

11th June 2026

Liley Hall
Liley Lane
Mirfield
WF14 8EG

FTAO: The Case Officer

Dear Danielle,

We would like to register our strong objection to Planning Application 2026/62/90880/E for the proposed redevelopment of the agricultural sheds at Liley Hall Farm into residential units.

From the submission, it is unclear whether this application is for Full Planning permission or is based upon a Class Q application (*the permitted development right to convert agricultural buildings to dwellings in England*) given that the proposal assumes reusing the existing agricultural structures.

- The Planning Statement suggests full planning permission is being sought; however, the information submitted is wholly insufficient in detail and scope to enable a reliable decision to be reached
- If permission under Class Q is being sought, the proposals do not conform on numerous grounds

Either way, the application presents a significant overdevelopment of the site and, as currently proposed, would cause significant harm to the Grade II listed Farmhouse that sits within the farm curtilage of the agricultural sheds and to the Grade II listed Hall (which are semi-detached from one another). Our detailed objections are set out below.

1. Significant and adverse impact on the setting of a Grade II listed, heritage asset

The application fails to demonstrate compliance with Policy LP35 of the Kirklees Local Plan and Chapter 16 of the NPPF. The submitted heritage information is insufficient to properly assess the effect of the development on the setting and significance of the Grade II listed Liley Hall Farm and Grade II listed Liley Hall.

The proposals present significant harm to the Grade II listed Farmhouse 'Liley Hall Farm' which sits within the shared curtilage of the agricultural sheds and adjacent to Grade II listed 'Liley Hall' (semi-detached from the farmhouse).

The proposed development is approximately 17.65m from the corner of the listed farmhouse to the edge of the nearest agricultural shed and 6.5m from the listed brick outbuilding that forms part of Liley Hall Farm.

We strongly urge the case officer to consult their conservation colleagues and to require that a Full Planning Application be prepared with a detailed Heritage Impact Assessment, in order to prevent harm to these designated heritage assets.


11th June 2026

The 'Heritage Impact Assessment' in the Planning Statement (pg 16) is grossly insufficient in detail, neglecting any historical information (photos, plans, details, etc) about the Grade II buildings that would be affected by the proposals. See historic maps (source: National Library of Scotland) below which are significant to the built heritage and listed status of Liley Hall Farm, illustrating the historic relationship of the agricultural outbuildings with Liley Hall, sharing the same curtilage:


- OS map 1840s – 1880s



- OS map 1900s



- OS map 1940s – 1970s



2. Overdevelopment of the site

For an application proposing 9 new houses and an annexe (10 dwellings), the drawings included within this application are vague and insufficient in detail. For a planning application, site-wide existing and proposed sections and elevations need to be considered that show the proposals properly cited in their surrounding context to fully illustrate the changes proposed. The impact of introducing 10 dwellings to the farm, with 27 parking spaces, is substantial and warrants a much more detailed analysis.

Class Q stipulates that the maximum total floor space across all dwellings is 1000sqm and that the maximum size of any single dwelling is 150sqm.

Having scaled the plans available, the proposed building areas appear to be as follows:

- **Existing Buildings 1-4 (Proposed Unit 1 + Annexe)**
 - Approximately 330sqm for the 5-bed house and 115sqm for the 2-bed annexe
 - Totalling approximately 445sqm (substantially greater than the 150sqm allowed)
- **Existing Building 5 (proposed units 2-4)**
 - Approximately 640sqm for the 3 new dwellings proposed (substantially greater than the 150sqm allowed)
- **Existing Building 6 & 7 (proposed units 5-9)**
 - Approximately 716sqm for the 5 new dwellings proposed (which, when taking into account first floor accommodation, would be *substantially* greater than the 150sqm allowance per unit)
- **Total Built Development Area approximately 1800 sqm**
 - Significantly exceeding the 1000sqm maximum that Class Q stipulates

The drawings illustrate that significant alterations would be required to all of the existing agricultural sheds for the proposed units to work, again contravening the principle of Class Q, if this is the intended application route.

3. Concerns relating to information provided

- **Design & External Appearance of the Building**
 - The application fails to demonstrate compliance with Policies LP2 and LP24 as insufficient information has been provided regarding appearance, materials, detailing and the relationship of the development to the historic farmstead setting.
 - The application has not adequately assessed the landscape and visual effects of introducing ten residential units and associated domestic infrastructure into a historic farmstead setting, contrary to Policy LP32.

- The Planning Statement and Application form indicate that a Design & Access Statement has been produced. Unfortunately, this has not been included in the application presented on the planning portal (as of 11/06/26). Thus, insufficient information on design and access arrangements has been presented. A Design & Access Statement is essential for providing information to support either full planning or Class Q application. Without this information, it is not possible to determine a planning decision.
- We have serious concerns about the suggested external appearance of the buildings from the elevations provided, which are minimal in their detail and not appropriate within the curtilage of the Grade II listed Farmhouse and adjacent Hall.
- In the absence of further detail, our concerns extend to the proposed materiality, which is vague from the Application form (extracts included below for reference) and proposed elevations:
 - *Roof – ‘Standing seam metal roofing’*
 - *Walls – ‘Standing seam metal cladding and timber cladding’*
 - *Windows – ‘Composite widows with metal outer facing’*
 - *Doors – ‘Composite doors with metal outer facing to frames’*

This detail is woefully insufficient in setting out the quality of the proposed materials; the proposed colour, light reflectivity and appearance. Such detail is particularly pertinent given the close proximity to the Grade II listed Farmhouse and Hall.

- **Green Belt**

- **The scale of residential domestication proposed, including extensive parking provision, access arrangements and associated residential infrastructure, appears contrary to Green Belt policies relating to the re-use of rural buildings and would result in material harm to openness and rural character.**
- The site sits within Green Belt. Conversion of the agricultural sheds into residential dwellings is inappropriate within this setting. We would challenge the Planning Statement’s written justification based on the ‘conversion or reuse of existing buildings’, as the agricultural sheds (as currently proposed in the elevations,) will look significantly different after conversion.

- **Transport and Highways Impact**

- **In the absence of a Transport Assessment or Highway Statement, compliance with Policies LP20, LP21 and LP22 cannot be properly assessed.**

Continues overleaf

- The Planning Statement says that a highways statement has been commissioned; however, this has also not been uploaded as part of the application (as of 11/06/26), once again providing insufficient information for the determination of the proposed scheme.
 - Liley Lane (B6118) is a dangerous road, with a high incidence of road traffic accidents, being used as a 'rat run' by commuters to travel through green belt. The scheme proposes the addition of 27 car parking spaces. We have serious concern for the increased impact of this number of vehicles to this rural setting.
 - We have concerns about how vehicular access is to be achieved to units 6-9 on the far side of the site. It appears that a ring road is proposed around the site, bringing increased traffic directly past the Grade II listed Farmhouse and Hall.
 - It is also unclear from the information provided whether access is to be focused on the proposed new entranceway, which is less visible from the brow of the hill when approaching from the Mirfield end; or whether access is also to be made available through the existing gate marked 'existing field access' on the site plan.
- **Structural Integrity**
 - We note that the structural report commissioned was a ground-based visual survey and that no trial pits have been conducted to date to assess the suitability of any foundations for the conversion of the sheds into dwellings.
 - We have concerns that the information is insufficient for determining that the existing structure will be fit for the proposed purpose as residential units.
- **Ecological Impact**
 - **The Preliminary Ecological Appraisal identifies potential impacts on bats and barn owls, yet further surveys and mitigation work remain outstanding. The application therefore fails to demonstrate compliance with Policy LP30 and relevant provisions of the NPPF.**
 - We note that the PEA identifies the Barn Owl Nest Box and the presence of roosting bats in the stone barn that is proposed to become the 'Services Building'. Living in Liley Hall we greatly enjoy and benefit from the presence of both and would be concerned that the proposals will force them to relocate elsewhere. We value the recommendations set out by the ecologist for a barn owl mitigation strategy and further bat survey.

Please note that Page 2 of the Planning Statement contains an error in the site labelling. The building identified as "Adjacent Commercial Building" is in fact the neighbouring residential property, 'Liley Cottage'. Conversely, the actual commercial unit, 'The Linen Cupboard', occupies a building that has been incorrectly identified as one of the agricultural sheds proposed for conversion under this application.

4. Consultation

As a neighbouring property that would be directly affected by these proposals, we would like to note that there has been no formal consultation on these proposals which, for an application of this proposed scale, should be expected. Informally, the applicant shared a proposed site plan with us prior to submission but this has been the full extent of notification. Beyond this, there has been neither a statutory notice pinned within the area nor have we received a written letter to notify us of the application particulars.

The application lacks sufficient information to allow the Local Planning Authority to reach a fully informed decision. In particular, the absence of key supporting documents prevents a proper assessment of compliance with Policies LP24, LP21, LP30 and LP35.

We trust that the above points clearly demonstrate why this application should be refused. Should the Local Planning Authority be minded to grant permission notwithstanding our objections, we would request that the application be referred to the Planning Committee for determination and that any conditions imposed address, in full, the heritage, design and access, highways, ecological and structural matters raised in this communication.

We reserve the right to make further representations should additional information be submitted.

As a final point, we are not fundamentally averse to the notion of residential development at the site. Rather, as residents with a deep care for the address, we appeal to those involved, both the council and the applicant, to ensure that the proper planning processes are followed, to achieve a quality result befitting the setting. With this in mind, perhaps recommendation of a Pre-App would be a fitting next step, if such a thing has not already been pursued.

Yours sincerely,