

PEAK DISTRICT FARMSTEADS: ISSUES AND RESPONSES REPORT



PEAK DISTRICT FARMSTEADS: ISSUES AND RESPONSES REPORT

1. INTRODUCTION

This report forms part of the Peak District Farmsteads Project [www.PeakDistrict.gov.uk], which has mapped the historic character and survival of farmsteads and outfarms (including field barns) and produced illustrated guidance to heighten understanding and inform assessment of their significance, sensitivity and potential for change: a Peak Farmsteads Character Statement and a Farmsteads Assessment Framework. It was developed in response to significant threats to the historic character and significance of Peak District farmsteads, both within and outside the boundaries of the National Park, and has used as an evidence base the rapid mapping of the historic character and survival of farmsteads, field barns and outfarms across the National Park by Forum Heritage Services.

It was envisaged that one of the products of this project would be an Issues and Responses report summarising the outputs of workshop consultations with key stakeholders. These workshops were proposed as effective mechanisms for stimulating discussion and gaining a better understanding of the following:

1. The short- and long-term drivers for change.
2. Issues to consider when developing approaches to the reuse and conservation of upland farmsteads and buildings.
3. Topics to be considered when undertaking site recording.
4. Measures to be pursued to tackle the priority concerns raised during discussion.
5. The historic character, survival and use of farmsteads and field barns in a selected area of the National Park, to test the accuracy of Farmsteads Mapping and to demonstrate use of the Farmsteads Assessment Framework and Peak Farmsteads Character Statement. The Chatsworth estate was selected to test the accuracy of this method, due to the availability of the results of the Historic Landscape Survey (1997-8).

The Peak District shares many characteristics and issues for change with other upland landscapes of northern England. The findings of this report are also, therefore, of relevance to those authorities. These include National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs), which are facing significant pressures for change to their farmstead and traditional farm building resource.

The authors of this report are David Knight of Trent & Peak Archaeology, Jeremy Lake, recently of Historic England, and Ken Smith, recently retired Cultural Heritage Manager with Peak District National Park Authority.

June 2017

The front cover shows a field barn near Monyash (Peak District National Park), a cowhouse at Hathersage (Bob Edwards) and a derelict field barn near Baslow.

2. STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS

2.1 Defining the Stakeholders

Two half-day workshops were held to inform the development and delivery of the Peak District Farmsteads Characterisation Project. The first, Drivers for Change, was held on the morning of 29 January 2015; the second, Research and Recording, was timetabled for the morning of 11 February 2015. While the February workshop progressed according to plan, the January one was blighted by snow. This prevented some invitees from attending and resulted in early termination of the workshop due to closure of the National Park Authority offices because of the bad weather. Nevertheless, sufficient information and subsequent engagement resulted from that workshop to have made it a worthwhile and productive exercise.

Although there was some overlap between invitees to the two workshops, there were also some significant differences. Workshop 1, which aimed to establish the drivers for change for Peak District farmsteads, sought to gain insights from those involved directly in a variety of forms of land and property management. Consequently, representatives were invited from the NFU, CLA, LEADER, National Trust, Natural England and English Heritage (now Historic England), as well as Peak District farmers and representatives from conservation architects who had undertaken barn conservation projects in the Peak District under the Environmental Stewardship agri-environment scheme. National Park Authority staff from a range of disciplines were invited, together with specialists from the constituent Derbyshire and Staffordshire, High Peak and Staffordshire Moorlands councils and from the Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority (where a similar farmstead characterisation project was under way: Appendix 1).

Workshop 2 had a different focus, seeking to identify ways in which the development of farm buildings could benefit from recording, the methods that could be employed and the research framework that might inform such work. Invitees to this workshop included staff from local councils, Yorkshire Dales National Park and the National Park Authority, together with conservation architects and representatives of Natural England and English Heritage (now Historic England). Farming representatives were also invited, as well as landscape consultants and representatives of Sheffield Hallam and Nottingham Trent universities (Appendix 1).

2.2 Workshops

Each workshop was scheduled for a half-day duration. Each began with one or more scene-setting presentations, followed by a series of mini-workshops focusing upon particular issues. Subsequent feedback sessions enabled discussion of the issues raised.

2.2.1 *Drivers for Change*

The objectives of this workshop were to:

1. deliver an update on the Peak District Farm Characterisation project;

2. identify the 'drivers for change' impacting on Peak District farmsteads;
3. generate ideas on ways to manage change most effectively; and
4. provide an opportunity to network with colleagues who share a passion for, and understanding of, farmsteads in the Peak District.

Although the bad weather meant that the workshop had to finish early, sufficient work was done before curtailment to ensure that these objectives were met. The drivers for change that were identified on the day were circulated to all invitees for comment, regardless of whether or not they had been able to attend. This ensured that everyone had an opportunity to reflect on the discussions and to provide further comments if they wished.

2.2.2 Research and Recording

The objectives for this workshop were to:

1. deliver an update on the Peak District Farm Characterisation project;
2. identify topics to be considered when undertaking site recording;
3. define a strategy for future research; and
4. provide an opportunity to network with colleagues who shared a passion for, and understanding of, farmsteads in the Peak District

The day focused more on the development of a strategy for future research than an analysis of site recording methodologies. As with similar projects, including development of the Derwent Valley Mills World Heritage Site and East Midlands Historic Environment Research Frameworks, preparation of a coherent strategy proved to be a protracted exercise. Discussion raised a suite of issues which was enhanced by the addition of research themes identified by Bob Edwards and Jeremy Lake in the Peak Farmsteads Mapping Project (2015) that forms the basis of this Farmsteads Characterisation Project. The enhanced list of research issues was circulated to attendees of both workshops with the aim of eliciting further comment. Comments received were incorporated into the Agenda and Strategy that is outlined below.

3. ISSUES: THE DRIVERS FOR CHANGE

This section will consider the drivers for change in a national and specifically upland context. These drivers for change are impacting upon high densities of mostly small-scale traditional farmsteads with very high rates of survival in a national context, comparable to other upland areas of England. Farmsteads Mapping rapidly (at a rate of 100 sites per day) produced data on the historic character and survival of over 2500 farmsteads and more than 2600 field barns and outfarms across the Peak District, and provided an analysis of how they have developed in relationship to their historic landscapes. Ordnance Survey maps of c.1900 have been used as a baseline for recording survival, as they are clear and the overwhelming majority of traditional buildings date from before the 1880s. This demonstrated that 87% of the Peak District's recorded farmsteads have heritage potential as traditional farmsteads because they have retained more (83%) or less (4%) than half of their historic form. The levels of survival are lowest in the Dark Peak and highest in the White Peak. 42% of field barns and 59% of outfarms survive in some form, which again is comparable to other upland areas and considerably above the national average. The great

majority of these sites are not designated as heritage assets, with only 18% of farmsteads and under 0.5% of field barns and outfarms falling into this category. However, all of these sites contribute to *local distinctiveness* and a *sense of place* through their varied forms, the choice of building materials and their interrelationships with the surrounding landscape and other settlements. Moreover, most of the listed buildings on sites with designated heritage assets are houses; very few working buildings have been listed or are included within conservation areas, which with the notable exception of Edale focus mostly on settlements.

Those present at the workshop held in January 2015 identified the following as the most significant drivers for change:

1. Buildings becoming redundant.
2. Economic circumstances of upland farming and the availability of finance.
3. Economic drivers meaning that it is cheaper to build new structures than refurbish traditional ones.
4. Deregulation of permitted development rights outside the National Park.
5. Ability to source traditional skills for maintenance and repair.
6. Increasing demand for housing including for the accommodation of farming families driving the 'need' for additional housing on farmsteads and rising house prices.
7. Animal welfare requirements leading to functional redundancy.
8. National and local planning policies, such as the recent relaxation of Permitted Development Rights outside the National Park and the restrictions on the conversion of farm buildings outside settlements.
9. Need for more labour efficiency as another driver for building redundancy.
10. Use of buildings as holiday lets.
11. Increased popularity of hobby farming and the development of horse-paddocks.
12. Agri-environment schemes. These are increasingly becoming targeted and are under pressure as less money is likely to be forthcoming in the future from the new Rural Development Programme (RDP).

The text below provides a context for understanding these drivers for change in a national and upland/ Peak District context.

3.1 Changes in use

Traditional farm buildings are largely redundant for modern agricultural purposes, and have been under the greatest threat of either neglect or development than any rural building type. In response to these changes, the former English Heritage (now Historic England) and the Countryside Agency (now Natural England) commissioned the *Constructing the Evidence Base* report to examine in more depth the drivers for change and the effectiveness of policies relating to listed farm buildings at the national and local levels.¹ This and other recent work, including the Government Office for Science's Land Use Futures Project (www.foresight.gov.uk), has shown that in coming years the pace of change will accelerate further in response to the need to diversify farm businesses, the growth of larg-

¹ Gaskell, P and Owen S (2005) *Historic Farm Buildings: Constructing the Evidence Base*. Report by University of Gloucestershire for English Heritage and Countryside Agency

er farming units, the increasing demand for living in rural landscapes and for smaller hobby-farm units amongst dual-income households.²

The *Constructing the Evidence Base* report provided for the first time statistically robust national and regional estimates of the structural condition and adaptive reuse of listed farm buildings. It demonstrated that:

- Over half of all listed farm buildings have been subject to planning applications for development.
- Traditional buildings make a vital contribution to the remarkably varied character of England's landscape, but are largely redundant for modern agricultural purposes. They have been under the greatest threat of either neglect or development than any other rural building type. The great majority is not listed or is not included in local authority Historic Environment Records.
- The overwhelming majority of conversions was for residential use (70-80%), despite planning policies that favoured employment and business uses.
- Pressures for change will continue and accelerate in some areas, as farmers seek to rationalise their businesses and construct new infrastructure.

Extending the Evidence Base reported on the first results of mapping the historic character and survival of farmsteads, and included a pilot study of current use of these structures in South East England.³ This demonstrated that around a third of all surviving traditional farmsteads (whether or not they include listed buildings) remain in agricultural use, with varying degrees of diversification. Approximately 10% are in commercial use, while the remainder are in different forms of residential use. Residential use commands prices substantially above those of other property within a 10km radius, whether traditional buildings have been converted to other uses or not. The *West Midlands Farmsteads and Landscapes Project*,⁴ which matched the results of mapping the historic character and survival of all traditional farmsteads against data recording their use, revealed that the proportion of farmsteads in agricultural use with minimal diversification in the Staffordshire Peak District was above the regional average (44% against the average of 31%), and that residential use (at 51%) was below the regional average of 56%. The remainder of non-residential uses included an above-average proportion of tourist and holiday accommodation.⁵

² The Government Office for Science's Land Use Futures Project, for example, has scoped the short and long-term options for change across the United Kingdom (www.foresight.gov.uk).

³ English Heritage, University of Gloucestershire, Forum Heritage Services and University of Sheffield (2009) *Historic Farm Buildings: Extending the Evidence Base*

⁴ For the Summary Report of 2009 see <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/west-midlands-farmsteads-landscapes/>

⁵ Summarised on page 8 of the *South East Farmsteads Character Statement* (<https://content.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/south-east-farmsteads-character-statement/se-farmsteads-guidance.pdf/>) and the *West Midlands Farmsteads and Landscapes Project: Summary Report* (<https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/west-midlands-farmsteads-landscapes/>). Bibby, P and Brindley, P (2007) *Current Socio-Economic Context of Traditional farmsteads in the South East*. Pilot project report prepared for English Heritage. Department of Town and Regional Planning, University of Sheffield; Bibby, P and Brindley, P (2008) *Current Socio-Economic Context of Traditional farmsteads in the High Weald AONB*. Report prepared for High Weald AONB Joint Advisory Committee. Department of Town and Regional Planning, University of Sheffield; Bibby, P (2010), *Current Use of Historic Farm Properties in the West Midlands: Introduction and Overview*, Report for English Heritage by the Department of Town and Regional Planning, University of Sheffield

3.3 Changes for agricultural use

The Upland and Upland Fringe areas of England, including the Peak District, preserve the highest proportion of traditional farmsteads that retain their historic form and remain in agricultural use. Farming families in such areas often have strong emotional and cultural attachments to their property and play extremely significant roles in local communities. Such farms, however, face considerable challenges, as demonstrated by a now considerable body of research,⁶ and it seems likely that the rate of disposal of farmsteads and redundant buildings via the property market will increase significantly in the future.

The most critical issues for preservation of the historic farm building stock in the uplands of the Peak District include the following:

- Farm businesses in the Peak uplands are relatively small-scale, with low average incomes and low workers' wages. If they are to remain viable, there needs to be investment in infrastructure that will enable further savings in labour efficiency (both in the farmyard and for efficient grassland management).
- Farmers are particularly vulnerable to increasing livestock prices, which have obvious consequences for farm profitability.
- Over a quarter of farms have no recorded successor, and nearly the same proportion of businesses do not expect to survive for the next five years. This is probably an underestimate.
- Issues such as those noted above may be expected to spur significant changes in the Peak District's farmstead resource, including growth of some farms, the abandonment of some of the more marginal land and the development of a more diverse mix of family businesses, farms run by hobby and lifestyle farmers, and farms whose owners rely upon multiple sources of income.
- A decrease in cattle numbers and an increase in different systems of sheep farming, spurred by the economic drivers noted above, may be expected to affect in turn local service providers and economies.

Farmsteads in the Peak District and other upland areas are thus under increasing threat of functional redundancy, dereliction and loss, with all that this entails in terms of landscape change and the loss of historic character. Whilst this is a nationwide issue, the choice between absolute loss (consequent to dereliction and collapse) and relative loss (consequent to the impacts of conversion and redevelopment) will be particularly important in areas where stock farming and dairying have been important, notably in upland and western areas of England. In other areas, over 50% of traditional farmsteads are no longer functionally dependent on their locality through agricultural use, while in some lowland areas the percentage is far higher.⁷

The choice is particularly stark for field barns, which comprise the overwhelming majority of barns in poor to very bad condition; some of these are already in a state of imminent or

⁶ Gaskell, P, Dwyer, J, et al (2010) *Economic and environmental impacts of changes in support measures for the English Uplands: An in-depth forward look from the farmer's perspective*. Final report to the Defra Agricultural Change and Environment Observatory programme by the Countryside and Community Research Institute and the Food and Environment Research Agency

⁷ Highlighted in particular by the West Midlands Farmsteads and Landscapes Project, see note 5.

actual collapse. A clear disincentive to regular maintenance of field barns is their dispersal within the landscape and their relative inaccessibility, especially when they become redundant for fodder storage. This matches the results of *Farmsteads Mapping* across England, which has shown that field barns and outfarms have been subject to the highest rates of loss from the landscape.

3.3 Changes to Agri-environment Schemes

Countryside Stewardship and the Rural Development Plan for England provide the highest level of financial support for landscape and heritage⁸ in England, including the maintenance and weather-proofing of traditional farm buildings. Upland areas, where a particularly high proportion of traditional farm buildings remain in agricultural use, are particularly sensitive to changes in agri-environment schemes. A review of the effectiveness of these schemes has been published,⁹ focusing on the effectiveness of the restoration of historic buildings (HTB) capital items in the Environmental Stewardship Higher Level Scheme (HLS) and the maintenance of traditional farm building (TFB) options (D1 and D12) that were brought into the Entry Level Scheme in 2006 and 2010. Both were particularly popular in upland areas, and in the Peak District contributed in the following respects:

- the HTB option delivered the objectives of Environmental Stewardship for a limited proportion of buildings, the average size of grants (at £61, 400) being lower than for upland fringe (£73, 600) areas
- the maintenance option had a more limited impact in improving the condition of TFBs, but it covered a far higher number of schemes; the standard 'is very high and clearly would exclude many buildings being entered into the scheme if the requirements were strictly adhered to.'

The HTB option, whilst being highly effective in the conservation of fabric, was only able to protect a tiny sample of buildings within farmsteads, together with a small number of field barns and outfarms. Between January 2009 and 31 March 2014, 32 buildings and structures had been conserved as part of these schemes or via National Park Authority funding.

The future of these schemes after 2020 will depend upon post-Brexit domestic priorities and the nature of the next Rural Development Regulation.

3.4 Economic Factors

The conservation and reuse of traditional farmsteads can make a significant contribution to rural economies and communities. Although upland areas are marked by relatively little productive capacity and prejudiced by low capital endowment, they are marked by their high amenity and landscape value. The agrarian landscape and its built heritage is vital for community well-being and for attracting domestic and foreign tourists to rural areas. This includes National Parks, which have been the subject of a 2013 study for National Parks

⁸ £273 million for heritage over the period 2005-14 with a further £44 million planned for 2015-20.

⁹ Gaskell, P., Edwards, B. and Courtney P. with Barber, W., Berry, R., Edwards, R., Lewis, N., Lord, J., Moore, F., Murphy, K., O'Seaneachain, D. and Pritchard, H. (2014) *Evaluating the effectiveness of Environmental Stewardship for the conservation of historic buildings*, Final report to Natural England.

England entitled 'National Parks, National Assets' (www.nationalparksengland.org.uk). The University of Gloucestershire have also quantified the contribution of pre-2008 TFB schemes to local economies in the Lake District and Yorkshire Dales, and have scoped the potential for determining the social and economic benefits of heritage in the National Parks of England and Wales.¹⁰

The Rural Economy and Land Use Programme (Relu) that was led by Newcastle University and published in 2013 revealed that rural areas contribute at least 19% of Gross Value Added (GVA) to the English economy, with a quarter of all registered businesses located in rural areas (<http://www.relu.ac.uk/news/Consultations/Growth%20Review.pdf>). Rural areas account for around £210 billion, or 16%, of England's economic output. There is a high incidence of home working, together with manufacturing, services, R&D and a diversity of other types of business. This raises the need to treat rural areas as an integral part of cross-cutting and mainstream plans for economic development. It is highly significant, in this respect, to note that Farmsteads Mapping in the West Midlands (which included the Staffordshire Peak District) demonstrated that commercial use was difficult to secure and that the extent of minor diversification affecting the reuse of farm buildings may be underestimated.¹¹ It also demonstrated that farmsteads in residential use are more strongly associated with home-based entrepreneurial businesses than any other kind of urban or rural property. This still leaves field barns as a particularly difficult issue, despite the success of some 'bunk barn' schemes and experimentation with 'light-touch' reuse: for example, Feilden Clegg's installation of a pod in one of the field barns suggested for reuse as part of a joint English Heritage and Cavendish Estate survey on the Bolton Abbey estate in North Yorkshire.¹²

3.5 Changes in Planning Policy

The National Park Authority is at a critical moment in planning for the future. The Local Development Framework Core Strategy was adopted in October 2011. This document, together with the saved policies from the earlier Local Plan, is informing the production of the development management documents and policies that are essential for the effective conservation management of the Peak District landscape through the planning process. Current policies address barn conversion and re-use, favouring proposals that will take place within settlements. Core housing policy HC1 gives scope for the conversion of valued vernacular buildings where development might be considered necessary to conserve and enhance the building. The next stage of development management policy is seeking to develop consideration of the significance of heritage assets and their setting. This will place a higher test on, for example, more remote barns in the open countryside which will clearly

¹⁰ Courtney, P and Gaskell, P and Mills, J and Boase, R, Cheese, L and Jones, O and Kubinakova, K and Lewis, N and Urquhart, J (2008). *Scoping Study on the Socio-Economic Benefits of Heritage in the National Parks - Final Report for English Heritage and Cadw. Project Report. CCRI, University of Gloucestershire.*

¹¹ Minor diversification, still of significance to individual farm businesses, can remain 'hidden' in planning statistics. This is because small-scale businesses developed on working farms do not require a Use Class change from the local planning authority if diversification does not extend as far as the creation of new residential or business facilities.

¹² For the 'Feildbarn' project see <http://www.yorkshiredales.org.uk/living-and-working/development-opportunities>; for Bolton Abbey see Lake, J with Hartley N and Proctor E (2009) *Farm Buildings and Change on the Bolton Abbey Estate, North Yorkshire: A Character-based Pilot Study*. English Heritage and Bolton Abbey estate.

benefit from the character-based information and review of policy that this project will provide. The Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority's 'Barns Toolkit', developed at the initial stage of the Yorkshire Dales Farmsteads Project and following consideration of the Assessment Framework piloted on the Bolton Abbey Estate, provides another instance of a more flexible framework which accepts the need for conversion as a means of conserving adaptable buildings in accessible locations beyond settlement cores, accepting that it cannot rigidly adhere to car travel as an impediment to sustainable rural development.¹³

While government has not relaxed Permitted Development Rights (PDRs), which would permit virtually unrestricted conversion of barns to alternative uses in Section 1 (5) land (National Parks and AONBS), including conversion to dwellings, there remains the threat that this decision could be rescinded. Government has, in any case, stated its expectation that National Park authorities should have a positive approach to dealing with the re-use of traditional buildings. This necessarily increases pressure on National Park authorities to approve conversions, demolitions and replacements. The resource, which is a key landscape characteristic, heritage asset and economic contributor through tourism, remains significantly under threat. Meanwhile, in contiguous areas of similar character and content (High Peak and Staffordshire Moorlands outside the National Park boundary), the threat to that resource has increased significantly. It is particularly important, in this context, to note that farm buildings of marginal quality for designation were considered to be sufficiently protected through 'curtilage listing' of the house or more rarely another principal item: it was then considered that any raising of the threshold to include more 19th century buildings would add thousands of buildings to the statutory list. Interpretation of recent case law now suggests that if farm buildings have uses independent of the farmhouse they should not be treated as listed, even if they have been in the same ownership prior to the date of listing. If sustained, this has significant implications for the protection of many thousands of farm buildings, especially in view of the fact that only a small proportion are listed (see 1: Introduction) and that historic farm buildings are acknowledged as under-represented on the statutory lists.¹⁴

4. RESPONSES: DEFINING AN AGENDA AND STRATEGY

A second project workshop was held on 11th February 2015 at the headquarters of the Peak District National Park Authority in Bakewell. It was facilitated by DK and attended by JL, KS and 26 representatives of organisations with interests in the Peak District farm resource (see Appendix 1).

The workshop was convened with the aims of updating attendees on the Peak District Farm Characterisation project, identifying topics to be considered when undertaking site recording, and defining a strategy for future research. A summary of the East Midlands Historic Environment Research Framework, with which the Peak Farmsteads research framework will interface, was provided as background for delegates.

4.1 Research Agenda

¹³ See <http://www.yorkshiredales.org.uk/living-and-working/development-opportunities>

¹⁴ Cherry, M. et al 2010 *Heritage Protection Reform Statutory Lists: Review of Quality and Coverage* Report for English Heritage. Edwards, B 2012. *South East Farmsteads: Higher Level Stewardship Targeting & Framework*. Report by Bob Edwards of Forum Heritage for English Heritage, South East Team.

The following issues were identified as high priority concerns during the workshop and from subsequent feedback:

1. What are the pressures on farm businesses to locate modern buildings away from traditional farmsteads, and how is their scale, intensity and distribution likely to impact on landscape character?
2. How can we collate and assess the data that are currently available for Peak District farmsteads in Historic Environment Records (HERs), the Archaeology Data Service and other data repositories, and how can we ensure ready access to these data for decision-makers, the community and other stakeholders?
3. How can we ensure the longevity and accessibility of HER data generated by new projects?
4. How does the historical development of field barns and farmsteads relate to the wider historic landscape, including past phases of enclosure?
5. Can the Farmsteads Assessment Framework be refined so that it can help identify the different levels of significance and the capacity for change of different farmstead types?
6. What are the most significant clusters of groupings of field barns, and how can they be sustained as features in the landscape through continuing and alternative uses? To what extent can we accept the loss of groupings which are less significant in intrinsic or landscape terms?
7. Are improvements needed in refining the developing national typologies of farmsteads, farm buildings and other agricultural structures in order to create a bespoke classification for the Peak District?
8. How do we reach a better understanding of medieval and later rural landscape changes, such as piecemeal and planned enclosure, improvements such as liming and drainage and the rebuilding of farmsteads and rural buildings in the later 18th and 19th centuries?
9. How do the different sensitivities of individual buildings to adaptive reuse impact on their landscape setting?
10. How do we determine the significance of the atypical versus the typical but locally distinctive farm building?
11. How can we assess the influence and role of estates, squires and independent farmers upon the development of farmsteads, associated agricultural structures and the wider agrarian landscape?
12. What was the role of farmsteads in the development of settlement?
13. How can we support local communities in recording farmsteads and associated agricultural structures?
14. Can we shed further light upon changes in building material sources and the impact of changing patterns of supply upon the vernacular traditions of the Peak District?
15. Can we elucidate changes in farm building usage over time and the impact of these upon their design and modification?
16. Can we refine our understanding of the relationship between field barns and water sources?
17. How will the anticipated expansion of home-based businesses and other changes in the rural economy impact upon the farmstead resource?
18. How will climate change, together with the adaptation and mitigation measures that are instigated in response to this, impact upon traditional buildings and their landscape context?

4.2 Research and Management Strategy

The following measures were identified as means of tackling the questions raised during discussion:

1. Undertake assessment of the built environment, archaeological, documentary and cartographic data available for the study of Peak District farmsteads and facilitate dissemination of this information (e.g. digital platform).
2. Investigate the potential for crowd-sourced funding (e.g. for recording of historic farmsteads by digital photography and searches of documents and old maps).
3. Investigate the availability of other funding sources for research (including the Heritage Lottery Fund, Natural England, the National Trust, Historic England/ English Heritage and estates or other private sources).
4. Promote and develop training for specialists in building-related traditional rural trades and crafts.
5. From the training perspective, explore the potential for collaborations with representatives of local businesses and trades.
6. Investigate changes in raw material supplies and the impact of these changes upon local vernacular traditions.
7. Examine changes in farm building use and form from the High Medieval to Modern periods (in consequence, for example, of industrialisation).
8. Monitor the impacts resulting from alterations of the Permitted Development Rights concerning farmsteads and other agricultural buildings, and in particular isolated field barns outside the National Park boundary.
9. Foster undergraduate and postgraduate research projects addressing Agenda issues.
10. Determine the effectiveness of the planning process as a mechanism for ensuring appropriate recording of the built and archaeological resource of farmsteads, associated structures and the agrarian landscape.
11. Establish the effectiveness of designation as a tool for management of the vernacular building resource.
12. Prepare a user-friendly guide to levels of significance, including a summary of designation criteria, for use in planning applications requiring changes of building structure and function.
13. Refine the planning checklists of the highly significant features of local farmsteads and buildings as a means of supporting the monitoring of building developments.
14. Enhance understanding of the role of dual and non-farming economies in the development of farmsteads.
15. Assess how recent changes in the farming economy have impacted upon the use, form, function and appearance of farm buildings.
16. Investigate the potential impact of climate change upon traditional buildings and the agrarian landscape.

5. CHATSWORTH CASE STUDY: REFINING THE STRATEGY

The objectives of this component of the project were to:

1. *Test the reliability of the Farmsteads Mapping data against the results of the Chatsworth Historic Landscape Survey (CHLS) reports which were published in 1996-7, focusing on the accuracy of the survival and plan type data.*
 - 33 farmsteads (defined as places where the farmhouse and the working buildings of a farm are located) and 127 field barns and outfarms were recorded.
 - 6 records have required amendment.
2. *Demonstrate how Farmsteads Mapping and the guidance can be used for rapid and initial assessment of the historic character, significance and issues for change of the estate's farmsteads and field barns.*
 - *Historic character.* Farmsteads on the Chatsworth estate have been shown to be larger generally than those found elsewhere in the Peak District. There is no overall 'estate style' which distinguishes the farmsteads and farm buildings of the Chatsworth estate, in striking contrast to the 'model cottage architecture' dating from the 1820s on the estate (notably at Edensor) and the planned farmsteads found on other landed estates of the late 18th and 19th centuries (particularly in northern England). This is probably a result of the piecemeal manner in which the estate around Chatsworth House developed, with substantial portions not falling into the hands of the estate until the later 19th and early 20th centuries.
 - *Significance of farmsteads.* The mapping of farmsteads across the Peak District has shown that the levels of survival are extremely high by national standards, with more than 81% of farms (and over 88% on the Chatsworth estate) retaining all or more than half of their historic form. Statutory designations affect a small proportion of those farmsteads that contribute to local character. There are only two listed farm buildings (at Duke's Farm and Old Hall in Beeley) and six listed farmhouses on 32 recorded sites.
 - *Significance of outfarms and field barns.* Analysis shows that field barns and outfarms have always been subject to higher levels of replacement and loss than farmsteads, with c. 44% of 128 recorded sites having retained some or all of their original working buildings. This is comparable with the total for the Peak District and the uplands of northern England, but much higher than in lowland arable areas of the country. None, including those shown on 18th century maps, have yet been dated with any certainty to the 18th century or earlier. Field barns and outfarms in some parts of the estate, particularly to the west of Edensor, south of Pilsley and north of Beeley, comprise groupings of buildings which can be viewed from roads and public rights of way; these may be seen to have clear relationships with historic fields and surviving medieval earthworks, including lynchets and ridge and furrow.
 - *Issues for change.* Many of the smaller traditional farmstead types have adopted non-agricultural functions, and although a high proportion of sites remains in agricultural use there are long-term trends for restructuring and amalgamation which will continue to require new uses for both traditional buildings and whole sites. A small number of outfarms are located next to or accessed by tracks and roads (and one has been successfully converted to a commercial use), but otherwise the small scale and remote location of field barns presents formidable obstacles to sustainable reuse. As a result many, of these will continue to deteriorate; consideration can be given to 'light-touch' maintenance of those that are most visible from public rights of way and are

capable of being appreciated as part of groupings within the most coherent historic farmed landscapes.

3. *Demonstrate use of the Farmsteads Assessment Framework*

- The first two stages of the Farmsteads Assessment Framework have been used to rapidly identify the historic character and significance of two sites, to inform consideration of the need and potential for change and the siting and design issues for two traditional farmsteads.

4. *Research issues and recording: demonstrate how the results of the Peak District Farmsteads Project can be used to inform research issues and Level Two survey of a site.*

- This has highlighted the distinctive characteristics of the estate and how the historic development of farmsteads and farm buildings can contribute to understanding of how the farmed landscape - and one site selected for a case study - developed. It must be stressed that this rapid assessment of the estate did not allow for any deeper investigation including work on the estate archives, and has raised questions for future investigation and research.

6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Conclusions

1. Farmsteads in the Peak District and other upland areas are under increasing threat of functional redundancy, dereliction and loss, with all that this entails in terms of landscape change and the loss of historic character.
2. The absence of statutory designation does not imply lack of significance, as the great majority of farmstead buildings which contribute significantly to landscape character will not fulfil the criteria for designation.
3. The Peak District has high numbers of traditional farmsteads in continuing agricultural use, sited within areas of high amenity and landscape value. The conservation and re-use of traditional farmsteads, together with a targeted approach to conservation of field barns in key landscapes, can make a significant contribution to rural economies and communities, and these should form key elements of forward-looking planning and post-Brexit agri-environmental policy.

6.2 Recommendations

To ensure that sustainable re-use and economic growth is achieved, change to traditional farmsteads needs to be fully informed by a balanced appraisal of wider social, economic and environmental factors. This should include an understanding of the historic character, significance and sensitivity to change of the assets and their landscape settings, with particular emphasis upon the following:

- Understand the present and future pattern of redundancy
- Demonstrate the value of traditional farmsteads as heritage assets
- Demonstrate the value of traditional farmsteads as social and economic assets

- Develop a locally nuanced and flexible approach to *all* types of use for traditional farmsteads and their buildings, based on an understanding of their historic character, significance and sensitivity to change.
- Inspire high quality development which ensures that traditional farmsteads can continue to contribute to the local distinctiveness, economies and communities of rural areas, whether designated or not.
- Provide incentives for the maintenance of buildings on sites in agricultural use, informed by an understanding of local variations in the survival and distribution of traditional farmsteads in the landscape.
- Encourage the reuse and small-scale development of farmsteads for agricultural and business use, including traditional buildings which assessment has shown have lower sensitivity to adaptive reuse.
- Develop a strategic approach to prioritising significant landscapes with their traditional farmsteads. The development of sustainable reuse may require incentivisation or support: for example, farmsteads that are sited in areas of low farm income or economic mass but which are important to local economies and communities through the value that they hold for tourism. This needs to be taken into account when developing strategies for schemes to replace Countryside Stewardship and development in these areas.

7 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thanks are extended to Historic England (HE) for funding this document, and in particular to Bob Hawkins (HE) for his help and advice during the progress of this project. The authors would also like to extend thanks to Pete Spriggs of *Clearer Thinking* for facilitating the Drivers for Change workshop that has informed this document.

Appendix 1: Workshops 1 and 2 Invitees/Attendees

The authors would also like to thank the following invitees/attendees at the two Workshops (Drivers for Change and Research and Recording) for their contributions on and subsequent to each day:

Workshop 1: Drivers for Change, 29 January 2015

PDNPA staff: Judith Fidler; Suzanne Fletcher; Suzanne Fowkes; Matt Freestone; Chris Fridlington; Ian Fullilove; John Sewell; Brian Taylor; Sarah Whiteley.

PDNPA members: Stella McGuire; Geoff Nickolds

Derbyshire County Council: Glynis Foster; Alex Gilbert; Adam Lathbury

Staffordshire County Council: Debbie Taylor

Staffordshire Moorlands District Council: Gillian Bayliss

Country Land and Business Association: David Merton

English Heritage (now Historic England): Tim Allen; Jeremy Lake

LEADER: Amanda Brown

Natural England: Elaine Willett

National Farmers Union: Andrew Critchlow

National Trust: Rachael Hall; Rachel Walker

Practitioners: Evans Vettori Architects, Smith & Roper Architects, Sheila Hine, farmer and author, Sue Prince, farmer and consultant

Trent & Peak Archaeology: David Knight (facilitator, Workshop 2)

Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority: Robert White

Workshop 2: Research and Recording, 11 February 2015

PDNPA staff: Sue Adam; John Barnatt; Jane Chapman; Suzanne Fowkes; John Scott; John Sewell; Karen Shelley-Jones; Brian Taylor; Rebecca Waddington; Sarah Whiteley.

PDNPA members: Stella McGuire

Derbyshire County Council: Nikki Manning

High Peak Borough Council: Richard Tuffrey

Staffordshire Moorlands District Council: Gillian Bayliss

Countryside: Jonathan Porter

English Heritage (now Historic England): Bob Hawkins; Jeremy Lake

Natural England: Elaine Willett

National Trust: Rachael Hall

Nottingham Trent University: Rachel Welton

Practitioners: Evans Vettori Architects, Smith & Roper Architects, Faith Cleverdon, consultant, Sheila Hine, farmer and author

Sheffield Hallam University: Simon Kincaid

Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority: Robert White