**Annex 2 – FiPL Targeting Historic Building Restoration Form**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Farming in Protected Landscapes****Assessment Criteria for Historic Building Restoration Grant**  | **PL Ref:** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Significance** |  |  | **Score Range** | **Score** |  |  |  |
| 1. Date of building | ▪ | Pre 1750 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
|  | ▪ | 1750-1914 | 4 |  |  |  |  |
|  | ▪ | Post 1914 | 2 |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Status | ▪ | Listed | 4 |  |  |  |  |
|  | ▪ | Curtilage/ Conservation Area/Local List | 2 |  |  |  |  |
|  | ▪ | No Listing/None Designated Cultural Heritage Asset | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Style of building/feature | ▪ | Vernacular | 4 |  |  |  |  |
|  | ▪ | Designed | 4 |  |  |  |  |
|  | ▪ | Industrially produced | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Survival of the farmstead as a whole | ▪ | Substantially intact: less than 25% change | 16 |  |  |  |  |
|  | ▪ | Partial Loss: 25%-50% change | 8 |  |  |  |  |
|  | ▪ | Significant Loss: more than 50% change | 4 |  |  |  |  |
|  | ▪ | Major loss: More than 75% change | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| 5. Significance of the farmstead | ▪ | Rare survival in area | 16 |  |  |  |  |
|  | ▪ | Representative farmstead type for the area and period | 8 |  |  |  |  |
|  | ▪ | Unrepresentative farmstead type for area | 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 6. The farmstead's contribution to historic landscape character | ▪ | Significant Contribution | 8 |  |  |  |  |
|  | ▪ | Limited Contribution | 4 |  |  |  |  |
|  | ▪ | No Contribution | 2 |  |  |  |  |
| 7. Individual interest of the building | ▪ | Rare survival | 16 |  |  |  |  |
|  | ▪ | Representative building type for the area and period | 8 |  |  |  |  |
|  | ▪ | Unrepresentative building type for area and period | 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 8. Fittings and fixtures  (internal fittings and fixtures that add to its character and are associated with the use e.g. stalls, grain bins, machinery.) | ▪ | Rare original features survive | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| ▪ | Typical original features survive | 4 |  |  |  |  |
| ▪ | Partial loss of original features or survival of secondary features | 2 |  |  |  |  |
|  | ▪ | All original features removed | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| 9. Additional interest e.g. Graffiti, ritual marks, tallies | ▪ | Unusual feature of historic interest | 4 |  |  |  |  |
|  | ▪ | Feature associated with use of land/ritual | 2 |  |  |  |  |
| (Incremental) | ▪ | Constructional marks | 1 |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Vulnerability** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10. Building fabric | ▪ | Particularly rare or vulnerable fabric | 16 |  |  |  |  |
|  | ▪ | Traditional | 8 |  |  |  |  |
|  | ▪ | Not original but still largely traditional | 4 |  |  |  |  |
|  | ▪ | Extensive use of non-traditional materials | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| 11.Changes to Building | ▪ | Original form | 8 |  |  |  |  |
|  | ▪ | Largely original form | 4 |  |  |  |  |
|  | ▪ | Largely changed | 2 |  |  |  |  |
| 12. Potential for Adaptation | ▪ | None, or low economic potential | 16 |  |  |  |  |
|  | ▪ | Some potential for non-original re-use | 8 |  |  |  |  |
|  | ▪ | High potential for change to new use | 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 13. Extent of restoration work required to safeguard & weatherproof building | ▪ | Minimal | 2 |  |  |  |  |
|  | ▪ | Substantial work required | 8 |  |  |  |  |
|  | ▪ | Extensive rebuilding/structural work that would affect integrity or interest of building | Ineligible (due to timescale to complete) |  |  |  |  |
| 14. Urgency of work at present time and ability to complete within the existing timescales | ▪ | Imminent collapse. Ongoing/significant structural failure | 16 |  |  |  |  |
| ▪ | Significant water ingress, minor structural repairs | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| ▪ | No immediate concern | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| 15. Impact of expected use | ▪ | No loss of integrity or character | 8 |  |  |  |  |
|  | ▪ | Little change in fabric or character | 4 |  |  |  |  |
|  | ▪ | Significant intervention | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| 16. Landscape amenity value | ▪ | High | 16 |  |  |  |  |
|  | ▪ | Medium | 8 |  |  |  |  |
|  | ▪ | Limited | 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 17. Wildlife interest | ▪ | Evidence of protected species | 4 |  |  |  |  |
|  | ▪ | Tangible evidence of use, current or past | 2 |  |  |  |  |
|  | ▪ | Wildlife potential | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| 18. Public access | ▪ | Public/educational access to building | 16 |  |  |  |  |
|  | ▪ | Permitted route adjacent or close to building | 8 |  |  |  |  |
|  | ▪ | Clearly visible from permitted route | 4 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | **Total Score** |  |  |  |  |

**Value for Money**

Where full restoration is required but the landowner is only requesting a FiPL contribution towards some of the smaller items (such as new doors and windows etc) projects will generally be regarded as good value for money and recommended for approval. The expectation however would be that a project brief would be provided by the FiPL team and that in these cases the landowner follows the same processes (wildlife, structural reports, specification, three quotes, project management by suitably qualified) as those making applications for all restoration works. Suitably qualified and skilled persons with conservation building experience would need to be engaged (such as to provide specialist advice, produce specifications and project management services). It is expected that this may only be taken up by larger landowners/estates with specialists in-house who could facilitate the process at their own cost.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| PL FiPL Officer:  |  |
| Date: |  |