

8. FULL APPLICATION - 1) RENOVATION AND ALTERATION OF EXISTING YARD BARN (ALSO KNOWN AS BUTTRESS BARN) 2) DEMOLITION OF FIELD BARN (ALSO KNOWN AS SHOWGROUND BARN) 3) ERECTION OF PORTAL FRAMED BUILDING FOR STORAGE AT MARSH FARM, CASTLETON ROAD, HOPE (NP/HPK/0919/1018, SPW)

APPLICANT: Ms Virginia Priestley (on behalf of the Marsh Farm Development Company)

Summary

1. This application proposes the renovation and alteration of a traditional barn within a group of buildings at Marsh Farm, the demolition of a field barn to the north of the group and the erection of a new framed building at the northern end of the building group. Whilst the loss of the field barn is unfortunate, it is in a very poor structural condition and is beyond repair. The renovation and re-use of the barn in the building group is, however, to be welcomed. The erection of a new portal framed building and the cladding of the adjacent building is considered to be acceptable.

Site and Surroundings

2. Marsh Farm is situated on the northern side of the A6187 road to the west of Hope, between Hope and Castleton. Marsh Farm is a mixed group of buildings, comprising both traditional limestone buildings and more modern structures. One of these, along the eastern boundary of the site, is known as the “Buttress Barn” as it is a traditional limestone barn that has been reinforced by stone buttresses. There is a field barn in a very poor structural condition approximately 130 metres to the north of the farm group, with a mono-pitched sheet roof; this is referred to as the “Showground Barn” as it is within the area used by the annual Hope Show. There is an access off the A.6187 through the building group, with a stone track leading north to the field barn and the showground.
3. The buildings are not listed and they are not within a Conservation Area but they are considered to be non-designated heritage assets by virtue of their age and history.
4. The buildings are owned by the Marsh Farm Development Company (MFDC). This is a company formed to manage the Marsh Farm site where the traditional end of summer agricultural show for the area is held annually.

Proposal

5. Renovation and alteration of existing yard barn (also known as buttress barn). The renovated building would be used for as a workshop and store and may be rented out for this purpose. The renovation involves the rebuilding of the west wall and south gable and re-roofing. The windows would be hopper style, and doors would be timber. There would be two conservation style rooflights on the east elevation. The amended plans now show the buttresses being removed.
6. Demolition of field barn (also known as showground barn)
7. Erection of portal framed building for storage; the building would measure approximately 18m x 10m and 5m to the ridge. It would abut an existing portal-framed building dating from the 1970s. The new building would be clad in vertically boarded timber under a dark blue sheet roof and the existing building would also be clad in timber to improve its appearance. The building would be used to store the materials currently stored in the field barn (sheep hurdles, a judges’ viewing hut and other materials associated with Hope Show).

8. The application has been supplemented with amended plans and a Heritage Statement since it was first submitted, addressing the concerns raised by officers. The Heritage Statement was produced to assess the impact of the proposal to the buildings and the potential impact that the development might have on any features of heritage significance.

Planning History

9. 2001: Planning permission granted for retention of mobile veterinary surgery.
10. 2000: Planning permission granted for siting of mobile consulting room within existing barn for use as temporary consulting room for veterinary practice
11. Pre-application advice: In 2018, prior to submitting the application, the applicants sought pre-application advice on proposals to demolish both barns and to erect a new agricultural building in the fields to the north of the farmyard, on or close to the site of the field barn. They were advised that any application would require an assessment of the historic interest of the buildings and a justification for any demolition and alterations and that the siting of any new building should be better related to the existing building group.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the application be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

- 1) **Statutory time limit for implementation**
- 2) **Development in accordance with the amended plans and specifications, subject to the following conditions:**
- 3) **Use of new building to be restricted to purposes ancillary to Hope Show**
- 4) **Use of Yard/Buttress Barn to be restricted to storage or light industrial and office uses within Class E.**
- 5) **Detailed design conditions.**
- 6) **Carry out landscaping scheme within first planting season following erection of new building.**
- 7) **Archaeological conditions:**
 - a) **No development shall take place until a Written Scheme of Investigation for a scheme of a programme of building recording has been submitted to and approved by the National Park Authority in writing. The scheme shall include an assessment of significance and research questions; and 1. The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording; 2. The programme for post investigation assessment; 3. Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording; 4. Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation; 5. Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation; 6. Nomination of a competent person or persons/organization undertake the works set out within the Written Scheme of Investigation.**
 - b) **No development shall take place until all on-site elements of the approved scheme have been completed in accordance with the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition (a), and to the written satisfaction of the local planning authority.**
 - c) **The development shall not be occupied until the site investigation and post investigation assessment has been completed in accordance with the programme set out in the archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition (a) and the provision to be made for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition has been**

secured.

Key Issues

- The impact of the proposals on the archaeological interest of the existing barns, which are considered to be non-designated heritage assets.
- The impact on ecology, particularly bat roosts.

Consultations

12. **Highway Authority:** No highway objections in principle providing the buildings are agriculturally related in support of the existing farming activities carried out on surrounding controlled land. It is noted the portal frame building is situated in close proximity to a public footpath which must remain on its existing alignment.
13. **Borough Council:** No reply
14. **Parish Council:** No objections
15. **Senior Archaeologist (PDNPA):** Raised concerns about the submitted scheme and makes the following comments in respect of the revised submission:

Buttress Barn: The revised proposals for the buttress barn still required the rebuilding of 2 elevations due to structural issues, but they will be rebuilt to replicate the historic form and features, including the buttresses. These changes are welcomed as they will better retain the character and significance of the barn as it moves forward into a new use. The large cart opening required has been moved to the east elevation, where there currently a blocked cart opening. This elevation is largely being retained, but the opening altered to have stone jambs and moved slightly further back from the gable end to improve the structural stability of the building. Overall this is a high level of intervention and rebuilding for this barn. The application includes the required justification for this because it structurally unsound and every effort has been made to work with significance of the building, including several revisions to the proposals. I welcome the commitment of the Marsh Farm Development Company to find a way to retain and repair the building which forms part a historic farmstead and also a historic cupola site, and to find a new use for it. To secure the future of this heritage asset and viable future use is a positive outcome for the historic environment. The partial rebuilding of the barn and the changes this entails will result in harm to the archaeological and historic interest of the building that is part of heritage asset (historic farmstead and cupola site) of regional interest. The level of this harm is moderate with respect to the barn itself, but reduces to minor in the context of the wider farmstead and cupola site. This harm needs to be mitigated.

Marsh Barn (field barn): As stated in my previous consultation response, the development will result in the complete loss of the field barn (Marsh Barn), a heritage asset of regional significance, this represents a high level of harm. Whilst this is regrettable, the building has undergone many unsympathetic alterations that have compromised the structure. This alongside the movement of the structure off its foundations means it is dangerous structure, particular because it is located so with the Hope Show ground. On this basis I do not object to the demolition of the field barn subject to appropriate mitigation be secured by condition.

New Building: There are no archaeology comments specifically on the proposed new building.

Recommendation: Should the planning balance be favourable the harm to both barns

identified above can be addressed by a conditioned scheme of building recording to secure appropriate mitigation in accordance with para.199 of NPPF. This should build on and not duplicate the existing Heritage Statement and should comprise:

- *A full visual record when the buildings have been emptied and cleared out, vegetation cutback/removed and access provided to allow the recording to take place of all areas.*
- *Elements of a drawn record (annotated plan and elevation drawings showing the form and location of surviving historic fabric; photograph location and direction plan). This can make use of or be based on the architectural drawings and survey undertaken as part of the planning application, so long as they are at a suitable scale and can be provided in an appropriate format.*
- *A written record and description of all the buildings and historic features /fabric revealed, and analysis of historic use and development. This should achieve an overall Level 1/2 record for the Buttress barn and a Level 2/3 record for the field barn (Marsh Barn). This reflects the greater significance and the greater level of impact for the Marsh Barn. This work needs to be carried out by a suitably qualified and experienced heritage/archaeological contractor in accordance with the nationally agreed standards of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, and to a written scheme of investigation approved by the Senior Conservation Archaeologist.*

These recommendations are in accordance with NPPF para 199, and a suitable condition to achieve this is suggested.

16. **Ecology (PDNPA):** Note that a bat survey report has been submitted with the application but are concerned that the survey has been significantly compromised as the interior of neither building has been inspected; this will have hampered the ability to assess overall roost potential. In these circumstances where a building inspection has been significantly compromised and the site has potentially moderate/high suitability, it is particularly important that sufficient activity surveys are timed during the optimal period. However, the report states that there are ample potential crevices and access points which indicates high potential and from the single activity survey roosting bats have been found. The resulting report should include details on measures to avoid, mitigate or compensate for potential harm and ensure that any development provides a mitigation strategy and ensures future roosting provision as appropriate, details need to be provided with the report. Overall the strategy should seek enhancement and overall net gain.

Representations

No representations have been received from the public notification.

Key Policies

17. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published on 27 March 2012 and replaced a significant proportion of central government planning policy with immediate effect. It was last updated in February 2019. The Government's intention is that the document should be considered as a material consideration and carry particular weight where a development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date. In the National Park the development plan comprises the Authority's Core Strategy 2011 and those in the Development Management DPD adopted in May 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 more recent Government guidance in the NPPF.
18. Paragraph 172 of the NPPF states that "*great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and*

scenic beauty. The conservation of wildlife and cultural heritage are important considerations in all these areas and should be given great weight in National Parks and the Broads.”

Development Plan

19. The main Development Plan policies which are relevant to this proposal are: Core Strategy policies: GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, GSP4, L1, L2, L3 and CC1, and Development Management policies: DM1, DMC3, DMC5, DMC10 and DMC11.
20. Policy GSP1 sets out the broad strategy for achieving the National Park’s objectives having regard to the Sandford Principle, (that is, where there are conflicting desired outcomes in achieving national park purposes, greater priority must be given to the conservation of the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the area, even at the cost of socio-economic benefits). GSP1 also sets out the need for sustainable development and to avoid major development unless it is essential, and the need to mitigate localised harm where essential major development is allowed.
21. Policy GSP2: *Enhancing the National Park* states that:
 - Opportunities for enhancing the valued characteristics of the National Park will be identified and acted upon.
 - Proposals intended to enhance the National Park will need to demonstrate that they offer significant overall benefit to the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the area.
 - When development is permitted, a design will be sought that respects the character of the area.
 - Opportunities will be taken to enhance the National Park by the treatment or removal of undesirable features or buildings. Work must be undertaken in a manner which conserves the valued characteristics of the site and its surroundings.
 - Development in settlements necessary for the treatment, removal or relocation of nonconforming uses to an acceptable site, or which would enhance the valued characteristics of the National Park will be permitted.
22. Policy GSP3 *Development Management Principles* sets out development management principles and states that all development must respect, conserve and enhance all valued characteristics of the site and buildings, paying particular attention to, amongst other elements, impact on the character and setting of buildings, scale of the development appropriate to the character and appearance of the National Park, design in accordance with the National Park Authority Design Guide and impact on living conditions of communities.
23. Core Strategy policy GSP4: *Planning conditions and legal agreements* states that the National Park Authority will consider the contribution that a development can make directly and/or to its setting, including, where consistent with government guidance, using planning conditions and planning obligations.
24. Core Strategy Policy L1 *Landscape character and valued characteristics* states that development must conserve and enhance valued landscape character and valued characteristics, and other than in exceptional circumstances, proposals in the Natural Zone will not be permitted.
25. Core Strategy Policy L2 states that development must conserve and enhance any sites or features of geodiversity importance, and any sites, features or species of biodiversity importance and where appropriate their settings.
26. Core Strategy policy L3 provides core policy principles for cultural heritage assets and

requires that all development conserves and where appropriate enhances or reveals the significance of archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic assets and their settings. Development will not be permitted where there is harm to the significance of a heritage asset other than in exceptional circumstances.

27. Policy CC1 *Climate change and mitigation* requires that all development must build in resilience to and mitigate the causes of climate change.

28. Development Management policies

29. DM1 *The presumption of sustainable development in the context of National Park purposes* states:

When considering development proposals the National Park Authority will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (2012). It will work proactively with applicants to find solutions that are consistent with National Park purposes:

- i. to conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the National Park; and
- ii. to promote opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the valued characteristics of the National Park.

Planning applications that accord with the policies in the Development Plan will be approved without unnecessary delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

30. Development Management policy DMC3: *Siting, design, layout and landscaping* 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.

31. Development Management policy DMC5 *Assessing the impact of development on designated and non-designated heritage assets and their settings* says that planning applications for development affecting a heritage asset, including its setting must clearly demonstrate: (i) its significance including how any identified features of value will be conserved and where possible enhanced; and (ii) why the proposed development and related works are desirable or necessary. The supporting evidence must be proportionate to the significance of the asset. It may be included as part of a Heritage Statement or Design and Access Statement where relevant. Proposals likely to affect heritage assets with archaeological and potential archaeological interest should be supported by appropriate information that identifies the impacts or a programme of archaeological works to a methodology approved by the Authority.

32. Development Management policy DMC10 *Conversion of a heritage asset* says that the conversion of a heritage asset will be permitted provided that it can accommodate the new use without changes that adversely affect its character (such changes include enlargement, subdivision or other alterations to form and mass, inappropriate new window openings or doorways and major rebuilding) and that the building is capable of conversion, the extent of which would not compromise the significance and character of the building. The policy goes on to provide further detail of what will be considered in this assessment.

33. Policy DMC11 *Safeguarding, recording and enhancing nature conservation interests* states, amongst other things that proposals should aim to achieve net gains to biodiversity or geodiversity as a result of development. In considering whether a proposal conserves and enhances sites, features or species of wildlife, geological or

geomorphological importance all reasonable measures must be taken to avoid net loss by demonstrating that in the below order of priority the following matters have been taken into consideration:

- i. enhancement proportionate to the development;
- ii. adverse effects have been avoided;
- iii. the 'do nothing' option and alternative sites that cause less harm;
- iv. appropriate mitigation; and
- v. in rare cases, as a last resort, compensation measures to offset loss.

Assessment

34. Principle of Development

35. The application proposes the renovation of an existing building for future re-use and the demolition of a semi-derelict field barn and its replacement with a modern portal framed building in the yard abutting an existing building. The buildings are owned by the company that runs the Hope Show, along-established agricultural show, and they would be used for storage and other purposes associated with the show, with the possibility that the Buttress barn would be let to local businesses
36. The principle of development to support the Show, which an important event in the local calendar, supporting local farming businesses and communities, is acceptable and in accordance with Authorities policies.

37. Archaeological and Cultural Heritage

Marsh Farm is considered to be a site of archaeological, architectural and historic interest, and aesthetic value. Core Strategy policy L3 and DMP policies DMC5 and DMC10 are therefore particularly relevant. The original application provided some detail of the site's history, but officers had concerns about how fully this had been assessed. Consequently a more thorough archaeological assessment was requested and has now been submitted. The Farmstead was identified as an extant 19th century farmstead in the recent Historic England Historic Farmstead Project which was completed in 2016. It was subsequently included as a site in the Peak District Historic Buildings, Sites and Monuments Record and the Derbyshire Historic Environment Record. As such the farmstead, and its component traditional farm buildings, are considered to be a non-designated heritage asset. Marsh Farm was described as a loose courtyard plan with three sides of the yard formed by agricultural buildings, with detached elements to the main plan and a farmhouse that is set away from the farmyard. Small, loose courtyard farmsteads are particularly characteristic to the landscape of the Dark Peak, contributing to the landscape character. There has been a partial loss of the traditional farm buildings, less than 50%, indicating that the farmstead has high heritage potential. The farmstead is also the site of a cupola lead smelting site. Marsh Cupola is first listed in Bagshawe's Directory of 1846 and seems to have been in operation until about 1879. The farmyard/buttruss barn that is the subject of this application appears to have been built as part of the cupola, and adapted overtime to an agricultural use, as the function of the site changes from lead smelting to agricultural. This is a heritage asset of regional importance.

38. The field barn, known as Marsh Barn, is also a building of archaeological interest. It was identified as an extant 19th century outfarm in the recent Historic England Historic Farmstead Project which was completed in 2016 and was subsequently included as a site in the Peak District Historic Buildings, Sites and Monuments Record and the Derbyshire Historic Environment Record. This barn is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset. It is a traditional farm building, constructed in traditional form and materials. It has suffered from unsympathetic later alterations, particularly changes to the

roof (now a mono-pitch with metal sheeting) and inserting a large opening in the gable end. It retains a number of currently open and blocked historic openings, including ventilation holes and slots; windows; doorways and what appears to a large, blocked threshing openings. A number of the openings have carved stone lintels characteristic of the 18th century – these may be original or may be reused. The barn is depicted on the 1820s enclosure plan of Hope, so could be of 18th century origin. The fabric of the building will hold evidence of its use, function and development worthy of further investigation that could be revealed by archaeological investigation. The barn is located within an area which is defined as ‘Ancient Enclosure - Fossilised Strip System (Known)’ under the National Park’s Historic landscape Character assessment. . These are fossilised medieval strip fields that relate to the medieval open field system of Hope; the map and field shape evidence (characterised by the enclosed narrow strips with a characteristic s-shaped curve) suggest that remnants of the medieval open fields.

39. Both buildings have been assessed to be structurally unsafe, both requiring a scheme of partial or total demolition. Whilst it is apparent that such a scheme would constitute a negative impact on the structures and their settings, the submitted archaeological assessment says that these impacts should be measured within the wider context put forward in the proposal. It suggests that a programme of historic building recording would ensure that both buildings are preserved via a record, in their current forms, in order to mitigate for the proposed alterations.
40. The Authority’s Senior Archaeologist has been involved in assessing the proposal. She welcomes the commitment of the applicant to find a way to retain and repair the building which forms part a historic farmstead and an historic cupola site, and to find a new use for it. Whilst the partial rebuilding of the Buttress barn and the changes this entails will result in harm to the archaeological and historic interest of the building, she considered that this harm is moderate with respect to the barn itself, and reduces to minor in the context of the wider farmstead and cupola site. This harm needs to be mitigated, so she recommends conditions. With regard to Marsh Barn, she notes that the development will result in the complete loss of the field barn, a heritage asset of regional significance; this represents a high level of harm. However, she concludes that whilst this is regrettable, the building has undergone many unsympathetic alterations that have compromised the structure. This alongside the movement of the structure off its foundations means it is dangerous structure, particularly because it is located on the Hope Show ground. On this basis she does not object to the demolition of the field barn subject to appropriate mitigation be secured by condition.
41. On this basis the proposals are considered to meet the requirements of Development Plan policies, notably DMC5.
42. **Ecology and Biodiversity**
43. The Authority’s Ecologist notes that whilst a bat survey report has been submitted with the application they are concerned that the survey has been significantly compromised as the interior of neither building has been inspected; this will have hampered the ability to assess overall roost potential. The report states that there are ample potential crevices and access points which indicates high potential and from the single activity survey roosting bats have been found. The Authority’s Ecologist advises that the report should include details on measures to avoid, mitigate or compensate for potential harm and ensure that any development provides a mitigation strategy and ensures future roosting provision as appropriate, details need to be provided with the report.
44. Given that the field barn is considered to be beyond repair and should be demolished, there are no opportunities for bat or bird roosts in that site. However, whilst the Buttress Barn needs significant rebuilding and reroofing, measures should be taken to provide for

roosts in the renovated building. This should be covered by condition and should seek to provide net gain if possible.

45. **Amenity**

The demolition of the Marsh barn and the renovation of the Buttress barn in the yard will not have any impact on the amenity of neighbouring residential properties. The new portal framed building would be close to the western boundary of the site but it would adjoin an existing building and would be of the same scale. There is a gap to the western boundary and some additional planting is proposed in this area. The use of the buildings should be restricted by condition, which would also help to avoid any impacts on residential amenity.

46. **Environmental Management**

A statement has been submitted with the application to set out how the development meets the requirements of policy CC1.

Conclusion

47. This application proposes the demolition of field barn that is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset but it is accepted that it is now beyond repair. Subject to an archaeological monitoring condition, this is acceptable. The significant rebuilding and repair of the Buttress barn, in the yard, is also considered to have an impact on a non-designated heritage asset. However, without these works the building will only deteriorate further, so the works are considered to be necessary and acceptable. The removal of the buttresses, which were later additions, is considered to be appropriate.
48. The erection of a new building in the yard to replace the field barn is also considered to be acceptable as it would be within the building group, abutting an existing building, so it would not appear as an isolated structure. It also provides an opportunity to enhance the appearance of the existing adjoining building.
49. The use of the buildings for purposes ancillary to the Hope Show or to be let as workspace, generating income to pay for the works and to supplement the Marsh Farm Development Company's income, to support the Show, is considered to be acceptable, subject to conditions to control the uses.

Human Rights

50. Any human rights issues have been considered and addressed in the preparation of this report.
51. List of Background Papers (not previously published)
52. Nil
53. Report author: John Keeley