

10. LISTED BUILDING CONSENT FOR REPAIR WORKS COMPRISING: CRACK REPAIRS, CRACK STITCHING, RE-POINTING (USING LIME MORTAR), DE-VEGETATION AND REMOVAL OF TREES, INSTALLATION OF TELL TALES AND MORTAR TABS, REBUILDING OF AREAS OF COLLAPSE. - MONSAL DALE VIADUCT, MONSAL DALE (NP/DDD/0720/0611, TS)

APPLICANT: PEAK DISTRICT NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY

Summary

1. The application seeks listed building consent for a series of repair works to the grade II listed viaduct. The repairs are necessary for the ongoing maintenance and use of the viaduct as part of the Monsal Trail. Subject to conditions to ensure appropriate materials and working practices, the repair works would conserve the significance of the listed building. The application is therefore recommended for approval.

Site and surroundings

2. The site is Monsal Dale Viaduct. The site is within Little Longstone parish, a short distance from Monsal Head. The viaduct spans the River Wye in the Monsal Dale Valley. The structure was constructed in the mid-19th century as a railway viaduct by Midland Railway. The viaduct is now part of the Monsal Trail.
3. The viaduct is constructed of stone and brick and comprises 5 round headed barrel arches of equal height. The viaduct is about 20m high and spans 91m in length. It was listed as a grade II building in 1970 and it is therefore of national importance.

Proposal

4. The application seeks listed building consent for a scheme of repair works to the viaduct.
5. The application is a result of a condition inspection of the viaduct that was undertaken on behalf of the Authority in 2016. The inspection identified a series of repair works that are necessary to bring the viaduct into sound condition. The full inspection report has been submitted with the current application and is available to view. However, the issues can be summarised as a series of cracks to all five spans of the viaduct and the parapets of varying widths, loss of mortar and missing stones. Much of the damage has been attributed to movement arising from settlement of the foundations.
6. A detailed scheme of works has been submitted and is available to view in the application documents. The proposed works can be summarised as follows:
 - Crack repairs;
 - Crack stitching;
 - Re-pointing (using Lime Mortar);
 - De-vegetation of the structure;
 - Re-building of areas of collapse.

In addition, in order to monitor any future damage arising from movement of the structure, it is proposed to install monitoring tools in the form of tell tales and mortar tabs.

7. The proposed works would be undertaken using rope access from the top of the viaduct.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the application be **APPROVED** subject to conditions to secure the following:

1. **Time limit for commencement.**
2. **Development to be carried out in accordance with the submitted details and specifications.**
3. **Mortar repairs and repointing to match the existing lime mortar with a sample to be submitted and approved.**
4. **All brick and stone to match existing.**
5. **Method statement for brick and stone repairs to be submitted and approved, including use of hand tools only.**
6. **Method statement for crack stitching to be submitted and approved.**
7. **Specific details of the monitoring devices to be submitted and approved.**
8. **Details of any unforeseen repairs to be submitted and approved.**
9. **Details of any access equipment that requires temporarily fixing to the viaduct to be submitted and approved.**
10. **Works to be carried out in accordance with the submitted Precautionary Working Method Statement in respect of roosting bats.**
11. **Details of equipment and material storage areas to be submitted and approved.**

Key Issues

- The impact on the character and significance of the listed building;
- The impact on ecology and protected species.

History

8. There is no planning history that is directly relevant to the assessment of this application.

Consultations

9. **Little Longstone Parish Meeting** – no objections.
10. **Derbyshire County Council Highway Authority** – No objections. Note that a Greenway and Public Right of Way run along the viaduct and the route must remain unobstructed at all times.
11. **Authority’s Conservation Officer** – No objections subject to conditions, noting the following:

“The application is for repairs to the viaduct that were identified during the access inspection in 2016. The inspection identified a number of issues that need addressing, this being cracks and separation, loss of some stonework and brickwork.

The works proposed are repairs to the cracks, re-pointing, removal of vegetation, stonework or brickwork replacement and installation of monitoring tell tales.

Methods statements have been submitted for some of the works, however further details are required regarding the materials and methods to be used.

Repointing and mortar repairs are to be done using lime of varying strengths identified within the method statement, an accessible sample patch should be agreed. The additional information, replacement materials and sample patch can be conditioned.

There is to be some replacement of brickwork and stonework, although no details have been included in Table 3 specification of works. To prevent damage to the surrounding brickwork or stonework removal must be by hand using the appropriate hand tools. A method statement should be agreed, again this can be conditioned.

There has been a significant period of time between the inspection and the likely commencement of works, there could be further deterioration and therefore increased and unforeseen works could be identified once access and works commence. Allowance for unforeseen works should be conditioned.”

12. **Authority’s Ecologist** – No objections subject to conditions to ensure the submitted Precautionary Method Statement is followed in respect of bats and to ensure that materials and equipment is stored in appropriate locations.

Representations

13. No third party representations have been received.

Main policies

14. Relevant Core Strategy policies: GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, DS1, L3.
15. Relevant Development Management Plan policies: DMC3, DMC5, DMC7.

Legislation

The Authority must, by virtue of S16 of the Listed Buildings Act 1990 pay special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses

National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Practice Guidance

16. In the National Park the development plan comprises the Authority’s Core Strategy 2011 and the Adopted Development Management Policies 2019. Policies in the Development Plan provide a clear starting point consistent with the National Park’s statutory purposes for the determination of this application. It is considered that in this case there is no significant conflict between prevailing policies in the Development Plan and government guidance in the NPPF with regard to the issues that are raised.
17. Paragraph 189 advises that in determining applications, 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. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.
18. Paragraph 193 states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on

the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

19. Paragraph 196 of the NPPF states that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

Development plan

20. Core Strategy policies GSP1, GSP2 and GSP3 together say that all development in the National Park must be consistent with the National Park's legal purposes and duty and that the Sandford Principle will be applied where there is conflict. Opportunities for enhancing the valued characteristics of the National Park will be identified and acted upon and development which would enhance the valued characteristics of the National Park will be permitted. Particular attention will be paid to impact on the character and setting of buildings, siting, landscaping and building materials, design in accordance with the Design Guide and the impact upon living conditions of local communities. Core Strategy policy GSP4 highlights that the National Park Authority will consider using planning conditions or obligations to secure the achievement of its spatial outcomes.
21. Core Strategy policy DS1 outlines the Authority's Development Strategy.
22. Core Strategy policy L3 requires that development must conserve and where appropriate enhance or reveal significance of archaeological, artistic or historic asset and their setting, including statutory designation and other heritage assets of international, national, regional or local importance or special interest.
23. Development Management Policy DMC3 requires development to be of a high standard that respects, protects, and where possible enhances the natural beauty, quality and visual amenity of the landscape, including the wildlife and cultural heritage that contribute to the distinctive sense of place. It also provides further detailed criteria to assess design and landscaping, as well as requiring development to conserve the amenity of other properties.
24. Development Management Policy DMC5 provides detailed advice relating to proposals affecting heritage assets and their settings, requiring new development to demonstrate how valued features will be conserved, as well as detailing the types and levels of information required to support such proposals. It also requires development to avoid harm to the significance, character, and appearance of heritage assets and details the exceptional circumstances in which development resulting in such harm may be supported.

25. Development Management Policy DMC7 addresses development affecting listed building, advising that applications for such development should be determined in accordance with policy DMC5 and address how their significance will be preserved. It goes on to detail specific aspects of development that will not be supported when dealing with applications affecting listed buildings. It advises that the only exceptions to this are where any resulting harm is less than substantial in terms of impact on the character and significance of the Listed Building and its setting; and where it is also offset by the public benefit from making the changes, including enabling optimum viable use, and net enhancement to the Listed Building and its setting.

Assessment

Impacts of the proposed works on the significance, character and appearance of the building

26. A Heritage Assessment has been submitted which outlines the significance of the listed building. This appraises the significance of the listed building as follows:

“Evidential: Medium to high value

The evidential value of the viaduct lies in its potential to provide evidence for late 19th century railway engineering, especially in regard to viaducts. Analysis of the extant structure and the repairs which it has undergone allows an insight into its construction, purpose and use, and buried remains associated with its construction may still remain below ground. While the loss of railway infrastructure such as the tracks and signals somewhat diminish its evidential value, it does not impede understanding of the purpose or use of the viaduct.

Historical: Medium to high value

The associative historical value of the viaduct strongly lies in its association with the Peak Railway Line, its designer William Henry Barlow and the wider history of how the landscape of the Peak District was transformed from the 1840s onwards due to the introduction of the railway. The appearance of the viaduct in newspaper reports, postcards and marketing records from the late 19th century and early 20th century add weight to this value. Records show that at the time of construction the viaduct was regarded as contentious, and written accounts by prominent contemporaries of the time (such as Ruskin) are still available and epitomise the debate over the price of progress at the detriment to the natural landscape. Furthermore, records, including photographs, associated with the railway and the viaduct still exist today and an archive is held at the MRSC in Derby. Such evidence strengthens the viaduct's historical value.

The illustrative value of the viaduct is linked to its evidential value in the sense that it provides evidence of viaduct construction and design processes of late 19th century. While the structure is no longer used to support a busy railway network, it is still being utilised to support the popular Monsal Trail. Although the historical value has been lessened to an extent by the loss of the railway network (similar to the evidential value), the fact that the viaduct is integrated as part of an active trail along the Peak District, still, to some degree, allows the feeling of a moving, connected network to be retained.

The historical value of the viaduct is considered to be medium to high.

Aesthetic: High value

The aesthetic value of the structure primarily derives from its architectural design and the ways in which people may draw sensory and intellectual stimulation from it. While there may have been some opposition to the viaduct following its construction, the overall structure and its relatively slender design forms an impressive visual and physical link across Monsal Dale. The use of local materials emulates much older bridges in the Peak District, with a counterpoint of modernity highlighted through the use of the railway era materials for detailing, including Staffordshire blue engineering bricks to form the arch voussoirs. Nowadays it appears to blend in well into the wider landscape of the Wye valley, while still providing a prominent feature in the landscape.

The authenticity of its design, while there is evidence of repairs and alterations, means that it has retained some of its integrity. The aesthetic value of the viaduct is considered to be high.

Communal: Medium value

The communal value of the viaduct is expressed through the sense of place and connectivity people may have had, or still have, with it, the Peak Railway line or the Monsal Trail. While sections of the railway are still preserved operating as a steam and heritage diesel for tourists further along the line, the preserved railway only covers c. 5.6km in length. Collective experiences and memories of the working railway may still exist in living memory as the railway did not fall into disuse until 1968. While not used for railway purposes from then onwards, from the start of the 1980s the viaduct was officially incorporated into the Monsal Trail which has been a popular walking and cycling route since.

The viaduct to this day is described as one of the most impressive viaducts in Britain, despite its earlier criticism by Ruskin, and its position across the scenic countryside was one of the reasons why this stretch of railway between Rowsley to Bakewell was so popular. Due to the continued use of the viaduct, the communal value is considered to be medium.”

27. The proposed works have all been identified as necessary to ensure the soundness of the viaduct. In addition, the repair works are clearly important to the ongoing function of the viaduct as part of the Monsal Trail.
28. The Authority's Conservation Officer has raised no objections, subject to conditions to ensure appropriate materials and working methods. The use of like-for-like brick, stone and mortar is an appropriate solution that will restore damaged and missing historic fabric. The proposed crack stitching is a more modern construction technique but it is accepted that this is the most minimal intervention available and is therefore acceptable. The use of tell tales and dated mortar tabs are small-scale interventions that will allow for monitoring in connection with the ongoing maintenance of the viaduct and will have no adverse impact.
29. Subject to the conditions recommended by the Conservation Officer, the proposed works would not diminish and of the values set out in paragraph 27 which make up the historic significance of the listed building. The proposed works would therefore not be harmful to the significance or character of the viaduct.
30. The proposal would therefore achieve the conservation of the listed building and fully accords with policies DMC3, DMC5 and DMC7 and the guidance in section 16 of the NPPF.

31. As the proposal would conserve the listed building and is fully policy compliant, there is no requirement to take public benefits into account. However, it is acknowledged in any case that there are clear public benefits arising from the works in terms of both securing the soundness of the listed building and also in ensuring that the viaduct can continue to function as part of the Monsal Trail.

Ecology and Protected Species

32. A bat survey report has been submitted with the application. This sets out that the viaduct has limited potential for roosting bats and no evidence of roosting bats has been identified. A precautionary working method statement has been submitted that sets out measures to avoid disturbance to roosting bats or nesting birds if evidence of any is found.
33. The proposed works are to be carried out by accessing the affected areas from above so no support structures are required in the river or at ground level.
34. The Authority's Ecologist has raised no objections subject to conditions to ensure the method statement is followed and that materials and equipment are stored in areas that are already hard-surfaced.

Other Issues

35. The submitted information sets out that the repair works could impede access by the public to the viaduct for a temporary period during the works but that the extent of this is unknown at the moment.
36. This matter cannot be given any weight in the consideration of a listed building consent application. It is however clearly an important issue for the Authority going forwards and the Authority will need to ensure that all requirements are met in terms of the impact of the works on a public right of way.

Conclusion

37. The application would conserve the significance of the listed viaduct. The application is recommended for approval.

Human Rights

38. Any human rights issues have been considered and addressed in the preparation of this report.

List of Background Papers (not previously published)

Nil

Report Author: Tom Shiels, Area Team Manager