 12/1/67 (Formerly listed as No 34 (Old Hall Farmhouse) II\*

Large farmhouse. C.17. Deeply coursed hammer dressed stone. Gabled stone slate roof with chamfered copings with large finials. Two stone spouts with carved faces. Two storeys and attics, with continuous drip mould over ground and 1st floor openings. Square plan with 2 gables to each elevation.

Symmetrical facade with central doorway with moulded surround, classical impostes and square headed lintel with moulded arched panel. To left and right, ground floor, is 8-light window with King mullion, and to 1st floor a 6-light window, all double chamfered. One blind 2-light window, in each gable,

with drip mould. To extreme right, ground floor, is a doorway, enlarged from a 2-light window. Left elevation has projecting chimney breast, tall cross window for stairs, and 5 and 3-light windows. Right elevation has Tudor arched doorway and 4 and 3-light windows. Small C.18 addition to rear. Some detailing has been repaired with mortar. Some oak panelling inside. A good example of its type.


Listing NGR: SE1985222984

## Selected Sources

Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details

National Grid Reference: SE 19852 22984

## Map



© Crown Copyright and database right 2016. All rights reserved. Ordnance Survey Licence number 100024900.

© British Crown and SeaZone Solutions Limited 2016. All rights reserved. Licence number 102006.006.

Use of this data is subject to [Terms and Conditions \(https://historicengland.org.uk/terms/website-terms-conditions/\)](https://historicengland.org.uk/terms/website-terms-conditions/).

The above map is for quick reference purposes only and may not be to scale. For a copy of the full scale map, please see the attached PDF - [1135409 .pdf \(http://mapservices.HistoricEngland.org.uk/printwebservicehle/StatutoryPrint.svc/430827/HLE\\_A4L\\_Grade|HLE\\_A3L\\_Grade.pdf\)](http://mapservices.HistoricEngland.org.uk/printwebservicehle/StatutoryPrint.svc/430827/HLE_A4L_Grade|HLE_A3L_Grade.pdf)

The PDF will be generated from our live systems and may take a few minutes to download depending on how busy our servers are. We apologise for this delay.

This copy shows the entry on 24-Oct-2016 at 08:58:13.

End of official listing

SITE PLANS / DRAWINGS

**Local Plan Site: H442**


# LIVERSEDGE

**Legend**

- Local Plan Site
- Archaeological Site
- Registered Battlefield
- Conservation Area
- Listed Building
- Registered Parks and Gardens
- Scheduled Monuments



**Planning Policy**



Scale: 1:5000

Date: January 2017

© Crown Copyright and database right 2017. Ordnance Survey 100019241



HISTORIC MAPS



[Leeds@farrellandclark.co.uk](mailto:Leeds@farrellandclark.co.uk)  
[London@farrellandclark.co.uk](mailto:London@farrellandclark.co.uk)  
[www.farrellandclark.co.uk](http://www.farrellandclark.co.uk)

First Floor, Brodrick's Building,  
43 -51 Cookridge St,  
Leeds, LS2 3AW

Tudor House,  
35 Gresse Street,  
London, W1T 1QY