

FINAL PROJECT REPORT

Name of Project	Barns and Buildings
Delivery Partner	PDNPA
Name of Person Completing Report	Catherine Parker Heath
Start Date of Project	January 2018
End Date of Project	June 2022
Date of Report	May 2022



Aims and Objectives of the Project

- Identify and record redundant traditional field barns, a key feature of the landscape of the South West Peak;
- Where possible, repair, conserve or consolidate field barns so that they remain a key feature for years to come by engaging with landowners and ensuring management agreements are in place;
- Where possible, enhance provision for wildlife in traditional field barns;
- Repair a key community or public building;
- Train volunteers to carry out surveys and in traditional skills;
- Engage wider public in an understanding of traditional field barns.

Project Delivery

The project began hand-in-hand with the Small Heritage Adoption (SHA) project. Volunteers were recruited and trained to carry out level 1 building surveys (alongside level 1 landscape surveys) to identify and record the condition, location and factors such as landscape amenity value of field barns and outfarms across the South West Peak (SWP). This data was in part to be used to identify barns suitable for repair work, although it had value in and of itself. Potential candidate barns were evaluated and assessed against appropriate criteria by the Cultural Heritage Officer (CHO). In the first instance, four barns were identified, and the CHO along with trained volunteers carried out historic building recording. The CHO also tendered for and contracted a building surveyor to carry out condition surveys and repair strategies and an ecologist to carry out ecological surveys. The intention was to then identify priority repairs and have these carried out by a suitable contractor and volunteers. A public building, Reapsmoor Chapel and Schoolroom, had already been identified for repair and was managed through the PDNPA Properties Team.

Level 1 surveys continued throughout the life of the project although the impact of Covid-19 and resultant lockdowns and PDNPA policy regarding volunteering, prevented this for a time. The initial target number of buildings to receive repair work was 10. This was reduced to eight through the change control process in 2019, to reflect the reduction of the post of CHO from 5 years to 4 years.

Due to a variety of challenges with barn owners, such as family bereavement, divorce, cash flow issues (see 'Challenges' below) only one of the barns mentioned above was taken forward for restoration. In early 2020, it was clear that a different method of identifying barns was required and so a minor repairs grant scheme was launched, aiming to identify those barns needing only minor repairs. This identified another 13 possible barns. Initial inspection from CHO and visits from a Conservation Architect found that six needed major repairs not minor, two landowners did not respond further, one did not want to go ahead and four went onto the next step – one of these was one that needed relatively major repairs – Pyeclough Head.

The CHO brought volunteers together to develop a barn trail, and research and write content. This developed to include wider heritage of the area and had input from Manifold Primary Academy in Warslow.

A number of other groups, such as Peak District Young Archaeologists, Buxton and Leek College Students, also participated in Level 1 surveys and historic building recording, and the CHO gave a number of talks to a variety of societies and parish councils throughout the life of the project.

Staff resource

A full time Cultural Heritage Officer (CHO), Catherine Parker Heath, delivered this project and the Small Heritage Adoption project over four years.

Budget resource

The initial planned project budget for Barns and Buildings was £345,000 (figures excluding VAT) and was subdivided as follows, showing planned and actual costs incurred against each budget heading:

NLHF budget heading	Example items	Intended cost	Actual cost
Repair and conservation work	Costs of repair, restoration or consolidation	£150,000	£143,083
Equipment and materials (capital)	Materials for volunteers for on-site conservation works	£4,000	£287
Professional fees (capital)	Professional fees - specialist engineering, ecological surveys etc	£8,000	£31,082
New staff costs	1 FT officer for 4 years	£150,568	£148,254
Training for staff	Training for staff for CPD etc.	£1,000	£841
Training for volunteers		£4,000	£1,805
Travel for staff		£4,500	£2,392
Travel and expenses for volunteers		£4,500	£3,012
Equipment and materials (activity)	PPE, welfare kit, clothes, tools and equipment	£20,350	£2,932
Other costs (activity)	Room hire for public events	£2,250	£1,449
Recruitment		£500	£145
Publicity and promotion		£1,500	£96
Contingency		£4,802	£0
Inflation		£4,000	£0
TOTAL		£359,970	£335,378

In addition, the project received non-cash contributions of £200 and volunteer time valued at £49,332.

Partnership working – team involvement, steering group etc

Support for the delivery of this project came from a range of colleagues and partners. No formal steering group was established:

SWPLPS Programme Manager – Karen Shelley-Jones;

Programme Administrator - Sara Smithson

PDNPA Cultural Heritage Team;

Farm Link Workers – Andy Farmer, Dave Cooper;

PDNPA Senior Farm Advisor - Suzanne Fowkes;

PDNPA Cultural Heritage Team (CHT) – Anna Badcock, Natalie Ward, Sue Adams, Rebecca Waddington

Historic England – Nick Carter, Benjamin Parker, Jez Bretherton;

Vocational Training Officer - Helen Betts (repairs to Barn Trail; drystone wall at New York Farm)

Volunteers

This project could not have been delivered without volunteer input:

- 89 separate individuals completed training in level 1 building surveys. 8 individuals did the training twice, the second time as a refresher and 2 volunteers attended on multiple occasions to give support to the CHO.
- 55 of these volunteers took part in a scheduled level 1 surveys after training with further support from the CHO.
- 23 of these volunteers carried out unscheduled surveys in their own time.
- 28 volunteers received training in historic building recording.
- 16 of these worked on historic building recording fieldwork and reports following training.
- 11 volunteers contributed to the barn trail.
- 11 volunteers worked on clearing and restoring barnyards.
- 5 volunteers contributed to data entry.

Some of these volunteers were the same individuals. In total 106 separate volunteers were involved in the Barns and Buildings project.

Consultants and contractors

Due to the specialist nature of the work required a number of contractors were taken on, following quote or tendering procedures:

- Apex Ecology carried out ecological surveys and assessments of 3 barns;
- Penny Anderson Associates carried out ecological assessments of 2 barns;
- Chloe Pritchard, ecologist and SWPLP volunteer carried out ecological assessments of 5 potential minor repair barns in a voluntary capacity;
- Restoration Projects carried out condition surveys of 4 barns, cleared hay from hayloft at Hobcroft Barn and construction work at Hobcroft;
- Brennan Consult/Brennan Associates, carried out structural engineer assessment at Hobcroft Barn and a topographical survey at Pyeclough Head;
- Alan Wood & Partners carried out condition survey at Pyeclough Head and engineers report regarding access to Pyeclough Head;
- Evans Vettori, Conservation Architects, provided project management for construction works at Hobcroft, advice and schedules for minor repair work, including tendering for Pyeclough Head;
- Trevor Wragg, Master Craftsman, provided workshops on drystone walling for volunteers;
- Mark Womersely provided training in lime mortaring for volunteers.

Community involvement

- Landowners and barn owners including PDNPA (of barns surveyed and repaired);
- Manifold Church of England Academy (Barn Trail);
- Peak District Young Archaeologists Club (historic building recording);
- Buxton and Leek College Outdoor Education students (level 1 surveys);
- Grindon Parish Council (information event, identifying barns in parish & possible trail, with Engaging Communities);
- Butterton History Society, Warslow Parish Council, Swythamley History Society, Elkstonians (information events prior to Pilot Scheme re level 1 surveys – identifying barns);

- Talks promoting work of BB and SHA to Butterton (Village Hall); Ipstones (History Society); Whaley Bridge (Footsteps Café); Potteries Museum, Stoke-on-Trent (Archaeological Society); Hollinsclough (History Live); Buxton Civic Association (BCA); Derbyshire Archaeology Day, Chesterfield x 2;
- SWP Farmers Group (talk and tour);
- High Peak Scouts (level 1 surveys, general heritage/archaeology workshops x 3);
- Wider public - BBC Countryfile (Waterhouse Field Barn) May 2021;
- National Park Archaeologists (visit to Waterhouse Field Barn at annual meeting);
- Volunteer Rangers (guided tours and adoption of Hobcroft Field Barn);
- Sheffield University - 3 work experience students – fieldwork and data inputting for both BB and SHA projects;
- Staffordshire Barn Owl Action Group (barn owl box in Sandy Meadows Barn, Butterton).

What Has (and has not) Been Achieved

Outputs

	Intended Output	Delivered Output
1	40 barns recorded	200 recorded at level 1: Data sent to PDNPA HBSMR, to be shared with County HERs in due course. 8 recorded at level 3: Drawings; Historic Building Recording Reports; Documentary archive deposited with Potteries Museum and uploaded to ADS.
2	Consolidation, repair or restoration of 7 field barns with associated management plans where applicable	4 barns: Hobcroft Field Barn; Waterhouse Farm Field Barn; Fowler’s Barn, Sandy Meadows Barn (4). Preparation of Pyeclough Head for FiPL application; Lane End Farm signposted to FiPL scheme (2).
3	7 landowners engaged with	16: Engaged with landowners for all barns considered (17 barns considered altogether (4 initially and 13 minor repairs - 2 barns belong to same landowner).
4	1 community building brought to an appropriate standard for community or educational use	1 public building: Reapsmoor Chapel and Schoolroom.
5	200m drystone walls	79m: c.26m at Hobcroft; c.15m Waterhouse Farm Field Barn; c.21m at Gradbach Limekiln (link with SHA project); 15m - Sheepfold (link with Future Farmscapes); 2m New York Farm (with Apprentices).
6	130 volunteer days given (skilled rate)	212 volunteer days at skilled rate.

7	18 school or community groups worked with e.g. - 2 secondary schools - 1 college/university - 4 youth groups - 6 community groups - 5 community consultation events	22: see Community Involvement for details See also SHA project for more community/school groups worked with where focus on heritage assets other than barns.
6	2 learning resources/packs	4: Barns Trail presentation for Manifold Academy; Barns trail leaflet; Hobcroft Barn interpretation ('museum'); online Barns Trail.
7	2 new heritage trails	2: Warslow Moors Barns Trail; 10,000 years in a day in Dove Valley (includes barns) guided walk in 2018, online ArcGIS story map.
8	4 interpretation boards (or Opportunities – see quarterly report)	No interpretation boards for barns but 5 opportunities – leaflet and online for barns trail (2), Hobcroft Barn 'Museum' (1); 10,000 years in a day guided walk and ArcGIS story map (2).
9	4 leaflets	1 leaflet: Barns trail leaflet; see above for alternative interpretation opportunities other than leaflets.
10	5 one-day courses in rural skills (shared with SHA)	Equivalent of 9 days: Dale Mine & Gradbach consolidation = 6 days; Gradbach & Hobcroft drystone walling = 2 days; Milestone painting = 1 day workshop. Also clearing/restoring barn yards = 7 days in total although not included as not a course/workshop.

As the project progressed, it was felt that some of the outputs overlapped in intention such as interpretation boards/opportunities, leaflets. The preference of CHO was to move away from permanent onsite interpretation boards that detract from the setting of heritage assets and barns, to more inclusive interpretation engaging in modern technology using online interpretation, and in terms of the Small Heritage Adoption project, an augmented reality app. This kind of interpretation can also be accessed from home. This was particularly pertinent due to Covid 19 and the associated lockdown requirements. The interpretation around Hobcroft Barn includes labels written on Staffordshire Blue tiles within the barn itself describing some of the original features inside as well as some of the traditional equipment such as a horse drawn sledge and scythe handles. It was felt that this would be a better way of interpreting the barn for the wider public than a board.

The CHO would have liked to do more specific buildings conservation workshops. The original idea as stated in the Project Plan, of volunteers working on barn repairs unfortunately proved very difficult to organise, due to CDM regulations regarding building works and schedules of work provided by a Conservation Architect. A PDNPA farm adviser advised from the very beginning that this would be very unlikely especially as barn owners would be paying a percentage of the work and it would be

their responsibility to make sure the work was done to the standard required. It was hoped that traditional skills workshop could be arranged for local builders, but this was hampered by Covid-19, which affected two springs and summers. The courses in rural skills then were focused on training for volunteers ‘on-the-job’ on conservation projects such as Dale Mine and Gradbach Limekiln, where volunteers were taught lime mortaring and drystone walling amongst other skills. Three volunteers were then able to use these skills to work on lengths of walls independently – e.g. Waterhouse Farm field barn.

In some cases where the targets linked with those from the SHA project it was difficult to decide which activity belonged to which project and whether activities that crossed over would be seen as double counting. Between the BB project and the SHA project, there were an enormous amount of targets and activities achieved in terms of engagement, interpretation, participation and learning.

Key Outputs

200 barns were recorded at level 1, and 8 at level 3.

Although the target was not reached for the number of barns to be repaired, those that were have great impact on ensuring heritage is in better condition, enhancing wildlife provision and ensuring local areas are better places to live work and visit. In particular, the impact of the restoration of Hobcroft Barn is far reaching, not only is heritage in better condition, there is public access to the barn and it is one of the first on the barn trail, thus setting the scene for the rest of the trail. This barn is also adopted by volunteer rangers and SWPLP volunteers as part of the SHA project, which will ensure it is looked after and managed into the future.

212 skilled volunteer days were given. The project could not have been delivered without these invaluable individuals.

Outcomes

Intended Outcome	Delivered Outcome
1 Heritage will be better managed	Heritage is better managed through data on a large number of barns and 4 barns in 5 or 10 year management agreements. 1 barn has been adopted as part of the SHA project by a volunteer ranger and SWPLP cultural heritage volunteers.
2 Heritage will be in better condition	Heritage is in better condition as 4 barns and 1 community building have been restored or repaired. In addition, the yards of two barns have been cleared/excavated by CHO & volunteers revealing their original surface and walls around two have been repaired.
3 Heritage will be better identified/recorded	Previously, most of the field barns were known about although this was from a desk based study. Through surveying these barns we now know more about their condition and also about types, form and function. The

		data are now available, including photographs for others in the future.
4	People will have developed skills	People have developed skills in level 1 surveys, historic building recording, drystone walling and lime mortaring, research and interpretation of heritage. In addition, some volunteers have helped recover original barnyard surfaces and learnt something of archaeological excavation.
5	People will have learnt about heritage	Volunteers through attending training days and participating in work, and the general public including school children through attending talks and presentations, walking the barn trail, and engaging with online trails and tours.
6	People will have volunteered time	106 volunteers have given their time particularly for the BB project amounting to 212 skilled days
7	Environmental impacts will be reduced	Barns remain for wildlife – ecological surveys were carried out and advice taken before all repairs to barns. Licenses were acquired where applicable for this work. Entrances and exits such as gaps above doors and owl holes were left for wildlife to use barns. In one barn, an owl box will be placed inside (at an appropriate time to be decided with the Barn Owl Action Group).
8	More people and a wider range of people will have engaged with heritage	This project along with the SHA project have engaged younger people by providing work placements for 3 university students. One of these used the data on barns to write his undergraduate dissertation and the other chose to write his masters dissertation on historic field boundaries in the South West Peak. The project has also engaged with college students, Young Archaeologists Group and school children.
9	The local area/communities will be a better place to live, work or visit	Barn repairs ensure that the very things that give the landscape its character are retained, they look better and people are impressed to see original features. One barn is on a trail that people can visit and gain greater understanding, and another is hoped to become a destination for Heritage Open Days.

Key Outcomes

Heritage is now better identified and recorded, through level 1 surveys, data that is shared with the PDNPA Historic Buildings Sites and Monuments Record, which in turn will be shared with the relevant County HERs. This data is publicly accessible and can be utilised by all in the future for research purposes and management of this resource. In addition, higher level building surveys (level 3) have been carried out at 8 barns and their reports are available to PDNPA HBSMR, HERs and wider public. The original drawings and documentary archive has been deposited with the Potteries Museum.

Another key outcome is that people have volunteered time. 106 individual volunteers have engaged with the BB project and given 212 skilled days. As above, in relation to outputs this is key and the project would not have continued without them. New friendships and connections have been made between these people, and many want to continue volunteering in some capacity.

People will have learnt about heritage, the many talks, presentations to wider public, including TV appearance on BBC Countryfile, focusing on one barn recording and repair; engagement with younger groups and research volunteers themselves have carried out e.g. for the barn trail means that people have indeed learnt about heritage.

Heritage is in better condition. The restoration of Hobcroft barn is certainly in better condition and the minor repairs made to Fowlers Barn, Sandy Meadows Barn and Waterhouse Farm Field Barn (using sustainable Accoya timber with 60-year guarantee), means these buildings that are so much part of the landscape will remain for many years to come.

What Made The Difference

Volunteers made the difference, the number of them, their enthusiasm, and the camaraderie. Some volunteers were already very skilled in lots of different areas and were able to share this knowledge and expertise.

No less was the support of the programme manager, Karen Shelley-Jones and the rest of the team, especially through COVID. There were many challenges and hurdles in the delivery of this project and an understanding of the difficulties faced made it possible to find a way through, so that in the end a whole raft of meaningful outputs and outcomes have been achieved.

Challenges

Through undertaking an apprenticeship in project management whilst in post, the CHO had the opportunity to thoroughly assess this project, the issues they faced and the part they played in this through using the project as a case study. This naturally feeds into lesson learned. Below is a consideration of the challenges faced:

Identifying barns to be repaired:

The project plan set out that the number of barns identified through the Farmstead Characterisation Project and on the Warslow Moors Estate ensured the project would not lack candidates. However, the Farmstead Characterisation Project was a desk-based exercise that used map regression to identify traditional field barns and out farms, and as such provided no information about current condition. In terms of ten barns identified on the Warslow Moors Estate, as these belonged to the PDNPA, it became clear that only one of these could go forward as part of the BB project to prevent accusations of favouritism.

The level-1 surveys were designed to gather more information about the barns already known about through the Farmstead Characterisation Project. Volunteers captured information about the barns, including their condition and their suitability as candidates. However, this process took time and time was something that was limited. If barns were identified from only those areas surveyed, then it would mean that barns repaired would be skewed towards those areas surveyed rather than being distributed across the SWP and could result in complaints from barn owners in areas not surveyed. Their barns too could have been more deserving in terms of such things as 'landscape amenity value'. However, if we waited until the whole SWP was surveyed then there would be no time left to make any repairs at all. The CHO was keen to ensure that the system was fair and seen to be fair. It soon became apparent that nearly every field barn surveyed required some sort of repair and that many, if not all, scored highly using a scoring system closely based on one used by Historic England. One suggestion made by the CHO at the outset was that the availability of grants should be advertised to barn owners. However, the feedback from PDNPA farm advisors was that the CHO would be overwhelmed by the response and it was not a good idea. This was put to one side and identification continued through level 1 surveys. Four barns were identified through these surveys as candidates for repair, but three could not be taken forward (see below), and so it became clear that the project would struggle to hit the target. In 2020, the CHO pressed for advertising a grant, and the Minor Repairs Grant Scheme was developed.

Cost:

Estimates in the original project were unrealistic, possibly in part because they were out-of-date. The assumption was that ten buildings (9 barns and Reapsmoor chapel and schoolroom) could be repaired for a capital budget of £150,000, when in reality they could not. This target was reduced to 8 in total. However, a barn that had been given an estimate of £18,000 in the Project Plan, was repaired through the DEFRA pilot traditional buildings project for an actual cost of £48,000. Hobcroft Field Barn cost c£85,000. Reapsmoor Chapel and Schoolroom took £35,000 from the BB capital budget (although the total cost was much more). Cost advice for three others amounted to £55,000, £49,000 and £51,000. The minor repairs grant scheme was an effort to find barns that could be repaired for around £10,000 or less. This worked to an extent and the three barns that were eventually repaired under this scheme came to £16,110. In many cases, where barns seemed to only require minor repairs, on further inspection this was not the case.

Pyecloough Head Barn:

Pyecloough Head barn has proved to be an enormous challenge. This is a barn that looks relatively sound, with a good watertight roof and was put forward by the owners as a candidate for a minor repairs grant. On closer inspection, the Conservation Architect (CA) identified that a gable end was delaminating and needed to be taken down and rebuilt entirely. This meant that a structural engineer needed to assess it and a full condition survey take place. As three of the four original barns being considered for repair were not going ahead this seemed to be a viable alternative. Restoration Projects, the company who had completed work at Hobcroft barn were asked to have a look and give their opinion. They did and highlighted the difficulty of access. Their cost advice included costs for installing temporary tracks to the barn and the use of a helicopter, giving a total estimate of around £50,000. This was more than the barn owners could afford and they argued against the use of a helicopter suggesting a historic track could be reinstated. This, however, needed planning permission (after submitting an application for General Permitted Development Order GPDO) and required

topographical survey and engineers cross-sections and details of the nature of the track in order to progress. The civil engineers report that came out of this suggested that reinstating this track would amount to over c£100,000. In addition, the barn is situated next to a SSSI and SPA, and needed a Habitats Regulation Assessment. It became clear that the invasive nature of reinstating a track would mean planning permission would likely not be granted. The suggestion of a helicopter is now been returned to with access suggested across the field without track mats. This project plan is now out for tenders to obtain comparable costings. It was realised some time ago that the BB project would not be able to repair this barn in the time the project had left, but it has been provisionally agreed that it will go to the Farming in Protected Landscapes (FiPL) programme Local Assessment Panel hopefully in July. The BB project will have provided all the groundwork for this project up to the stage of receiving quotes and recommending a contractor. It will be up to the FiPL grant panel and barn owners whether this will actually go ahead.

Process/Procedure:

The CHO was advised to follow a procedure that was being used by the PDNPA to distribute grants given by DEFRA as part of a pilot scheme to restore traditional farm buildings in a number of National Parks. This involved the PDNPA supporting barn owners to commission a Conservation Architect (CA) to create a management plan for their barn, following which the CA would then manage all aspects of the barn restoration. However, although this was the advice, it was also recognised that this was very expensive – ‘the gold standard’ - and that the BB budget would not allow this and that there would be an element of ‘feeling our way through’. The CHO’s response was to take over the compilation of the management plan and deliver some of the services involved, such as the historic building recording using volunteers. They would also be responsible for contracting a building surveyor and/or structural engineer to carry out condition surveys and ecologists to carry out wildlife surveys. The CHO would then put all the parts together to form the management plan. After management plans had been compiled for three barns and then in a position to support barn owners to procure building contractors, it became clear that a suitably qualified professional i.e. a CA was needed to write exact specifications and that the CHO could not do this. In addition, where these building projects fell under CDM regulations, as did all three of these, then a Principal Designer/CDM Coordinator was needed – again a CA or similar. The cost advice for these three barns after this process was £211,000 and the budget for professional fees had been depleted. Through the change management process and support of the Scheme Manager money was moved from various budget headings so that a CA could be appointed to take forward the three barns proposed with the assumption that when quotes came in priority repairs could be identified to keep the actual costs within budget. With the launch of the minor repairs grant scheme a CA was retained on a daily rate to give advice as required. This was on the suggestion of the Senior Farm Advisor, which was in fact a brilliant solution. The minor repairs that went ahead were not subject to CDM regulations.

Barn owners backing out:

One barn owner could not continue with the process due to personal circumstances and the need to sell his landholding. Another, after receiving quotes, decided that they could not afford the cost even with an 80% grant; in particular, they could not find the money to pay contractors up front. This was in addition to a family bereavement; another pulled out because of the high cost of repairs and reluctance to enter into a 10-year agreement, as the members of the Trust who owned the barn were all elderly. The owners of one barn decided that the quotes they received were from contractors who

were questioning the schedule written by the CA too much or were overcharging. They had in mind another contractor but confirmed they would not be able to have him do the work in time.

Covid-19:

This affected many of the projects in one way or another. In relation to the BB project, it delayed the process of procuring a conservation architect for the minor repairs grant scheme, and ecological assessments of them. Since restrictions were lifted completely earlier this year, the CA has suffered from Covid, as have two sons of the CHO. In fact the illness of the CA at this time, delayed the application for General Permitted Development Order for Pyeclough Head. Level 1 surveys could not continue for a time during lockdowns and due to the policy of the PDNPA around volunteer working, to ensure that people were kept safe and abiding by regulations at the time. Covid-19 also prevented the development of a second specific barn trail intended around the Kettleshulme area. Instead, the CHO focussed on adapting a new trail to ensure barns were included too (10,000 years in a day). The CHO adapted training to take place online, which was successful and enabled people to still keep engaged throughout this period.

Case Studies

See separate documents for Hobcroft Barn and the Barn Trail.

Legacy

Skills/knowledge/experience

- 89 volunteers trained in level 1 landscape survey (shared with SHA project);
- 28 volunteers trained in historic building survey/ measured building recording (level 3);
- 11 volunteers developed barn trail, researching and writing content;
- 11 volunteers revealed and resorted two historic barnyards and developed skills in drystone walling;
- 2 undergraduate archaeology students on work placement/experience: (shared with SHA project)
 - Samuel wrote his dissertation on field barns using data collected through level 1 surveys and is now undertaking a MA in Cultural Heritage Management at the University of Sheffield;
 - Matthew wrote his dissertation on historic field boundaries in the South West Peak and is now employed by Archaeological Research Services based in Bakewell;
- 1 postgraduate work experience, Poppy, is now working for an archaeological geophysics company in Yorkshire (shared with SHA project);
- CHO with further project management experience including Level 4 Associate Project Management qualification and accreditation with the Association for Project Management (shared with SHA project).

Habitat/species improvements

In general, repairs ensure that four buildings remain standing for use by a range of wildlife.

In four barns, Waterhouse, Fowlers, Sandy Meadows and Hobcroft, gaps above doors, through ventilation slits and owl holes enable wildlife to continue to use the barns. In one barn, Sandy Meadows, an owl box is to be provided by Staffordshire barn Owl Action Group, at an appropriate time to be decided.

Capital Works

- Reapsmoor Chapel and Schoolroom - restoration
- Hobcroft barn – full restoration
- Waterhouse – joinery and ironmongery repaired/replaced
- Fowler’s barn - joinery and ironmongery repaired/replaced
- Sandy Meadows Barn - joinery and ironmongery repaired/replaced
- Pyeclough – all preparation to enable capital works to go ahead subject to funding acquired through the Farming in Protected Landscapes grant scheme
- c.79 m of drystone walls repaired

Data

- Level 1 survey data of c.200 barns, including photographs
- Level 3 historic building surveys of 8 barns including drawings and reports where applicable with documentary archive deposited in the Potteries Museum and uploaded to the Archaeology Data Service and OASIS
- Pilot survey Report
- Final report on level 1 surveys (tbc)
- Condition surveys and structural engineer reports on four barns – Hobcroft, Pyeclough Head, Cundy Green and the Education Trust Barn
- Ecological reports on five barns, Dumkins, Hobcroft, Pyeclough Head, Cundy Green and the Education Trust Barn

Equipment

Some shared with SHA:

- Surveying kits - ranging poles, photo scales and north arrows
- Extendable measuring pole
- 360 degrees camera
- Panasonic Lumix camera
- Ladders

Connections/collaboration

Collaboration existed between the CHO and 17 landowners. Although not all of these resulted in their barns being repaired relations stayed positive.

In addition, there was much collaboration between the CHO, and Dan Greenway the conservation architect with Evans Vettori, working closely to find solutions to various challenges with barns and repairs needed.

The CHO also collaborated with the PDNPA farm advisors and the cultural heritage team as and when required.

Educational Resources/Other Resources

- Level 1 Survey Handbook
- Leaflet of barn trail
- Hobcroft as a 'museum'
- ArcGIS story map of barn trail and 10,000 years in a day
- Manifold Academy barns presentation

Lessons Learned

Once the project started, the risks and potential issues identified should have been revisited and added to. In particular, the estimates should have been interrogated to see whether the targets were realistic in relation to the budget set. An original project plan, where it has not been written by the project officer delivering the project, should be subject to scrutiny as a matter of course.

A steering group would have been useful for this project, with regular meetings for the project from the beginning. As part of this, the project would have benefitted from closer contact with Historic England representatives. There were three different HE staff in place during the lifetime of the project with only one that the CHO connected with regularly. Likewise, a steering group that included the PDNPA Cultural Heritage Team (CHT) would have enabled the team to allocate time to be involved. There was often a sense of lack of capacity and the CHO was reluctant to put more work on people's desks. Whilst the CHT team were very helpful and supportive when they could be, a more formal arrangement may have been advantageous.

It would have been advisable to advertise a grant from the beginning as eventually happened with the minor repairs grant scheme, in a similar way to the Engaging Communities grant, and even perhaps with a panel to assess applications. As a result, the project could be prepared for an influx of requests, should this have happened, and provided the resources to deal with it, perhaps by having a number of rounds depending on length of project (first one after 6 months then perhaps yearly following this).

Level 1 surveys and identifying suitable candidates for repair should have been divorced from each other. Level 1 surveys provide useful data in their own right, which was of course recognised, but the idea that this would be the main mechanism for identifying candidates for repairs could have been better considered.

The Big Headline

Enthusiastic and wonderful volunteers that ensured that something that was already headline news - the restoration of Hobcroft Field barn - was even better with the restoration of the yard, wall and new gate and inclusion in the Warslow Moors Barn Trail.

Appendix 1. Map of assets recorded via level 1 surveys

