Hubbard Conservation



Heritage Impact Assessment

Part Two: Impact Assessment

Hatt Farm
Old Jockey Box
Corsham
Wiltshire
SN13 8DJ

April 2023

Victoria Hubbard MSc.
Tel. 07775598317. Email. Victoria@hubbardconservation.co.uk



Front page: Aerial view of Hatt Farm and farmhouse, kindly provided by Mr. J Fuller.

Figure 2: Arial view of Hatt Farm and farmhouse, naming the various barns which make up the farmstead.

Job reference. 124-23. Date: April 2023.
Victoria Hubbard MSc.
Tel. 07775598317. Email. victoria@hubbardconservation.co.uk

Contents.

Introduction and methodology. 4

Part Two: Impact Assessment 8

Introduction to the proposal 8

Description of the proposal and impact assessment: 9

- Pen shed 9
- Long store 11
- Farm office 13
- Cart shed 15
- Ancillary barn 18
- Main barn 21
- C20 grain store 26
- Conclusion and summary of impact 27

Victoria Hubbard MSc.
Tel. 07775598317. Email. victoria@hubbardconservation.co.uk

Introduction and methodology.

Victoria Hubbard MSc of Hubbard Conservation has been commissioned to write this Heritage Impact Assessment on behalf of Neston Park Estate in relation to the proposed plans to restore this redundant farmstead, transforming it into a wedding venue with a view to providing a sustainable and viable use. This report only focuses on the farmstead and its setting, and not the farmhouse.

Hatt Farmhouse was statutorily listed as Grade II on the 24th July 1985 (**Appendix I -** List Entry Number: 1022793). The farmstead is pretty much isolated with the exception of Old Jockey House and cottages, which are located at the entrance of the track leading to Hatt Farm. Old Jockey House, with its screen wall, (Kingsdown Road) was statutorily listed as Grade II on the 20th December 1960, and amended on the 24th July 1985 (**Appendix II -** List Entry Number: 1022792). Old Jockey Cottages, (3-5, Kingsdown Road) were statutorily listed as Grade II on the 20th December 1960, and amended on the 24th July 1985 (**Appendix III -** List Entry Number: 1181553). Hatt Farm is located within the North Wilshire's green belt [1].

This report has been prepared in accordance with Historic England guidelines relating to *Conservation Principals, Policies and Guidance*, Historic England, April 2008. Analysis of the setting and site have been recorded and analysed at **level 3** in accordance with Historic England's guidance '*Understanding Place'*. Although, a level 2 survey may-well have sufficed in light of the fact that the farmstead is listed by virtue of curtilage. Based on the aesthetic and fabric evidence of some of the barn the site was deemed worthy of a higher level of survey. Also, the fact that the barns are in a poor state of repair it was appropriate in term of conservation to record the site sufficiently to be able to understand its significance and evolution.

Guidance under 'The Setting of Heritage Assets: Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Historic England)' and 'Understanding Place, Historic Area Assessments: Principles and Practice - 2010' has been referred to, along with the various appropriate guidance issued by Historic England with regard to farmstead settings and curtilage:

- Listed Buildings and Curtilage, Historic England Advise Note 10, February 2018.
- National Farm Building Types, Historic England, 2013.

[1] https://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/media/8177/North-Wiltshire-Local-Plan-2011-Map-1a/pdf/North_Wiltshire_Local_Plan_2011_-_Map_1a.pdf?m=637767671314870000

Victoria Hubbard MSc.
Tel. 07775598317. Email. victoria@hubbardconservation.co.uk

- Adapting Traditional Farm Buildings, Best Practice Guidelines for Adaptive Reuse, Historic England, September 2017.
- The Adaptive Reuse of Traditional Farm Buildings, Historic England Advice Note 9, September 2017.

The level of detail in this report is proportionate to the proposed works and the significance of the main asset and setting in accordance with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), Section 16, Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment, 2021, in particular paragraph 194**.** '*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.'*

Paragraph 195 of the NPPF states, '*Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.*' To accord with this policy this report has been written in two parts: Part one will comprise **Statement of Significance** and part two, an **Impact Assessment**. Due to the size of the site and subsequent document, the report will be presented as two separate (but related) reports.

As referred to above, Part One report (Statement of Significance) first sets out the historic background of the heritage asset and its setting, investigating the 'significance' in accordance with Historic England's Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance, which advocates the understanding of 'significance' taking place before moving onto assess the impact of potential change on that 'significance'. The Impact Assessment (Part Two – *this report*) will detail the planning proposal, again, in accordance with Historic England's Conservation, Principles, Policies and Guidance and paragraph 199 of the NPPF. *'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)'.*

Victoria Hubbard MSc.
Tel. 07775598317. Email. victoria@hubbardconservation.co.uk

To simplify the explanation of the site, the each barn has been clearly described in the Statement of Significance (Part One) as shown in **Figure 2** on **page 2):**

- **Pen shed**
- **Long store**
- **Farm office**
- **Cart shed**
- **Ancillary barn**
- **Main barn**
- **C20 grain store**

Local constraints:

- Wiltshire Core Strategy: Adopted January 2015 – Wilshire Local Development Framework.
- North Wilshire Local Plan 2011:
  - 7: Historic Environment Topic Area.

The planning system expects reports such as these to be based on evidence. Therefore, this report has been based on a site inspection that took place on October 20th 2022 where a site survey was conducted. Photographs were taken on the day. Documentary research has been obtained from a variety of sources including: local history and online sources [2]. Other sources have been consulted such as: Promaps Ltd, National Library of Scotland and Aerial Photo Explorer via historicenglandorg.uk. The client has also kindly provided some documentary evidence.

A desktop search of the Wiltshire Council planning portal for previous planning applications show the following:

- N/09/01204/S73A – change of use to film set (amendment to permission 08/00392/S73A.
- N/07/01064/LBC – temporary change of use from agriculture to film set and associated operational development, including erection of scenery.

[2] http://www.boxpeopleandplaces.co.uk

Victoria Hubbard MSc.
Tel. 07775598317. Email. victoria@hubbardconservation.co.uk

- N/07/01065/COU - temporary change of use from agriculture to film set and associated operational development, including erection of scenery.
- N/08/00392/S73A – renewal of temporary permission granted under 07.01065.COU to extend use as film set until 31.Jan. 2010.

Victoria Hubbard has a Masters degree in Historic Conservation from Brookes University, Oxford. She is the project coordinator for The Early English Fabric project in Chipping Norton on behalf of Historic England, which started in 2013 and is ongoing. The project was nominated for The Historic England Angel Awards in October 2016 in recognition of the time, effort, and determination afforded to the project. In 2012 she became one of the founder members of the Chipping Norton Buildings Record (CNBR) and is an Affiliate member of the Institute of Historic Building Conservation (IHBC).

This report has been prepared with care, diligence and as an objective assessment based on the information provided, discovered, or known at the time. This report has been produced for the sole use of the clients and their professional advisors in connection with this application and should not be relied upon by any other party or any other context. This report should be read in conjunction with the Design and Access Statement and proposed plans provided by Millar + Howard Workshop and the Statement of Significance (Part One), which includes location and setting, historic context, building and evolution analysis and a Statement of Significance.

Victoria Hubbard MSc.
Tel. 07775598317. Email. victoria@hubbardconservation.co.uk

Part Two: Impact Assessment.

Introduction to the Proposal.
The following analysis of the proposed works has been taken from the following proposed drawings provided by Millar + Howard Workshop:
P110, P210, P211, P710, P711, P712, P203, P204, and P704.

The proposal seeks to convert this redundant farmstead into a wedding venue with the aim of providing a sustainable and viable use; thus preserving this collection of barns for future generations. Rather than breaking the farmstead up into individual units [3], this proposal makes good-use of the farmstead as a collective group, creating an inventive use of space, resisting any temptation for domesticity, and embracing the agricultural aesthetic, floor plan, and materials.

To simplify the analysis each barn will be discussed in turn with clear references to the appropriate pages of the Statement of Significance (Part One) to prevent some duplication of information and to avoid over-complicating the analysis:

- **Pen shed**
- **Long store**
- **Farm office**
- **Cart shed**
- **Ancillary barn**
- **Main barn**
- **C20 grain store**

[3] For individual commercial or industrial enterprise, which would run the risk of frequent empty units.

Victoria Hubbard MSc.
Tel. 07775598317. Email. victoria@hubbardconservation.co.uk

Pen shed (pages 31 & 32, Figs. 19 – 20 – Statement of Significance: Part One)

Existing – Former livestock shelter located to the north of the site comprising a L-shaped building with 10-bays orientated east-west (PS1) and a shorter range of 3-bays oriented north-south (PS2). The barn is built from randomly coursed limestone rubble as solid walls to the north, east and west and to the southern gable of PS2. The bays are open to the south of PS1 and there is vertical timber cladded to the east of PS2; although secondary as this too was previously open. The roof covering comprises clay pan tile with stone copings; hipped at each end. The pen shed is coeval with the long store.



Figure 3: Pen shed

PS1: 10-bays (bay 1 to the west and bay 10 to the east) divided by jowled posts resting on staddle stones. A deep C20 concrete floor has been inserted into each bay and rises almost as high as the staddle stone. The low dividing bay-walls all comprise C20 concrete. King post roof with a single row of back-purlins with wedges. Between bays 8 and 9 there is a thick wall with dressed quoins. Between bays 6 and 7 there remains a film-set partition. The post between bays 9 and 10 has empty mortices to its south face; likely once accommodating a fence as indicated on the 1873 map.

PS2: comprises 3-bays. King post roof with a diagonal truss between PS1 and PS2. Jowled posts and staddle stones to the east; now cladded with wide vertical boarding to enclose these bays. Only the top part of the stable door remains but is in a derelict state. To the west wall there is a feeding trough gully with a drainage gully with limestone edging. The southern truss rests on a secondary pier to its western end. The floor comprises concrete to the northwest corner, which is cut-and-ground for livestock use. To the southern end the floor comprises a thin layer of concrete on earth; possibly earth floor between the gullies. There are quoins to the southeast corner, which may be repeated to the southwest but there is a degree of delamination.

Proposed works and mitigation – The proposal seeks to:

- Remove the deep concrete floor, replacing this with a new insulated floor.
- Retain the stone piers (jowled post on staddle stones.
- Remove C20 low walls that divide the pens, and provide new dividing walls constructed from timber stud, created under exiting trusses to respect some of the bays.
- Rebuild south and east open elevation with timber stud walls and exterior timber cladding, revealing the jowled posts and staddle stones.
- Re-roof to make repairs, and to provide insulation suitable for accommodation. The trusses will remain. The roof will be raised slightly, and recovered using the salvaged existing tiles. Sacrificed tiles will be replaced like-for-like (reclaimed).

Assessment of, and significance of impact – The existing concrete floor is modern and partially obscures the staddle stones. The nature of concrete against exposed stone is not preferable often rendering the stone sacrificial, therefore its removal is deemed as beneficial, preservation and enhancement. According to the elevation drawings (P712) it would appear the jowled posts and staddle stones will be exposed, which will enhance the elevation making clear the former pen bays. The proposal seeks to enclose the bays with timber stud walls with external timber cladding to replicate the farmyard aesthetic.

The low bay division walls will need to be removed to provide adequate accommodation space, however, these walls are modern and are not worthy of retention. The new walls will respect some of the trusses/bays. Retention of the external jowled posts will provide readable evidence of the former bays.

The roof is in need of repair. This is the perfect opportunity to conduct a programme of repairs and to provide insulation appropriate to the change of use into accommodation. The proposal suggests there will be a slight increase in profile due to the insulation; however, the proposal does not appear to request anything that suggests this increase will be substantial as the walls are to remain in-situ, as too the trusses. Sacrificial tiles will be replaced like-for-like (reclaimed presumably). There is nothing in this proposal to suggest the overall scale and form will change. It would appear that the changes to provide accommodation are modest and well designed. The proposed repairs will preserve the building and the new interventions should enhance the existing.

Victoria Hubbard MSc.
Tel. 07775598317. Email. victoria@hubbardconservation.co.uk

Long store (Pages 33 & 34, Figs. 21 – 22 - Statement of Significance: Part One).

Existing – Former livestock shelter known as the 'long store' is located to the south-eastern corner of the site. The building comprising 7-bays orientated north-south. The barn is built from randomly coursed limestone rubble as solid walls to the east and north gable. The bays were open to the west, but now mostly closed by metal corrugated sheets. The roof covering comprises clay pan tile with stone copings; hipped at the southern end. The long store is coeval with the pen shed. The floor is C20 concrete, which has been cut and ground to stop livestock from slipping (may be from the 1980s). The inner east wall and south gable have C20 render. The west elevation has retained its jowled posts resting on staddle stones, which are now behind metal corrugated sheets.

King post roof structure with a single row of back-purlins, with wedges. Plank battens on the rafters, which sit on the wall plate. The tiles adhere to the plank battens. All timbers are machine cut – likely C19. The roof is hipped to the south end, but open to the north. The tie-beam of the northernmost truss has been cut to provide a garage, and has new rafters where the former hip has been removed; the end purlins remain visible.



Figure 4: Long store.

Victoria Hubbard MSc.
Tel. 07775598317. Email. victoria@hubbardconservation.co.uk

Proposed works and mitigation – The proposal seeks to:

- Re-roof to make repairs, and to provide insulation suitable for accommodation. The trusses will remain. The roof will be raised slightly, and recovered using the salvaged existing tiles. Sacrificed tiles will be replaced like-for-like (reclaimed).
- Rebuild west elevation with timber stud walls and exterior timber cladding to replace the corrugated metal sheeting; revealing the jowled posts and staddle stones.
- Remove northernmost existing internal wall and replace with new dividing wall to be built in line with existing trusses (P203). Proposed drawing P210 appears to suggest three other walls/divisions will be provided to be able to convert the building into five bays: bin store, workshop/maintenance room, two stores and a plant room. This will require five sets of timber double doors.

Assessment of, and significance of impact – As with the pen shed, the roof needs repairing. This is the perfect opportunity to conduct a programme of repairs and to provide insulation appropriate to the change of use into ancillary use. The proposal suggests there will be a slight increase in profile due to the insulation; however, the proposal does not appear to request anything that suggests this increase will be substantial as the walls are to remain in-situ, as too the trusses. Sacrificial tiles will be replaced like-for-like (reclaimed presumably). Presently, the west elevation would be open if it were not for the corrugated tin adhered to the front. Removal of this is welcome. It is proposed to convert this building into five individual rooms with each with a set of timber double doors. The external walls will have a similar treatment to that of the pen shed comprising external timber cladding, which will reveal the jowled posts and staddle stones.

The proposal seeks to make good-use of this barn as ancillary without any alteration to the scale and form. The proposed changes will preserve the structure and enhance the setting.

Victoria Hubbard MSc.
Tel. 07775598317. Email. victoria@hubbardconservation.co.uk

Farm office (Pages 34 – 36, Figs. 23 – 24 and pages 16 – 26, Figs. 8 – 18 - Statement of Significance: Part One).



Figure 5: Farm office.

Existing – The office comprises a single storey building built predominantly from randomly coursed limestone rubble, underneath a corrugated cement fibre roof, and comprising two rooms. The first, and easternmost (O1), is entered via the north gable and the second (O2) is entered either from O1 or from CS1. It would appear that primarily this was one L-shaped room before a concrete block wall was inserted to provide two rooms.

The west wall of O1 rises as limestone rubble until concrete blocks complete the last three courses raising the wall height above the wall plate. The fabric evidence shows the building formally had a fairly steep pitched roof; evidence of which is confirmed internally at the north gable. The east wall has quoins to both ends; however, the historic maps show the southeast corner as missing. The change in character of the stonework shows that the corner has been built-out, squaring off the room. The inner skin of this wall comprises concrete block, and may-well date to the installation of the 'new' computer in the 1980s. The window is C20 with a timber lintel and concrete cill. There is no casement; the glass is just wedged into place. There is also a possible blocked window opening. The northern gable has quoins to the northeast corner but not to the northwest. C20 door (into O1) with a concrete threshold, lintel and door jambs.

The lower courses of the northern elevation of O2 course-through (underneath the existing window) to the cart shed (CS1) terminating at the ancillary barn. Above the window there is vertical timber cladding underneath a catslide roof. The south elevation comprises concrete blocks and a garage door to O1 (used to fill the space), and all concrete blocks to O2 (constructed at two different times) with a modern timber casement window.

Victoria Hubbard MSc.
Tel. 07775598317. Email. victoria@hubbardconservation.co.uk

Internally (O1), the majority of the walling fabric comprises primary randomly coursed limestone rubble; some of which is rendered, with areas of concrete block work. The south end has ply board attached to the inside of the garage door [4]. All the floors are concrete. Room O2 has been partitioned from O1 by a concrete block wall. The majority of the internal walling fabric is covered by ply-board (presumably as insulation) although only the north wall is likely to contain any primary fabric. There is an opening into the east end of the cart shed (CS1) made from concrete blocks with a timber lintel; set in the randomly coursed limestone wall.

Proposed works and mitigation – The proposal seeks to:

- Clad the southern elevation in timber and fill the area of the garage door with double timber doors.
- It is proposed to replace the existing rough stone adjacent to the window of O2 on the north elevation with stone to match that of the barn walls.
- Repair and restore existing doors and windows.
- Repoint and restore stonewalls and openings.
- Rearrange the internal arrangement by removing modern block walls and rebuild with new partitions.

Assessment of, and significance of impact – The office has been heavily altered over the years. There are no walls of historic significance internally therefore rearranging the internal walls will have no detrimental effect. The proposal to repoint the stonework is welcome in terms of preservation and enhancement. Repairing and restoring doors and windows is likely to result in replacement as none of these have any historic significance and are ill-fitting and modern. In terms of heritage, there is no merit in keeping these. The notion of cladding the southern elevation will ensure this area blends with the adjacent cart shed. The garage door opening is large and the notion of double doors makes sense, although there is a considerable step down externally, therefore, one would expect to see a ramp or steps for access.

Overall, the proposal seeks to retain the scale and external form of the office. The internal plan form will alter, but the existing arrangement has no historic merit.

[4] The distance from the ground to the threshold of the garage door precludes any possible use as a garage.

Victoria Hubbard MSc.
Tel. 07775598317. Email. victoria@hubbardconservation.co.uk

Cart Shed (pages 37 & 38, Figs. 25 -27 and pages 16 – 26, Figs. 8 – 18 - Statement of Significance: Part One).

Existing – It appears likely that the cart shed was as the name suggests, with a granary above. This building occupies the space between O2 and the ancillary barn. The building is accessed from O2, the ancillary barn, and a southern external door. The north elevation courses through from O2 at lower levels then continue with quoins to the eaves, followed by copings to the gable. Slightly squared stone indicates where the building has been raised, likely C19. There is a loading door at first floor level, with ashlar surrounds.

There are three ashlar stone piers on stone plinth with capitals to the south elevation. The southeast quoins change character in-line with the capitals providing further evidence that both the lower courses of the north and south elevations are from an earlier building. The openings between each pier have been in-filled with concrete blocks.



Figure 6: Cart shed

The ground floor presents as an open space, the walls of which are mostly covered with insultaion. There are three modern timber casement windows to the south with iron security bars. Three hefty beams traverse the room, each of which appears to comprise four planks of timber pushed together to form a single beam. The beams rest on the captials.

The south elevation (at first floor level) is hidden behind metal corrugated sheets. When viewed internally it is clear some timber fabric survives. There are double loading doors over the 2nd bay. The soleplate is retained with empty mortices for vertical studs; suggestive of a weather-boarded second floor (prior to the corrugated sheets). It appears that a substantial girding beam sat along the top of the capitals, which appears to have rotted away. This girding beam would relate to the earlier east gable of the ancillary barn. This suggests that the lower levels of both the cart shed and the ancillary barn were built at a similar time, but the south elevation of the ancillary barn has been rebuilt to accommodate the girding beam**.** At first floor level (on the north elevation) there is a plank-loading door approximately 2 ½ feet above the floor. A former lower roofline can be seen in the east gable of the ancillary barn.

The roof comprises a 4-bay, king post roof with a single row of back-purlins and a ridge board (similar character to the long store and the pen shed suggesting coeval roofs, although this has a slate covering). The room is completely floored with boards. Access into the first floor is gained from an opening in the east gable of the ancillary barn stepping down into the cart shed.

Proposed works and mitigation – The proposal seeks to:

- Provide two conservation roof lights to the northern pitch
- It is proposed that the existing corrugated metal sheeting is to be removed, and if practical it is proposed that the existing studwork is reused. The external south elevation is to be clad in timber and lined with plasterboard internally. It is also proposed to repoint and expose the stonework (depending its condition).
- At first floor level there will be three new windows spaced to echo the existing plan form of the windows at ground floor level. The design of these first floor windows appear to echo 'loading-hatches' in terms of size and proportion, which is a welcome design feature to ensure the fenestrations are as far removed from domesticity as possible.
- At ground floor level the new timber stud wall will occupy the space between the stone piers.
- The door in the southwest corner of the ground floor will be converted into a window.

Victoria Hubbard MSc.
Tel. 07775598317. Email. victoria@hubbardconservation.co.uk

Assessment of, and significance of impact – Whilst the south elevation has some evidence of early material, essentially it is covered by modern metal corrugated sheeting and in need of repair/maintenance. Conversion into commercial use provides the perfect opportunity to make the building watertight and to provide insulation.

The proposal seeks to retain features such as the stone piers making them integral to the design. The notion of timber cladding is welcome considering the empty mortices for vertical studs in the retained soleplate, which suggest the wall was weather-boarded at second floor level primarily. The proposed installation of two conservation roof lights will be necessary to provide much needed natural light. Presently there is one window opening on the north elevation, which will be retained, but otherwise this side of the room is unlit.

The proposal request seeks to provide three windows on the southern side to provide much needed natural light and to be able to capitalise on the exquisite views from this aspect of the farmstead. The design appears to be agricultural in proportion (based on drawing P710) to draw away from a domestic appearance.

The proposal mentions re-pointing of stonework. It is vital that the apotropaic mark (daisy wheel) to the south of the doorway at first floor level is preserved.

Overall, the proposed works should enhance the building whilst the repairs and renovations should preserve the structure, again, retaining its scale and proportion.

Victoria Hubbard MSc.
Tel. 07775598317. Email. victoria@hubbardconservation.co.uk

Ancillary barn (Pages 39 – 42, Figs. 28 – 30 and pages 16 – 26, Figs. 8 – 18 - Statement of Significance: Part One).

Existing – The ancillary barn has experienced at least two periods of rebuilding. The primary use of this barn is unknown but the C19 period provided stabling with a substantial hayloft. The ground floor is a single room with four pens to the west. The first floor comprises one room of 6-bays. The roof comprises slate with copings.

Beginning at the north elevation, the lower courses (approximately up to 6 ft.) comprise large dressed limestone blocks, unequal in size. Above this level the character changes to randomly coursed blocks of dressed stone mixed with roughly squared rubble. There is a suggestion of quoins to the lower 6ft on the eastern end but none at the same level on the western end because at this level the wall courses through to the main barn. Above the 6ft level, dressed quoins rise between the ancillary barn and the main barn to the eaves. Empty sockets in the wall (below the eaves) are the remains of a demolished building. There is a loading door with dressed surround, similar character to that found on the south elevation.



Figure 7: Ancillary barn; south elevation.

The east gable is visible from inside the cart shed at first floor level, and comprises cut dressed stone blocks up to the first floor level – in-line with the door threshold from the cart shed into the ancillary barn. This then alters to random rubble stonework, similar in character to that of the upper courses on the north elevation. The door surround is surprisingly fine with



Figure 8: Ancillary barn; north elevation.

ashlar dressings; one stone of which exhibits apotropaic marks – a daisy wheel**.** The finely dressed surround is repeated on the opposing side.

The west gable shows three different roof pitches including the present roof. These relate to a lower steeper gabled structure visible from inside the main barn and that of the gabled roof above**.** The third, and final, pitch relates to the existing roof, likely C19.

The south elevation exhibits a completely different character to the rest of the building, presenting as a symmetrical building with finely-dressed/ashlar surrounds to the openings. There are two windows to both the ground and first floors and a blocked central door below a large loading hatch. Built on a foundation-course that rises for seven courses before being capped with chamfered stonework. There are quoins to the east but not the west. The remaining wall rises as squared (fairly uniform) dress coursed limestone of large blocks. The elevation is symmetrical and appears to be a complete rebuild, likely C19 renovations.

The ground floor was once accessed via a central south door, which is now converted into a window. Access is now gained via a later door insertion in the east gable (from the cart shed). 5-transverse ceiling beams have chamfers and stops, with cross-bracing between each bay. The pens comprise C20 concrete blocks and concrete floors to each bay, with central gullies. All evidence of former stabling has been removed with the exception of the loft feeding hatches on the first floor. The empty diamond-shaped stave mortices below the hatches are the only remaining evidence of the mangers.

The first floor is accessed externally (no internal stairs) via the first floor loading door above the now blocked central door (via a ladder). The roof comprises machine cut king post trusses, with two rows of back-purlins, with wedges, and a ridge board. The fully boarded floor comprises 6 x 1 softwood boards. As mentioned above, the only remaining historic fabric pertaining to stabling is six loft feeding hatches, all hinged and able to lift. This is an important feature, as the feed would have been dropped from the hayloft into the mangers below. The hatches run the full length of the first floor suggesting the whole of the ground floor was used as stables. There is a loading door, with double-timber doors in situ, to the north.

Proposed works and mitigation – The proposal seeks to:

- Provide external modern metal panelled stairs to the north elevation that will access the existing first floor opening.
- Provide three conservation roof lights to the southern pitch

- Block the existing eastern doorway into the cart shed, but create a recess to echo the former door opening.
- Reinstate blocked ground floor southern door.
- Reinstate and re-open southern elevation window openings to both ground and first floor.
- Remove existing livestock pen partitioning, and the modern concrete raised floor. Provide two WC rooms with a central passage, with a new insulated floor construction.
- Existing first floor central loading door is to be repurposed to provide an external balcony accessed from double doors.
- Provide a new oak door to the north opening to provide access to the new external north stairs.
- The proposal seeks to provide a doorway through the west gable. This will provide first floor access from the ground floor, via the main barn.

Assessment of, and significance of impact

There is no internal stair access, therefore the new external north stair and the new internal stairs positioned at the north end of the main barn will provide the first floor access. This will prevent alterations to the first floor fabric that would involve cutting away an area of floor to accommodate the stairs. Hopefully, this will also preserve the six loft feeding hatches, which are all hinged and able to lift.

For the north stairs to be accessed the existing opening on the north elevation **(Fig. 8)** will be reopened. Externals stairs (generally stone) to gain access to first floor lofts is a regular feature within a farmstead built environment. This proposal seeks to echo that inherent design. It is proposed to provide access via a new opening in the west gable. This will result in a loss of walling fabric, although this is mitigated against major disruption to the overall floor plan and fabric of the ancillary barn. Considering the request for a change of use, this is a minimal loss overall when weighed against finding a viable and sustainable use for the farmstead.

At ground floor level all of the modern livestock bays and flooring will be removed, none of which have any obvious historic value. The existing door and window openings will be re-opened and reinstated (to both the ground and first floor) with timber casement windows and door, thus enhancing this elevation and preserving the fenestration and door layout. The only alteration is to block the existing eastern door but a recess will remain to echo the former arrangement. It is proposed for a balcony to be added to the first floor loading door. It is also proposed for three conservation roof lights to be installed into the southern pitch to provide some much needed extra natural light into the first floor.

Main barn (Page 43 – 48, Figs. 31 – 36 and pages 16 – 26, Figs. 8 – 18 - Statement of Significance: Part One)

Existing - The main barn comprises an 8-bay building orientated north-south, with two large full-height, side-by-side threshing openings to the west, with opposing openings to the east, now blocked and partially blocked. The character of the stonework differs between the inner and outer leaves of the barn; the internal detail presents as high-status comprising finely dressed stone, complimenting the fine ashlar basket arches to the west elevation. The outer leaf presents a mixture of rubbles stone and large blocks (some dressed). Slate roof covering.



Figure 9: Main barn; south west elevations.

External detail:
Beginning with the north elevation: the wall courses through from the ancillary barn up to approximately 6ft in height before it rises to the eaves with the remains of dressed quoins**.** The majority of the wall rises as randomly coursed rubble, however, the higher courses rise in dressed large blocks; same character as those found on the ancillary barn and to the inner leaf of the main barn. There are quoins to the northwest corner. Four empty sockets show the location of the tall removed building, and there are loop vents below an owl hole at the apex **(Fig. 33).**

The east elevation is mostly hidden by the grain store. Quoins rise to the southeast corner. There are scars of the demolished gabled building, which must have been secondary to the main barn as it covers a loop vent, (which is now exposed). There are two full-height threshing openings, both with dressed jambs and timber-lintels, the southern of which has a central empty mortice to accommodate doors. The wall comprises coursed limestone rubble.

Victoria Hubbard MSc.
Tel. 07775598317. Email. victoria@hubbardconservation.co.uk

The southern gable comprises coursed rubble to the majority of the wall, but rises as large coursed and dressed stone from the eaves upwards. With the exception of the four loop vents, the two openings are secondary; both with concrete block jambs. These openings relate to the C20 grain dryer. The auger (grain shoot) at the apex remains visible, above the former loading gantry [5]. The footing of the removed steel frame of the dryer remains visible in the concrete. The lower opening is C20. The adjacent pale stonework would suggest there was either a roof or a structure covering this area for sometime, protecting the wall from the weather. C20 concrete block structures obscure a large proportion of the ground floor**.**

There are quoins to the southeast and southwest corners. With regard to the roof finish there are copings (with kneelers) and a finial at the apex. Below the roof pitch the ashlar stonework is similar to those found on the ancillary barn and cart shed suggesting the main barn was roofed at the same time (however the internal roof structure differs and will be discussed).

Two threshing doors dominate the west elevation with ashlar baskets arches resting on ashlar jambs. The stonework above the arches comprise large blocks of dressed stone. The southern of the two doors has secondary flanking walls (to shield the draft) comprising squared limestone; randomly coursed with stone copings. The internal walls are 'clean' suggesting this was once roofed forming a porch, (historic photographic evidence confirms). The northern door has had a porch added comprising concrete blockwork with a roller-door. There is a C20 steel-shed covering the majority of the southwest corner. There are loop vents and windows with dressed surrounds, mostly hidden by the steel-shed, but exposed to the northwest.

Internal detail:
Comprising 8-bays (Bay 1 - north and Bay 8 - south) comprising trusses with raking struts (some with thin, secondary collars,) and 2-rows of butt-purlins, with slate tiles adhered to the battens. The other barns have roof structures of a similar character, however, this roof is constructed differently. The roof is in a poor-state of repair: almost derelict to over bays 2 and 3 to the eastern pitch. The floors comprise a mixture of concrete, all of which are broken. There appears to be a rubble plinth course, evident in-part around the inside of the barn.

[5] Refer to http://www.boxpeopleandplaces.co.uk - Pope family for written and photographic evidence.

Victoria Hubbard MSc.
Tel. 07775598317. Email. victoria@hubbardconservation.co.uk

Bays 1 & 2 three blocked loop vents; one of which is converted into a window with a long timber lintel. There are open loop vents to the north gable. The eastern wall of these bays has a gablet of a former lower roof, above which the stone work changes to random rubble **(Fig. 12** and page 40 as to how this relates to the ancillary barn). The internal walls are all finely dressed. There is a plinth to all three walls, which appears to comprise cement covered in fertiliser bags**.**

Bay 3 has opposing threshing doors; the jambs of which are finely dressed. The eastern door is now boarded up **(Fig. 35),** and has a timber lintel. With regard to the western door, this has a finely dressed basket arch. As mentioned previously, the existing porch is secondary, however, the vertical dressed stone jambs of the primary door remain (in-part) resting on a plinth stones. These jambs are chamfered to the outer edge, and show signs of southern hinges but not to the north (?). There is a candle niche to the north.

Bays 4 & 5 have secondary joist pockets cut through the stonework, and blocked loop vents to the east and west walls.

Bay 6 has opposing threshing doors contemporary to those of bay 3. The eastern door, again, has a timber lintel and dressed jambs, but is mostly open with the exception of 6-courses of concrete blockwork. However, the inner wall of the grain store blocks access. The western door has a finely dressed basket arch, and again, only hinges to the left hand side (south). There is a candle niche to south. The large door is on the floor, and only after close inspection, is it clear that this remains from the film set, and is not part of the barn [6].

Bays 7 & 8 has four loop vents to both the east and west walls with the exception of the top-left corner of the west wall which has been converted into a window. As mentioned previously, both openings to the south gable are secondary, with the exception of the four loop vents**.**

[6] The hinges are in fact wooden and not iron.

Victoria Hubbard MSc.
Tel. 07775598317. Email. victoria@hubbardconservation.co.uk




Figure 10: Left, view north of main barn. Right, view south of the main barn.

Proposed works and mitigation – The proposal seeks to:

- Remove the C20 farming sheds, structures and porch of the north-threshing opening. (Plan P203 suggests that the external threshing door cheeks will remain).
- The proposal seeks to repair (where possible) and re-hang timber threshing doors as architectural features.
- Stone cheeks and openings are to be re-pointed and repaired. Drawing P711 suggests this for the west elevation; presumably this will be repeated to the eastern side.
- Provide glazed units, including double doors, within a timber casement to seal the threshing openings. Drawing P711 proposes this for the west elevation; presumably this will be repeated to the eastern side.
- Provide minimally framed glazing to the loop vent openings to maintain the existing aesthetic.
- To the south gable; provide minimally framed glazing to the first floor window (presumably the windows on the west elevation will be treated the same) and block the C20 ground floor window opening with matching stone work flush with exterior wall.
- Construct timber staircase leading up to the timber balcony and new doorway into first floor of ancillary barn.
- Re-roof to make repairs, and to provide insulation suitable for accommodation. The trusses will remain. The roof will be raised slightly, and recovered using the salvaged existing tiles. Sacrificed tiles will be replaced like-for-like (reclaimed). *This roof is in a desperate state, thus its repair is imperative and urgent to prevent deterioration of historic roofing fabric.*
- It is not clear how the floors will be treated but needless to say the existing will need to be removed.

Assessment of, and significance of impact

The roof is in desperate need of repair; therefore works to the roof is urgent and vital to prevent deterioration of historic roofing fabric. This is the perfect opportunity to conduct a programme of repairs and to provide insulation appropriate to the change of use. The proposal suggests there will be a slight increase in profile due to the insulation; however, the proposal does not appear to request anything that suggests this increase will be substantial or that the trusses will be affected. It is not clear what the intension is with regard to the roof rafters and battens in terms of roof repairs or stair insertion. Sacrificial tiles will be replaced like-for-like (reclaimed presumably). There is nothing in this proposal to suggest the overall scale and form will change.

Removal of the C20 farming sheds, porch and structures will enhance the setting. The proposed re-pointing and repairs to the threshing openings (and presumably the barn as a whole) are welcome and deemed as preservation.

With regard to how the openings are proposed to be sealed/glazed; the notion of slim-framed glazing to the loop vents is welcome. These are an important agricultural feature demonstrating the need for ventilation when storing grain. Glazing will provide much needed natural light whilst retaining the openings. The plans do not mark up the western windows but presumably these will be treated similarly to that of the southern end, at first floor level, where again a slimly framed glazing unit will be provided. The window openings to the west elevation are secondary; replacing the primary loop vents.

To enclose the west threshing openings it has been proposed that glazed units set within timber frames are used. This will ensure the openings remain readable and that natural light floods the barn. It is not noted whether this detail will be repeated to the opposing openings on the eastern side.

The construction of the new stairs will be within the first two bays (northern end). It is not clear whether this will affect the trusses or not, and if so - how? However, there is a need for an internal stair to provide first floor access into the ancillary barn, and this seems to be the most practical position.

The existing floors are in a poor state of repair and have no historic significance. There is no mention of the proposed treatment, however, based on the proposal for the other barns it seems this will be an insulated floor.

Victoria Hubbard MSc.
Tel. 07775598317. Email. victoria@hubbardconservation.co.uk

C20 grain store. (Page 48, Figs: 2, 4, & 33 - Statement of Significance: Part One)

Existing – The C20 grain store covers the southwestern corner of the former farm/fold yard.

Proposed works and mitigation – proposal to remove the structure and replace with a purpose built structure; modern in design, but echoing the agricultural built environment in terms of design and materials.

Assessment of, and significance of impact – The existing structure has no historic significance. The replacement building seeks to use the a similar footprint. The slopping of the roof line will mean more of the historic roof structures of the main and ancillary barn should be visible from the setting.



Figure 11: Grain store.

Conclusion and summary of impact.

Hatt Farm is listed by virtue of being within the curtilage of Hatt Farmhouse [7]. The barns are of historic interest and value to the farmstead; the significance of which has been fully explained in the Statement of Significance Part One.

In accordance with Conservation Principles Policies and Guidance, and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), section 16 *Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment,* (2021), paragraph 194: *'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.'*

Both of the reports combined have thoroughly described the farmstead and each barn individually, as well the historic context. This has been to a proportionate level considering the length of time the farmstead has been mostly redundant and the condition of the barns. Also these reports have taking into consideration the new proposed use. This encompasses the entire farmstead therefore it was imperative that the reports cover every aspect of the farmstead.

These combined report also seeks to accord with paragraph 195 of the NPPF *'Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage*

[7] Appendix I, Statement of Significance, List Entry Number: 1022793.

Victoria Hubbard MSc.
Tel. 07775598317. Email. victoria@hubbardconservation.co.uk

asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal' by providing sufficient and appropriate information for the local authority to make a well-informed judgment.

Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance**,** paragraph 102 suggests, *'Ideally, proposed changes will cause no harm to any of the values of the place, and the right decision will be obvious. In practice, however, there tend to be options for achieving the objective of proposed change, each of which will have different impacts on values. The predicted long-term or permanent consequences of proposals (in terms of degree, and whether positive, negative or neutral) on each of the identified heritage values of a place, and thus on the significance of the whole, should provide the reasoned basis for a decision, where necessary taking other interests into account.*' When considering the long-term future of the barns at Hatt Farm it is clear that a new use has to be found. This proposal will ensure the farmstead is not disassembled into individually owned or rented units. The fact that the whole farmstead will be used at the same time for the same purpose means the farmstead will be cared for as a complete site. Considering the proposed complete change of use, very little in the way of significant alterations have been proposed. The majority of the work will be afforded to the repairs and maintenance, and the required insulation work. Paragraph 7.12 of the North Wiltshire Local Plan 2011 states '*In considering applications for development which involve a change of use, the District Council will seek to secure the retention, restoration, maintenance and continued use of the buildings and structures. The historic use will be the first option, but if it is clearly demonstrated that the historic use is no longer appropriate, alternative uses that are compatible with the building will be considering….'.*

Paragraph 7.11 of the North Wiltshire Local Plan [8] 2011 states *' Where a planning application is made for development within the curtilage or vicinity of a listed building, the planning authority will take into account the effect of the proposal on the setting of the listed building'.* In the case of Hatt Farm, the removal of redundant C20 structures will enhance the setting. The proposed new barn (in place of the grain store) seeks to use a similar footprint, but cleaver design had reduced the bulk of the roof, and reduced the overall height to expose more of the roof of the main and ancillary barns.

The NPPF advocates the need to find a sustainable and viable use for heritage assets; paragraph 190 a) states *'Plans should set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay, or there threats. This*

[8] Wiltshire Core Strategy adopted January 2015. North Wiltshire Local Plan 7: Historic Environment Topic Areas - 2011.

strategy should take into account: a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets, and putting them to viable uses consistent with there conservation'. This proposal will certainly ensure the setting is enjoyed, and at the same time; conserved. Equally, the buildings are in need of repairs, and in the case of the main barn, the roof is in urgent need of being made watertight. Paragraph 7.12 of the North Wiltshire Local Plan runs along side this policy by continuing to state '*…..The need to secure the continuation use of historic buildings is paramount to their retention, restoration and long-term viability and thus will be an important factor in assessing planning applications'.* Paragraph 197 a) also advocates local authorities taking into account: *'a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation'.*

As stated in the guidance from Historic England: *The Adaptive Reuse of Traditional Farm Buildings* [9] *'Structural changes in the farming industry have required farmers to construct new buildings that reduce labour costs and conform to animal welfare standards. As a result of this, the majority of traditional farm buildings are redundant for modern agricultural purposes'.* This appears to be the case with Hatt Farm.

The dilemma (and key questions) are:

- **How does a proposed change of use and adaptions ensure that the character and historic value is preserved?**
- **How would the proposed changes enhance the setting and buildings?**
- **How would the proposed changes sustain the historic significance and is the proposed new viable use consistent with the conservation of the setting and buildings?**

Analysis of the policy above has evaluated the proposal against policy and conservation principles and has found that the proposal is a positive measure. The three key questions above hone –in on the crux of the matter. In this case, it is felt that the proposal will preserve the character of the setting and barns. The change of use will ensure the site is developed and maintained as a collective group, preventing a piece-meal adaption and inadequate maintenance. The fact that this will be a wedding venue should ensure that maintenance is a regular occurrence and the works will be of a high standard.

[9] Historic England Advice Note 9, dated September 2017. Pg. 2, 1: Informing and managing change, paragraph 1.2.

Victoria Hubbard MSc.
Tel. 07775598317. Email. victoria@hubbardconservation.co.uk

Using the guidance by Historic England as a final checklist [10] the following analysis is made:

- *Understanding the construction –* The construction has been fully detailed in the Statement of Significance to ensure the individual barns and farmstead as a whole is understood.
- *Respecting the architectural and historic interest of the building* – The proposal seeks to preserve the architectural and historic interest of each barn and how each barn interacts as part of the farmstead.
- *Understand the setting* – The historic context in the Statement of Significance has analysed the setting to provide an understanding. The fact that the Horse and Jockey Inn was such a popular destination [11], and was commercially viable for many years, the notion of this area becoming a destination venue is nothing new.
- *Achieve high stands of design, repair, and craftsmanship –*As the proposal seeks to become a high-status wedding venue the level of repairs and craftsmanship should be of a high standard. The design team have worked hard to ensure the effects of the change of use is minimal and that the new building replacing the grain store is sensitively designed to echo the agricultural aesthetic.
- *Minimising alterations and loss of significant historic fabric –* The overall loss will be to the aspects of C20 farming which are now redundant and harmful to the setting. The losses to the barns themselves are extremely minimal and justified against ensuring the barns can be interconnected with the minimum of intrusive intervention.
- *Retaining distinctive features* – The proposal seeks to retain all of its distinctive features, most significantly the threshing barn door openings, and the jowled posts and staddle stones of the pen shed and long barn; as these demonstrate that the barns were once open-sided sheds, and will echo the historic bay divisions. Likewise, the retention of the piers to the south elevation of the cart shed will ensure the elevation is readable as a once open-sided barns.
- *How to introduce daylight* – The proposed design has been extremely mindful with regard to its provision of roof lights and for natural light. As with all farmstead buildings the need for light is often a minimal requirement, therefore barns can be habitually dark. The proposal seeks use all of the existing openings, all of which need refurbishment, most of which require re-opening. The request for roof lights is extremely minimal. Design guidance for farmstead development frowns upon overtly domestic fenestration and this proposal has certainly adhered to that advice.

---

[10] Historic England Advice Note 9, dated September 2017. Pg. 6, 4: Adapting Farm Buildings, paragraph 4.1.
[11] Statement of Significance, pg. 11.

Victoria Hubbard MSc.
Tel. 07775598317. Email. victoria@hubbardconservation.co.uk

- *Considering levels of subdivision* – The historic subdivision will only alter where the partitioning is modern. For example, in the ancillary barn the pens comprise C20 block walls, likewise in the pen shed.
- *How to incorporate services and insulation* – The roofs are in need of repair, in fact the main barn is in urgent need. Clearly, for a change of use these barns will need to be insulating, however this is mitigated against a sustainable and viable re-use. This seems the perfect time to make the repairs and upgrade the barns as a result to prevent them from going into a derelict state.
- *The necessity for extensions or new buildings* – The only proposed new building is the replacement for the C20 grain store, which utilizes a similar footprint to the grain store, and proposes to reduce the overall mass of the roof by way of clever design, which will expose more of the main and ancillary barns roof.
- *The reuse or retention of minor outbuildings* – All of the barns will be re-used and retained.
- *The retention or enhancement of wildlife habitats* – The view to the south and southwest are the areas of focus for the venue. One would imagine this would certainly be retained, managed, and protected as part of the change of use **(Fig. 12).**



Figure 12: View southwest from the southern boundary wall.

The main farmhouse, listed as Grade II, is situated within its own setting with its own garden to the south, and should not be affected visually by the proposal.

Victoria Hubbard MSc.
Tel. 07775598317. Email. victoria@hubbardconservation.co.uk

How can harm be assessed? The guidance [12] makes clear that the key question is whether the proposal might cause harm or impact upon the stated significance of the heritage asset. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) clearly states that significance derives from the asset, it setting, as well as the non-tangible heritage value. Where harm or potential harm is identified, a category will be applied either less than substantial harm or substantial harm (which includes total loss) in order to identify which policy of the NPPF should be applied. Whether the out-come is substantial harm or not is a matter for the decision-maker, who will have regard for the NPPF policies. The test is the evaluation of the degree of harm to the asset rather than the scale of development. Harm may arise from work directly to the asset as well to the setting.

NPPF. Paragraph 199 makes clear that '*when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of the designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the eight should be)'*. It also makes clear that any harm to a designed heritage asset requires '*clear and convincing justification'* (paragraph 200). Where a proposal will lead to substantial harm public benefit must be applied (Paragraph 201) unless it can be demonstrated that the said harm is necessary to achieve substantial public benefit that outweighs that harm or loss or all the following apply;

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

Paragraph 202 states *'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'.*

[12] Guidance for Historic Environment, from the Department from Leveling up, housing and communities and Ministry of Housing Communities and Local Government, updated 23 July 2019. PPG: Planning Practice Guidance. Gov.uk

Victoria Hubbard MSc.
Tel. 07775598317. Email. victoria@hubbardconservation.co.uk

The guidance [13] helps with the question of *'what is meant by the term public benefit?'* stating *'Public benefits may follow from many developments and could be anything that delivers economic, social or environmental objectives as described in the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 8). Public benefit should flow from the proposed development. They should be of a nature or scale to be of benefit to the public at large and not just be a private benefit. However, benefits do not always have to be visible or accessible to the public in order to be genuine public benefit, for example, works to a listed private dwelling which secure its future as a designated heritage asset could be a public benefit. Examples of heritage benefits may include:*

- *Sustaining or enhancing the significance of a heritage asset and the contribution of its setting*
- *Reducing or removing risks to a heritage asset*
- *Securing the optimum viable use of a heritage asset in support of its long term conservation'*

To conclude, this proposal seeks to find a sustainable and viable use for this redundant farmstead, whilst preserving the historic character and value.

[13] Guidance for Historic Environment, from the Department fro leveling up, housing and communities and Ministry of Housing Communities and Local Government, updated 23 July 2019. PPG: Planning Practice Guidance. Paragraph: 020 Reference ID: 18a-020-20190723. Gov.uk

Victoria Hubbard MSc.
Tel. 07775598317. Email. victoria@hubbardconservation.co.uk