



Document 6 – Heritage Impact Assessment

**PLACES FOR PEOPLE/ CITY AND  
PROVINCIAL PROPERTIES PLC**

**GILSTON AREA:  
HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

**OCTOBER 2017**

5 Bolton Street  
London  
W1J 8BA

Tel: 020 7493 4002  
Fax: 020 7312 7548

[www.montagu-evans.co.uk](http://www.montagu-evans.co.uk)



## CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>		<u>Page No.</u>
1.0	Executive Summary	1
2.0	Legislation, Planning Policy and Guidance	3
3.0	Methodology	15
4.0	Baseline	21
5.0	Site Capacity for Development	63
6.0	Avoiding Harm and Maximising Enhancements	82
7.0	NPPF Soundness Tests	88
8.0	Conclusions	89

## APPENDICES

1	Site Red Line Plan
2	Site Assessment Areas
3	Proposed Site Allocation, Draft Policy GA1
4	Map of Heritage Asset Groups
5	Table of Scoped in Assets
6	Map of Historic Landscape Character Areas
7	Site History
8	Historic Maps
9	Map of Gilston Park Designed Landscape
10	Map of Heritage Sensitivity

## 1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1. This Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) report has been prepared by Montagu Evans LLP (ME) to inform the emerging East Herts District Plan (plan) and draft policies GA1 (The Gilston Area) and GA2 (The River Stort Crossings). It is prepared on instructions from Places for People who are promoting the allocation of the Gilston Area in accordance with GA1 and GA2 of the emerging plan.
- 1.2. This report supplements the extensive heritage and archaeological assessment of the Site was undertaken by L-P Archaeology for Places for People and City and Provincial Properties Ltd following their initial appointment in December 2012, culminating in a Heritage Desk Based Assessment (DBA) dated October 2016. The DBA prepared by L-P Archaeology informed the original Concept Framework for the Site, which in turn shaped the proposed allocation in draft Policy GA1.
- 1.3. On 22 February 2017, after having reviewed the L-P Archaeology report, Historic England asked that additional work be undertaken. This work has been prepared in response to that request and to inform the overall extent and design of development in the Gilston Area. ME have made extensive use of the L-P B Archaeology DBA report to inform our work. It should be noted that our assessment, including the assessment areas, is slightly different to that contained in the L-P report. This does not invalidate the conclusions of the L-P report, but rather supplements and refines it.
- 1.4. This HIA report assesses, in heritage terms, the suitability for development of land to the north of Harlow (the 'Site') in accordance with the methodology set out in Historic England's Advice Note 3: Heritage Impact Assessment of Site Allocations in Local Plan (HEAN3).
- 1.5. The Site red line is shown on the map at Appendix 1. The Site has been divided into nine areas for assessment purposes. These are shown on the map at Appendix 2. The proposed allocation for development in the Gilston Area is set out in policy GA1 of the Pre-Submission District Plan. The allocation area is shown in red and green hatching within the redline boundary at Appendix 3. It is slightly smaller than the Site area and is wholly within the redline boundary of the Site shown on the map at Appendix 1.
- 1.6. This HIA assesses the potential impacts of development (within the allocation area) on above ground heritage assets and historic landscapes throughout the Site including listed buildings, scheduled monuments with upstanding remains, conservation areas, and registered parks and gardens. This report also includes non-designated assets such as locally listed buildings, and unregistered historic landscapes. Extensive survey was also undertaken outside of the Site boundary to identify potential setting impacts on a range of heritage assets, including listed buildings, conservation areas, scheduled

monuments.

- 1.7. The HIA considers the potential for any proposed development to affect these assets' significance, their existing and future surroundings. The HIA also looks at the capacity of identified sensitive assets (and their settings) to accommodate the likely change arising from the allocation. Below ground archaeological remains are not considered in this report; for these, see the L-P Archaeology DBA. That report includes management guidelines for the conservation of assets within the allocation area and which are in the control of the promoter.
- 1.8. This HIA concludes that the proposed draft allocation as set out in draft policies GA1 and GA2 are sound and meet the tests of the NPPF as they have sought to avoid and to mitigate harm to heritage assets, maximising the opportunity for enhancement through direct management and interpretation. This HIA will also be used to inform the overall extent of development and development criteria (parameter plans and design guidelines) that will come forward at the application stage for assessment.
- 1.9. This report is structured as follows:
  - Section 2: Legislation, planning policy and guidance;
  - Section 3: Methodology;
  - Section 4: Baseline conditions including identifying heritage assets potentially affected by the development and assessing the contribution the Site currently makes to their significance;
  - Section 5: Site suitability for development including an assessment of the potential impacts of development on the significance of heritage assets;
  - Section 6: Avoidance of harm and maximising enhancements, looking especially at the proposed allocation;
  - Section 7: Conclusions against NPPF tests of soundness.

## **2.0 LEGISLATION, PLANNING POLICY AND GUIDANCE**

- 2.1 The following section sets out the planning policy context for the Site and for the context of the assessment process.

### **Legislative Context**

#### **Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990**

- 2.2 The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (“the 1990 Act”) provides the legislation that is used to assess the impact of proposals on listed buildings and conservation areas. The following sections of the 1990 Act set out the duties on the decision maker in this case.
- 2.3 There are a number of designated assets, including listed buildings and Scheduled Monuments within the site, and it is within the setting of other designated assets. Section 66(1) states that in considering whether to grant planning permission which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.
- 2.4 A very small part of the Hunsdon Conservation Area is within the Site, and the site is within the wider setting of the rest of the Hunsdon CA and potentially within the setting of the Widford CA. Section 72(1) states that with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area. The provision at Section 72(1) does not apply to setting. The setting of conservation areas is, however, a matter of policy.
- 2.5 Preservation in this context means “to cause no harm”. Therefore, it is possible for development to have an effect on setting, even a material one, but for that effect to be either neutral or beneficial.

### **Planning Policy Context**

- 2.6 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states that planning applications must be determined in accordance with the adopted Statutory Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The currently adopted Statutory Development Plan is formed by the East Herts Local Plan Second Review 2007 (Saved Policies 2010). We refer also to the Saved Policies of the Adopted Replacement Harlow Local Plan (July 2009) as part of the Site redline to the south extends into Harlow.

***East Herts Local Plan Second Review 2007 (Saved Policies 2010)***

2.7 The East Herts Local Plan Second Review was adopted in April 2007. Following a Secretary of State Direction, certain policies of the local plan expired on 17th April 2010. The remaining 'saved' policies constitute the current local plan, and those of relevance are discussed below.

2.8 Policy BH6 states (New Developments in Conservation Areas) states that:

*"New developments in or adjacent to a Conservation Area will be permitted where:*

*(a) they are sympathetic in terms of scale, height, proportion, form, materials, and siting in relation to the general character and appearance of the area or are otherwise of such quality as to be highly likely to enhance the character and appearance of the area;*

*(b) those open spaces, trees, and other landscape features materially contributing to the character or appearance of the area are not affected to the significant detriment of that area;*

*(c) historically significant development features such as the street pattern, boundary walls, and street furniture are wherever possible retained; and*

*(d) important views within, into and out of the Conservation Area or its setting are respected."*

2.9 Policy BH16 (Historic Parks and Gardens) states:

*"(1) on sites listed in English Heritage's 'Register of Historic Parks and Gardens' and other locally important sites, development proposals that significantly harm their special historical character, appearance or setting will not be permitted."*

2.10 Notably, the policy affords the same protection to designated and undesignated sites.

2.11 Environment and Design policies are contained at Chapter 8. Those of relevance to this assessment are included below.

2.12 ENV1 (Design and Environmental Quality) states:

*"(1) All development proposals, including extensions to existing buildings, will be expected to be of a high standard of design and layout and to reflect local distinctiveness. To those ends, development proposals will be expected to:*

*(a) demonstrate compatibility with the structure and layout of the surrounding area, as well as effective connection with existing routes and spaces;*

*(b) complement the existing pattern of street blocks, plots and buildings (the grain of development);*

*(c) relate well to the massing (volume and shape) and height of adjacent buildings and to the surrounding townscape;*

*(d) respect the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring buildings and those of future occupants and ensure that their environments are not harmed by noise and disturbance or by inadequate daylight, sunlight or privacy or by overshadowing;*

*(e) incorporate sustainable initiatives in design, layout and construction methods including energy and water conservation and solar energy as an integral part of the design of the development;*

*(f) consider the impact of any loss of open land on the character and appearance of the locality, and on the nature conservation interest or recreational needs of the area;*

*(g) minimise loss or damage of any important landscape features;*

*(h) provide landscape, recreation or amenity features, and where appropriate habitat creation, in accordance with the Hertfordshire Local Biodiversity Action Plan.*

*(II) Development proposals, other than those relating to an existing dwelling house, must be accompanied by a written statement of design and access principles. The statement should include illustrative material explaining the approach to design and an assessment of the impact of the proposal on the visual quality and character of the locality.”*

2.13 Policy ENV2 (Landscaping) states:

*“(I) Development proposals will be expected to retain and enhance existing landscape features. Where losses are unavoidable, compensatory planting or habitat creation will be sought within or outside the development site.*

*(II) The submission of detailed surveys of landscape features will be required.*

*(III) Proposals on prominent sites will be required to give special consideration to landscape treatment.*

*(IV) Conditions will be imposed to ensure that the approved landscaping scheme is carried out.*

*(V) Appropriate maintenance of retained and new landscape features will be required as a part of any permission.*

*(VI) Landscaping proposals should include a statement setting out how they will meet the targets set in the Hertfordshire Local Biodiversity Action Plan.”*

2.14 Policy ENV11 (Protection of existing Hedgerows and Trees) states that:

*“(I) In its consideration of all development proposals, including new road or road improvement or maintenance works, the District Council will endeavour to ensure maximum retention of existing hedgerows and trees and their reinforcement by new planting of native broad-leaved species.*

*(II) Where hedge and tree removal is unavoidable, replacement planting of broad-leaved species along an appropriate and nature line of the new, or realigned, highway will be expected.”*

**Submission Version East Herts District Plan 2011-2033**

2.15 The new East Herts District Plan 2011-2033 was submitted for examination on 31st

March 2017. The LDS indicates that adoption of the plan is expected to take place in December 2017. The policies relevant to design and heritage considerations are included below. The proposed site allocation will, then, sit alongside these policies and reflect their objectives.

- 2.16 Chapter 11 deals with the Gilston Area, and notes at 11.1.2 that

*“Development in this location provides a unique opportunity to deliver a strategic sized sustainable development that will provide for a significant proportion of the District’s housing needs, both within this Plan period and beyond. As such, the Gilston Area is allocated for a total of 10,000 new homes, with approximately 3,000 homes to be delivered in the Plan period, along with a significant amount of supporting infrastructure including roads and sustainable transport provision, schools, health centres and public open space. Providing a significant amount of development beyond 2033 will help to ensure that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be reviewed again in this location, and will also reduce pressure to provide development in and around existing settlements in the next Plan period.”*

- 2.17 The allocation area for the Gilston Area is shown in Figures 11.1 and 11.2, which are reproduced here at Appendix 3.

- 2.18 Draft policy wording is provided at Policy GA1, the Gilston Area. We do not comment further on this policy wording in this document.

- 2.19 Section 11.3 deals with the proposed Stort River crossings. No maps are provided with this section, but paragraph 11.3.2 notes that while eastern and western crossing options are feasible,

*“eastern crossing is the option preferred by Essex County Council, largely because of the way in which it enhances access to the Enterprise Zone and links through, potentially, to the proposed new motorway Junction 7a.”*

- 2.20 This eastern crossing option is reflected in the Site red line as shown at Appendix 1.

- 2.21 Chapter 22 deals with heritage assets and their management. Policy HA1 (Designated Heritage Assets) states:

*“I. Development proposals should preserve and enhance the historic environment of East Herts.*

*II. Development proposals that would harm the significance of a designated heritage asset will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that the harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss.*

*III. Where there is evidence of neglect of, or damage to, a heritage asset, the deteriorated state of the heritage asset will not be taken into account in any decision.*

*IV. The Council will, as part of a positive strategy, pursue opportunities for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment recognising its role and contribution in achieving sustainable development.”*

2.22 Non-designated heritage assets are discussed at Policy HA2. This states:

*I. The Council will engage with local communities to identify undesignated heritage assets that contribute to local distinctiveness and refer to existing information in the historic environment record.*

*II. Where a proposal would adversely affect a non-designated heritage asset, regard will be had to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.”*

2.23 Policy HA4 (Conservation Areas) considers development within conservation areas and their settings. The following parts of the policy are relevant:

*I. New development, extensions and alterations to existing buildings in conservation areas will be permitted provided that they preserve or enhance the special interest, character or appearance of the area. Development proposals outside a conservation area which affect its setting will be considered likewise. Proposals will be expected to:*

*(a) Respect established building lines, layouts and patterns;*

*(b) Use materials and adopt design details which reinforce local character and are traditional in the area;*

*(c) Be of a scale, proportion, form, height, design and overall character that accords with and complements the surrounding area;*

*(e) Conform to any ‘Conservation Area Character Appraisals’ prepared by the District Council and safeguard all aspects which contribute to the area’s special interest and significance, including important views and green spaces.”*

2.24 Policy HA7 specifically concerns listed buildings. The provision relating to setting is included at part III, and states:

*III. Proposals that affect the setting of a Listed Building will only be permitted where the setting of the building is preserved and enhanced.”*

2.25 Policy HA8 (Historic Parks and Gardens) states that:

*I. Development proposals that materially harm the special historic character, appearance or setting of those sites listed on the Historic England ‘Register of Historic Parks and Gardens’ will not be permitted. The same level of protection will be afforded to other locally important sites.*

*II. Where appropriate, the District Council will actively encourage proposals for the repair, restoration and management of historic parks and gardens.”*

**Adopted Replacement Harlow Local Plan ‘Saved’ Policies (2009), reprinted 2016**

2.26 The Adopted Replacement Harlow Local Plan 'Saved' Policies comprises the policies of the 2006 Adopted Replacement Harlow Local Plan which were saved by the Secretary of State via a direction dated 12th May 2009. The below saved policies are of relevance to this Site.

2.27 Chapter 11.9 contains the policies related to Listed Buildings.

2.28 Policy BE6 states that:

*“Proposals for the extension of or alteration of any listed building, alteration of its setting, conversion or change of use should not adversely affect or harm any of the following:*

*1. The character that forms its value as being of special architectural or historic interest;*

*2. The particular physical features that justify its statutory protection;*

*3. Its setting in relation to its grounds, the surrounding area, other buildings and wider views and vistas.”*

2.29 Policy BE7 states that:

*“Planning permission for development that would necessitate the demolition of a listed building, or buildings, or compromise its/ their character or setting, will not be granted.”*

2.30 Chapter 11.10 includes policies related to conservation areas.

2.31 Policy BE10 states that:

*“New development in Conservation Areas or development that affects the setting, surrounding area, or inward and outward views will be granted planning permission providing:*

*1. It does not harm the character or appearance of the Conservation Area;*

*2. The scale, form, massing, elevation, detailed design, materials, and layout respect the character of the Conservation Area;*

*3. The proposed land use is compatible with the function and activities of the conservation area.”;*

2.32 Policy BE11 concerns Historic Parks and Gardens, and states:

*“Development proposals that would adversely affect the character, appearance, setting or views into and outward of a registered historic park or garden will not be permitted.”*

2.33 Chapter 11.12 concerns designated and non-designated archaeology. Policy BE12 states:

*“Planning permission will not be granted for development proposals that would adversely affect the site or setting of a Scheduled Monument listed below or other archaeological site or national or particular local importance.”*

***The New Harlow Local Development Plan: Development Management Policies Consultation Draft (July 2017)***

2.34 The New Harlow Local Development Plan will replace the Adopted Replacement Harlow Local Plan and set out the framework to guide and shape development in Harlow until 2031. Public consultation on the Development Management Policies Consultation Draft runs until 7th September 2017. The Local Development Scheme targets adoption of the plan for September 2018.

2.35 Policy PL11 relates to heritage assets and their settings. It states:

*“Development that affects a heritage asset or its setting will be assessed based on the harm caused by the development on the significance of the heritage asset. The greater the significance of the asset, the greater the weight that is given to the asset’s conservation. The level of impact caused to the significance of the heritage asset will be assessed against all the following criteria:*

*(a) the impact of development on the character, appearance or any other aspect of significance of the asset or its setting;*

*(b) the design quality of the development and the extent to which it safeguards and harmonises with the period, style, materials and detailing of the asset (including scale, form, massing, height, elevation, detailed design, layout and distinctive features); and*

*(c) the extent to which the development is sympathetically integrated within the area and any distinctive features (including its setting in relation to the surrounding area, other buildings, structures and wider vistas and views).”*

**Material Considerations**

***National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2012***

2.36 Paragraph 14 of the NPPF deals with plan making, and specifically refers to a presumption in favour of *“sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking”*, subject to specific policies in the NPPF that indicate where development should be restricted. Sustainable development is a central feature of the NPPF in relation to both plan-making and decision-taking.

2.37 In relation to plan-making, which is relevant here, the NPPF states that *“local planning authorities should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area”* and should meet objectively assessed needs unless adverse impacts *“would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against*

*the policies in the [NPPF] taken as a whole or specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.”*

- 2.38 Government policy on Planning and the Historic Environment is provided in paragraphs 126-141 of the NPPF.
- 2.39 Paragraph 126 provides strategic advice, requiring local authorities to take account of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of assets, the wider benefits that conservation can bring and the opportunities for the historic environment to contribute to local character. The general advice on decision taking elaborates upon these core principles. Thus paragraph 128 requires planning decisions to be based on an understanding of an asset’s significance, including the contribution of setting to that or an appreciation of it. This policy is reinforced at paragraph 129 and again at 131 where the positive contribution of assets to delivering sustainable communities is recognised alongside the desirability of sustaining the significance of heritage assets.
- 2.40 ‘Conservation’ is defined in Annexe 2 of the NPPF as *“The process of maintaining and managing change to a heritage asset in a way that sustains and, where appropriate, enhances its significance.”*
- 2.41 Paragraphs 132-134 need to be read together and applied in cases where development would cause harm to the special interest of a heritage asset, distinguishing degrees of harm and providing related threshold tests for the planning decision maker. Although these relate to decision taking, they are consistent with plan making objectives. Historic England’s separate note on site allocations, discussed below, contains apposite advice on how the objectives of the NPPF should be reflected in the plan making process.

***National Planning Practice Guidance (online, first live 2014)***

- 2.42 The Planning Practice Guidance (“PPG”) was published as a web-based resource on 6th March 2014 to support the NPPF. The publication contains guidance on decision-taking regarding historic environment matters.
- 2.43 The PPG provides guidance on how to minimise harm to the significance of a heritage asset:

*“A clear understanding of the significance of a heritage asset and its setting is necessary to develop proposals which avoid or minimise harm. Early appraisals, a conservation plan or targeted special investigation can help to identify constraints and opportunities arising from the asset at an early stage. Such studies can reveal alternative development options, for example more*

*sensitive designs or different orientations, that will deliver public benefits in a more sustainable and appropriate way”.*

- 2.44 Further guidance is provided by the PPG on the nature of public benefits. These may follow from many developments and can be anything that delivers economic, social or environmental progress as described in the NPPF (paragraph 7).
- 2.45 They should be of a nature of scale to be of benefit to the public at large and should not just be a private benefit. However, benefits do not always have to be visible or accessible to the public to be genuine public benefits. Benefits become relevant countervailing considerations if there is a finding of harm, then benefits to heritage interests attract particular weight in their own right under the terms of paragraph 132 of the NPPF.

### **Paragraphs 150**

- 2.46 This document meets the requirement in paragraph 158 for a proportionate evidence base, and also that in paragraph 169 that local authorities should have up-to-date evidence about the historic environment.
- 2.47 Paragraph 182 sets out a series of tests to determine the “soundness” of local plans. These are whether it is:
- Positively prepared – the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development;
  - Justified – the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence;
  - Effective – the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and
  - Consistent with national policy – the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework.

- 2.48 The proposed site allocation is assessed against these tests in Section 7 below.

### **The Historic Environment and Site Allocations in Local Plans: Historic England Advice Note 3**

- 2.49 The Historic Environment and Site Allocations in Local Plans: Historic England Advice

Note 3 (HEAN3) was published by Historic England in October 2015 and supplements GPA1. It sets out a phased process to identify sites suitable for selection in heritage terms, including:

- Identify which heritage assets are affected by the potential site allocation;
- Understand what contribution the site (in its current form) makes to the significance of the heritage asset(s);
- Identify what impact the allocation might have on that significance;
- Consider maximising enhancements and avoiding harm;
- Determine whether the proposed site allocation is appropriate in light of the NPPF's tests of soundness.

2.50 We have had regard to this process in preparing this report.

#### **Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 1: The Historic Environment in Local Plans ("GPA1")**

2.51 GPA 1 was published by Historic England in March 2015, and has been supplemented by the more detailed advice in HEAN3. The purpose of the document is to provide information on good practice to assist local authorities, planning and other consultants, owners, applicants and other interested parties in implementing historic environment policy in the NPPF and the related guidance given in the NPPG. We have had regard to this in forming our assessment.

#### **Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets (2015) ("GPA3")**

2.52 The 'Setting of a heritage asset' is defined in the Glossary of the NPPF as 'The surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve.' This definition is adopted in the Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in GPA3.

2.53 At paragraph 12 of the guidance note, Historic England recommends a broad, five step approach to assessing the impact of development upon the setting of heritage assets. The approach is very similar to that set out in HEAN3, and the method, if not the precise stages, also corresponds to EIA practice.

2.54 The guidance makes clear that the setting of a heritage asset is not an asset in its own right, nor a heritage designation. The importance of setting lies in what it contributes to the heritage value of the asset. An impact on setting may not, then,

have an effect on the overall heritage value of the asset.

2.55 Although the note is directed at decision taking, the principles and approach it outlines are clearly relevant to plan making and site allocations where heritage interests are under consideration, as is the case here.

2.56 GPA3 sets out a series of characteristics that it may be appropriate to consider when assessing significance. These are not intended to be an exhaustive check list, but rather a guide to understanding what may contribute to setting. They include the asset's physical surroundings, such as:

- Topography;
- Relationship to other nearby heritage assets;
- Character of surrounding streetscape or landscape, including open spaces;
- Formal design and land use;
- Historic materials or surfaces;
- Degree of change over time; and
- Integrity.

2.57 The experience of an asset can also play a role in its setting, for instance through:

- Views;
- Visual prominence;
- Intentional intervisibility with other features;
- Noise or other nuisances;
- Level of tranquillity or activity;
- Degree of promotion to the public;
- Rarity of comparable examples of setting; and
- Cultural or other associative relationships.

2.58 These characteristics and others where relevant are considered in assessing the potential contribution of setting to the significance of individual assets or to our ability

to appreciate that significance.

### **Historic Parks and Gardens Supplementary Planning Document (2007)**

- 2.59 The Historic Parks and Gardens Supplementary Planning Document was adopted by East Herts Council in September 2007 to provide guidance on the preservation and enhancement of the District's historic parks and gardens in accordance with Local Plan Policy BH16. The document includes sites included on Historic England (then English Heritage)'s Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest, and a local register, which is given as Appendix 2 of the document.
- 2.60 No map of Gilston Park is provided in that document and the description of the park in the text on pp. 32-33 notes the "Avenue of tall limes to entrance of house", the "terrace and parterres east of house, lawns, groups of trees, large serpentine lake, walled garden", and that "much of the park is now arable". The document states at para 3.4 that "Policy BH16 affords the same level of protection to Historic Parks and Gardens on both the English Heritage Register and the locally important sites list"

### 3.0 METHODOLOGY

- 3.1 The methodology used here is the product of legislation, policy and best practice guidance as set out above.
- 3.2 It broadly follows the staged approach set out in HEAN3 and GPA3, but Section 4 (Baseline) combines their steps 1 (identifying heritage assets potentially affected by development) and 2 (identifying the contribution made by their settings to their significance) into a single baseline section. Within this baseline section, however, the staged process is followed for each individual asset or group of assets. In Section 5, the assessment then proceeds to their step 3, assessing the potential effects of allocation on the identified baseline.
- 3.3 In response to step 4 of HEAN3, maximising enhancements and avoiding harm, key constraints and opportunities have been identified for each sub-area within the Site. These are summarised in Section 6, which also discussed the more restricted proposed site allocation in GA1 within the larger Site area. The concluding Section 7 responds to HEAN3 step 5, by assessing the soundness of the allocation against the NPPF.

#### **Baseline Assessment of Affected Assets**

- 3.4 The study identifies a number of heritage assets within or near the Site that may be affected by development on the Site. The term 'heritage asset' is used within this assessment to describe a designated (under relevant legislation e.g. World Heritage Sites, Registered Parks and Gardens, Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas etc.) or non-designated (by the local authority e.g. building of townscape merit etc.) heritage asset.
- 3.5 For the purposes of this report, the heritage assets are only above ground and do not include potential archaeological remains, which are considered in a separate report by LP Archaeology.
- 3.6 All heritage assets within the outer red line boundary of the Site have been identified, including those which are within inner exclusion areas. All designated assets within 1km of the Site have also been identified, as have non-designated assets in the local Historic Environment Record (HER) within 500m of the Site boundary. Given that potential effects are likely to relate only to setting, where assets share a similar setting these have been grouped for assessment. The assets and their groups are shown on the map at Appendix 4 and listed in the table at Appendix 5. Historic landscapes within the Site have also been identified using the GIS data from historic landscape character assessments sourced from the county historic environment records. These are shown on the map at Appendix 6.

- 3.7 Given the topography, orientation and position of assets, vegetation and interposing buildings, it is unlikely for there to be any material impact on assets over a greater distance, but as proposals are developed for the allocation, it may also be appropriate to assess assets at a greater distance.
- 3.8 Information was gathered from the Hertfordshire and Essex Historic Environment Records, the National Heritage List, and the Hertfordshire and Essex historic landscape characterisation studies from the county historic environment records. Extensive site survey has also been used to identify these above-ground cultural heritage assets and historic landscapes. This chapter also makes use of information gathered for the October 2016 Archaeology Desk Based Assessment (DBA) prepared by LP Archaeology.
- 3.9 The baseline assessment of heritage value includes a consideration of the significance of the asset(s) in question using the values set out in the NPPF. The contribution that the setting makes to this significance was also assessed as part of the baseline for each asset. This combines steps 1 and 2 of HEAN3 and GPA3.
- 3.10 An overall heritage value for each asset was then assigned against the criteria contained in Table 1.

**Table 1 Definitions of Heritage Asset Significance**

Value	Criteria	Examples
Exceptional	Building/site/area of international significance.	Likely to be World Heritage Sites, Areas of Natural Beauty and National Parks. Often listed Buildings Grade I and II* and their settings, Scheduled Monuments with upstanding remains, registered Historic Parks and Gardens Grade I and II* and their settings.
High	Building/site/area of national significance.	May be Listed Buildings Grade I and II* and their settings, Scheduled Monuments with upstanding remains, registered Historic Parks and Gardens Grade I and II* and their settings.
Medium	Building/site/area of national significance.	Often Listed Buildings Grade II and their settings, Conservation Areas and their settings, Scheduled Monuments without upstanding remains, and registered Historic Parks and Gardens Grade II and their settings.
Low	Buildings/sites/areas of national and/or regional	May be Listed Buildings Grade II and their settings, Conservation

Value	Criteria	Examples
	significance, or local assets of particular significance.	Areas and their settings, Scheduled Monuments without upstanding remains, registered Historic Parks and Gardens Grade II and their settings, and buildings of local interest.
Very Low	Buildings/sites/areas with some evidence of significance but in an incoherent or eroded form of local interest and generally with no statutory protection.	Often buildings of local interest and dispersed elements of townscape merit. Assets may be so badly damaged that too little remains to justify inclusion into a higher grade.

### Potential Effects

- 3.11 Potential heritage impacts resulting from the allocation include direct effects on assets, such as physical changes to listed buildings or below ground archaeology, and also indirect impacts that may result in changes to an asset's setting and significance, such as changes to setting.
- 3.12 For the purposes of this study, it was assumed that there would be no physical changes to any designated assets and that all impacts would be indirect impacts on setting. As noted above, setting may contribute to the significance of a heritage asset; therefore, changes to an asset's setting have the potential to have an effect on its significance.
- 3.13 Wherever possible, all the heritage assets referred to in this study were visited. However, it has not always been possible to gain access to individual heritage assets, especially those in private ownership. Some assessments of setting are therefore made based on publically accessible views and desktop study.

### Site Assessment

- 3.14 The wider site area has been divided into nine sub-areas for the purposes of this assessment (See Figure 1.2). These areas were drawn based on an understanding of local Site conditions and intended to be broadly similar in topography, landscape type, and historic characteristics.
- 3.15 Within each sub-area, heritage assets are identified and the potential effects of development within this sub-area on these assets is assessed. Heritage assets outside each area that are most likely to be affected by development in the sub-area are also identified and potential impacts on them assessed. These may change depending on the form and nature of any development that might come forward in these areas.

- 3.16 This assessment follows the broad criteria set out in step 4 of HEAN3, including
- Location and siting of development e.g. proximity, extent, position, topography, relationship, understanding, key views;
  - Form and appearance of development e.g. prominence, scale and massing, materials, movement;
  - Other effects of development e.g. noise, odour, vibration, lighting, changes to general character, access and use, landscape, context, permanence, cumulative impact, ownership, viability and communal use;
  - Secondary effects e.g. increased traffic movement through historic town centres as a result of new development.
- 3.17 Following assessment, each sub-area was assigned a level of sensitivity. This is a professional judgement. The criteria for these levels of sensitivity is set out in Table 2. These sensitivities reflect the capacity of the area to accept development with regard to the setting and significance of heritage assets.

**Table 2 Sensitivity**

Sensitivity	Area Characteristics	Examples
Very High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area likely to contain highly graded assets and/or important historic landscape features;</li> <li>• These highly graded assets and/or important landscapes are an important defining feature of the area;</li> <li>• Area may have a high concentration of heritage assets; and</li> <li>• Assets have little or no capacity to accept major change to their surroundings without substantial harm to their significance.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area is unlikely to be able to accommodate new development without substantial harm to heritage assets and/or historic landscapes; and</li> <li>• Development is likely to result in the total loss of, or major alteration to, key elements, features, or characteristics of the baseline.</li> </ul>
High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area likely to contain some highly graded assets and/or important historic landscapes;</li> <li>• Some assets and/or important landscapes may be an important defining feature of the area;</li> <li>• Area may also contain less highly graded assets;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area has a limited capacity to accommodate new development without harm to heritage assets and/or historic landscapes;</li> <li>• Development is likely to result in significant change to key elements, features, or characteristics of the baseline; and</li> </ul>

Sensitivity	Area Characteristics	Examples
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area may have moderate concentrations of assets or more widely spaced assets;</li> <li>• Assets have a limited capacity to accept to change to their surroundings without harm to their significance.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Careful planning of development may be able to mitigate some harm to heritage assets.</li> </ul>
Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May contain less highly graded assets or a mix of grades;</li> <li>• Assets may be well spaced or few in number;</li> <li>• Historic landscapes are likely to be of only moderate or low significance;</li> <li>• Assets may be well contained within their settings and so able to accommodate change in the wider area; and</li> <li>• Assets have some capacity to accept change within their setting without substantial harm to their significance.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area has some capacity to accept change to the setting of heritage assets; and</li> <li>• Development may not result in significant change to key elements, important features, or main characteristics of the baseline if harmful effects are mitigated through good design.</li> </ul>
Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Probably contains mainly low graded assets;</li> <li>• May contain relatively few heritage assets;</li> <li>• Unlikely to contain highly graded assets;</li> <li>• Historic landscapes are not likely to be significant;</li> <li>• Assets likely to be well contained within their own settings; and/or</li> <li>• The existing setting of heritage assets may be already altered; and</li> <li>• Assets have the capacity to accept change to their setting without substantial harm to their significance.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area has a good capacity to accept change to the setting of heritage assets; and</li> <li>• Development may result in some limited change to the setting of heritage assets, but this is likely to cause less than substantial harm to their significance.</li> </ul>
Very Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area contains very few heritage assets or heritage assets of very low value (e.g. locally designed assets);</li> <li>• Historic landscapes are not significant;</li> <li>• The existing setting of heritage assets may already be very altered or degraded; and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area has a high capacity to accommodate change through new development without harm to the significance of heritage assets; and</li> <li>• Change to the setting of heritage assets through development is not likely to result in harm to their significance.</li> </ul>

Sensitivity	Area Characteristics	Examples
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Assets have a high capacity to accept change to their settings without harm to their significance.</li></ul>	

- 3.18 Heritage impact assessment is not a strict quantitative process and some of these considerations will depend on expert judgements. Accordingly there is an emphasis on narrative text throughout this chapter to describe the assets and the judgements in regard to the significance of the identified effects. The text also draws out the key issues and ensures that the chapter is accessible to the public and to the competent authority or decision maker.
- 3.19 As part of our assessment of the Site as a whole, we have considered the scope for the avoidance of harm, mitigation, and enhancement in accordance with Step 4 of HEAN3. This is set out in more detail in Section 6 below.
- 3.20 The soundness of the allocation is assessed against NPPF tests in Section 7.

## 4.0 BASELINE CONDITIONS

### Introduction

- 4.1 This section assesses the baseline conditions in and around the Site. It combines Steps 1 and 2 of the HEAN3 methodology, in that heritage assets are both identified (Step 1) and the contribution of Site to their setting and significance assessed (Step 2) in this section.
- 4.2 The identification of the heritage baseline is based on the methodology set out above. All designated heritage assets have been scoped within a 1km radius of the Site boundary, and undesignated heritage assets such as those identified in the relevant Historic Environment Records (HER) have also been scoped-in with 500m of the Site red line. A map of the assets is shown at Appendix 4, and a table of scoped-in assets is provided at Appendix 5. Historic landscapes are shown on the map at Appendix 6.
- 4.3 This study area has been determined through site surveys, an analysis of historic maps and understanding of the topography of the area, and a review of approximately 250 heritage assets in the environs of the Site to identify those which may experience a change to their setting. We have reviewed the adopted appraisals for these assets, and had regard to the sensitivities identified when forming our assessment.

### Site History

- 4.4 A detailed Site history is provided in Appendix 7. The majority of the Site is formed by the Gilston estate, including the former park but not Gilston Park house. The designed landscape (undesignated) at Gilston Park was created around the then manor house called New Place in the late seventeenth century, and enlarged in the late eighteenth or early nineteenth century, but an area to the south of the Mount (Scheduled Monument) may have been part of Pisho park in the middle ages. St Mary's church Gilston (Grade I) was adjacent to the former Overhall manor, and may have another settlement nearby, but is now largely isolated.
- 4.5 Much of the western part of the Site was part of Hunsdon park in the middle ages and Tudor period, but this has left little trace in the landscape except for a moated site (Scheduled Monument) that may have been associated with it and the Big Black Barn (Grade II\*), which was a former lodge for Hunsdon park.
- 4.6 The Gilston estate was extensively altered and reshaped in the mid nineteenth century by the then owner John Hodgson, who demolished older houses, built many new houses and model farms, moved roads, altered field boundaries and made other changes to his estates. In the twentieth century, Hunsdon airfield was created in the north-west part of the Site. Eastwick parish was also part of the Gilston estate in the

nineteenth century and was also subject to extensive change under Hodgson, including the demolition of the old manor house at Eastwick Hall (Scheduled Monument) and the construction of new farms and houses. It has now largely been returned to agricultural use, but its outlines can still be seen in field boundaries, and associated structures are Scheduled.

### **Assets within the Site Boundary**

- 4.7 This section sets out the baseline for assets within the area captured by the redline boundary of the Site, including those which are not included in the allocation but are inset within the boundaries of the Site, including Gilston Park house, Gilston village, Eastwick church and village, Brickhouse Farm, Hunsdon Lodge farm, and Eastwick Hall farm.

#### ***Group A: Gilston Park and Associated Buildings***

- 4.8 This group comprises Gilston Park house (Grade II\*), and the Grade II listed associated outbuildings and related garden features around the house. In 1851 the Gilston estate was sold to John Hodgson, who demolished the Tudor manor house called New Place except for the porch (listed Grade II), which was retained as a garden feature. Hodgson built the present house at Gilston Park in 1851-2 to designs by Philip Charles Hardwick (1822-92). The house was extended in 1887 to designs by A W Blomfield, and again in 1903 to designs by A C Blomfield. P C Hardwick was known for his elaborate City banking halls, country houses, hotels, schools and churches. About 40 of his buildings are listed, four at Grade I including the church of St Leonard Newland and Madresfield Court, and seven at Grade II\* including Gilston Park house and the Grand Hotel, Birmingham.
- 4.9 Gilston Park house (Grade II\*) is designed in an opulent Tudor style and is built of coursed limestone. The design was clearly inspired by the older house, but it is on a larger scale. It has irregular facades with cross mullioned windows, steep, slated roofs and gabled dormers and projecting bays. There is a taller turret with a crenelated parapet at the centre of the house, several octagonal turrets, projecting polygonal bays, and tall, irregularly placed stacks. Gilston Park house was used as a research centre after World War II. The house has been converted to flats and smaller houses, but retains many of its original interiors. Additional houses have been built in the grounds, some in the early twentieth century and others more recently, and the subsidiary buildings have also been converted to housing.
- 4.10 The new house was about 125m further from the lake than its predecessor, and the porch of New Place (Grade II) was left as a garden feature. Although New Place itself was largely sixteenth century, the porch was built in the early nineteenth century.

Designed in a Tudor style, it has a plaster vaulted ceiling and a bust of Elizabeth I with a date stone of 1583 and the Royal arms. The lake, which had been enlarged in the late eighteenth or early nineteenth century, was enlarged again with a dam and cascade (Grade II), that was later altered to form a waterfall cascade in 1887 to designs by A C Blomfield. The dam was adapted to drive a turbine for electricity c.1902.

- 4.11 The kitchen garden remained in its earlier position to the north-east of the house, but the eighteenth-century garden walls (Grade II) were rebuilt in the 1850s. Hodgson had the arrangement of the road from Pye Corner to the church altered to move it further away from the house, and Cumberland Lodge (Grade II) was built in 1856 to serve the new drive. Cumberland Lodge is single storey and built of coursed limestone; It is designed in a Tudor style like that used elsewhere on the estate, with leaded windows, steeply pitched roofs and a prominent chimney, but the use of limestone was a deliberate statement to match the house, in contrast to other Gilston estate buildings of the same date which are built in red brick.
- 4.12 Other outbuildings including the stables were also rebuilt in the 1850s. Black Cottage (Grade II), a seventeenth-century house with later alterations, is a rare survivor of the earlier buildings in close proximity to the house. Also part of the complex around the house was Gilston Park Farm (HHER 9341), a model farm complex built in 1853 apparently by Frederick Chancellor for John Hodgson as part of his rebuilding of all of the farms on his estate. It is very different in character to the other model farms and comprises a single structure around a C-shaped courtyard, with a two storey central portion and lower flanking and side ranges. It is also built of sandstone in contrast to the brick used elsewhere on the estate.
- 4.13 Aside from the specifically designated Dam and fragment of New Place, the gardens including the lake and formal terraces are not designated but are an important part of the setting of the house. The extent of the gardens is much smaller than in the past, with the area to the west and south west of the house now rough grass rather than formal parkland as was the case in the past. Home Wood and the irregularly shaped tree belt to the north of the house were the boundaries of the seventeenth-century and later park. The tree line to the south of the house follows a feature shown on early maps. The likely extent of Gilston Park at various times is shown on the map at Appendix 9.
- 4.14 Gilston Park house has considerable architectural, aesthetic and historical significance as a Victorian country house designed by a well-known architect. Despite conversion to multiple dwellings, it retains some of its interiors and stands in a setting not wholly dissimilar to its original setting. The associated Grade II assets, including the Dam and the fragment of New Place, as well as Cumberland Lodge and the

Garden Walls have intrinsic architectural and historical interest, and are also an important part of the setting of the house.

- 4.15 The undesignated model farm also has some historical and architectural significance as an example of the model farms built by John Hodgson, albeit in a different style to that used elsewhere on the estate, and its proximity to the house is also an indicator of the importance placed on progressive farming methods. Black Cottage has architectural interest as a seventeenth-century cottage, and historical significance as a relatively rare survivor of the type of vernacular cottages that were once more common on the Gilston estate.
- 4.16 The setting of the group is park-like, with a strong sense of enclosure created by the tree belts and woodland on the east, north and west. The formal gardens including the lake are an important part of the setting of the house, and the wider complex including the lodge, model farm, and garden walls give a strong sense of this as an estate. The formal gardens have a strong tree enclosure to the south, but there are fewer trees to the south west and more open views from the back of the house. The wider setting is rural and the approach via a narrow lane gives the whole complex a sense of isolation. The setting makes a positive contribution to the significance of the assets in this group.
- 4.17 The heritage value of this group is High.

***Group B: St Mary Gilston Church***

- 4.18 This group comprises the parish church of St Mary, Gilston (Grade I), three associated monuments including the Grade I Johnston monument, and the nearby Church Cottages (Grade II). The medieval Overhall manor house was formerly nearby, but was demolished in the nineteenth century.
- 4.19 The earliest surviving fabric in Gilston church is the early thirteenth-century north door, but the presence of the twelfth-century font suggests that there was a church here from an earlier date. The church appears to have been extensively rebuilt or remodelled in the late thirteenth century with 4 bay north and south arcades and a west tower. It also retains fragments of a thirteenth century screen. There was more work in the later middle ages, when new windows were inserted in the fourteenth century, and the sixteenth century, the tower arch was rebuilt and the top of the tower was extended or rebuilt in brick. It also has a brick stair turret on the tower. It contains several interesting monuments, including fourteenth-century floor slabs and seventeenth-century wall tablets to members of the Gore family of New Place. There may have been some reworking in the early nineteenth century as the south door dates to that period. The church was heavily restored in 1852 by P C Hardwick,

architect of Gilston Park house, for John Hodgson of Gilston Park as part of his comprehensive reworking of the estate. As part of this work, the south aisle was rebuilt and the south porch added.

- 4.20 The church has very high architectural, aesthetic and communal significance as a good example of a medieval parish church restored in the mid nineteenth century by a well-known architect. Despite the heavy restoration, it still retains many medieval and post-medieval features including the arcades, the screen and the monuments. In addition to the intrinsic historic significance of its antiquity, the church also gains historical significance through its relationship to the former Overhall manor (now Overall farm) and to the group of cottages built in the mid nineteenth century as part of the reorganisation of the estate. Its historic relationship to Gilston Park house (formerly New Place) is also expressed through the tree lined footpath, dating to the eighteenth century or earlier, leading from the house to the church.
- 4.21 The Johnston Monument (Grade I) forms a prominent group at the entrance to the churchyard. By the highly regarded sculptor Eric Gill, it comprises three separate parts forming crucifixion group carved with relief figures in pale grey stone. Erected in 1923, the taller central part, with Christ on the cross, commemorates Geoffrey Stewart Johnston killed in Flanders in 1915; the right hand portion with the Virgin Mary commemorates Rose Alice Johnston d.1907, and the left hand part with St John commemorates Geoffrey's father Reginal Eden Johnston d.1922. The Johnstons lived at Terlings Park house in the far south-east of the parish in the early twentieth century). The slightly unusual placement of the figures on the east side of the monument probably relates to its relatively cramped spot next to the hedge. The monument has considerable aesthetic significance as a fine example of the important sculptor Eric Gill. Its relationship to the nearby church also provides a social, communal context for its creation, although it has no direct relationship to Terlings Park, the home of the Johnston family.
- 4.22 The Gore tomb of 1691 and the late seventeenth-century Turvin tomb, both listed Grade II, are fine examples of seventeenth tomb chests, the former to members of the family that owned New Place, the latter to the family who owned Terlings Park. Both have architectural and historical interest.
- 4.23 Church Cottages (Grade II) stand a short distance to the east of the church and form a group with the church and a pair of adjacent unlisted cottages of similar date and style. Built in 1852 by John Hodgson as part of his renovation of the Gilston estate, they are brick with steep roofs, casement windows with lattice work, and small decorative porches. They have architectural and historical interest as good examples of the elaborate estate cottages built by Hodgson in the mid nineteenth century to replace older houses in the parish.

- 4.24 The churchyard has some large trees along its edge, especially to the east and north. The setting of the whole group is formed by the other buildings in the group and the open agricultural landscape that surrounds it, which provides a sense of isolation and tranquillity. The sense of remoteness is increased by the narrow lane up which the group is approached. There are historic connections between the church and Overhall farm (formerly Overhall manor), and the sense of being in the remains of an ancient settlement is strong.
- 4.25 Also part of this group and forming part of its setting are the unlisted cottages adjacent to Church cottage, which are similar to Church Cottages but plainer and have a carved stone with the initials I.H. (John Hodgson) in the gable; Overhall farmhouse, also built by Hodgson in the mid nineteenth century to replace the medieval manor house at Overhall; and Dairy cottages to the west of the church, which began as another mid nineteenth-century Hodgson group said to have been built as a dairy and later converted to cottages. In our professional judgment, the setting of the three monuments is more specifically the churchyard and the other monuments also present there; however, they also share in the open, rural setting of the whole group. In order to appreciate the composition of the churchyard feature, one is looking west, not south.
- 4.26 In places, there are open views from the church, and back to it, especially from the south near the band of trees to the north of Gilston Park house and also to the west. However, in many places views are blocked by existing vegetation within the churchyard, along the lane and around houses. The curving form of the lane, which blocks longer views until the viewer is very close to the individual listed buildings also contributes to this sense of enclosure. To the south west, the group at Dairy Cottages blocks views although there are some views of the spire looking towards the church from the lane.
- 4.27 The setting makes a positive contribution to the significance of all the designated assets in this group.
- 4.28 The heritage value of this group is High for its coherence and setting, as well as its historical importance in the history of Gilston.

***Group C: Channock's Farm***

- 4.29 This group comprises the buildings around Channoeks Farm, including the Grade II listed farm house, barns and cottages, and the unlisted Channoeks Cottages. Chanocks was one of the many older farms on the Gilston estate rebuilt by John Hodgson in the mid nineteenth century. The farm itself is shown in its present location on historic maps including the mid eighteenth-century Drury map shown on the map

regression at Appendix 8. The whole was rebuilt on progressive, model farm lines in the 1850s and 60s, albeit apparently in more than one phase.

- 4.30 Channoeks farm house was built 1854 and has a datestone with the initials IH (John Hodgson). Built of red brick with slate roofs in a Tudor Gothic style as a model farm, it follows a similar pattern to other Hodgson farmhouses including Eastwick Hall farm and the Lion Inn (formerly a farmhouse). The barn group (Grade II) stands on the opposite side of the road to the house on the site of an earlier range of farm buildings. The barn group has an E-shaped plan comprising a large timber barn at the rear and lower barn and stable ranges for cattle and horses. It is also dated 1854. Stable cottage (Grade II) was added to the barn complex in 1868, and is also in the estate's Tudor Gothic style. Channoeks cottages (unlisted, in the HER) are similar in character form a group with the other buildings. The layout of the group is similar to that at Sayes Park Farm and other of Hodgson's model farms.
- 4.31 The ensemble forms a picturesque group typical of the work carried out on the estate in the 1850s and 60s for John Hodgson. As a group and individually, they have architectural and historical significance as a model farm complex built in the 1850s and 60s by the progressive owner of the Gilston estate, John Hodgson, in the estate style.
- 4.32 The buildings form each other's immediate setting, and the group as a whole is clearly understood as a mid Victorian model farm that retains its original buildings and layout. The distinctive estate style also provides a context within the Gilston Park estate. The wider setting of the group at Channoeks farm is rural and agricultural. Hedges and other vegetation block most long range views, and add to a sense of rural isolation. The setting makes a positive contribution to the significance of the group.
- 4.33 The heritage value of this group is Medium.

***Group D: Former School and Rectory, Gilston***

- 4.34 This group comprises former Gilston estate buildings that are now private houses, including High Gilston (the former school, Grade II) and the Old Rectory (Grade II). Both are built of red brick with steep slated roofs and designed in the Tudor gothic style typical of Gilston estate buildings, but more elaborate than most of the cottages and farmhouses. The former school, built in 1865, has diaper brickwork and carved bargeboards; the former rectory, which replaced the medieval rectory.
- 4.35 Also part of this group and forming part of their setting is a small group of estate cottages built in a similar style. To the west the group faces Gilston Park house and its grounds, but views in this direction are blocked by trees and other vegetation also

the park boundary. To the east there are open views over agricultural fields. Their coherence style and their proximity to each other gives this group a clear sense of being part of the Gilston estate. The narrow lane adds to the sense of a rural setting. The setting makes a positive contribution to this group of assets.

- 4.36 The heritage value of this group is Medium.

***Group E: Pole Hill***

- 4.37 This group comprise Pole Hill Farm, High Wych (Grade II). A small two storey house of the early to mid-eighteenth century, it is plastered and has a tiled roof. The house has architectural and aesthetic significance as a small, eighteenth-century farmhouse, and historical significance as a survivor of the type of scattered houses that were characteristic of the pre-modern landscape in this area.

- 4.38 Its setting is isolated, set down a small lane off the Eastwick Road, and the curtilage of the house is enclosed by vegetation. To the east is a large gravel quarry now partly used as a landfill site that is visually prominent in the setting of the house at the rear, and also contributes noise and traffic. The setting makes a neutral contribution to the significance of the house.

- 4.39 The heritage value of Pole Hill Farm is Low.

***Group F: Gilston Village***

- 4.40 This group comprises the assets in Gilston village (formerly known as Pye Corner). Pye Corner was a historic hamlet on the edge of Gilston parish. Historic maps such as the tithe map of c.1840 (Appendix 8) show it to have been very small. Under the tenure of John Hodgson of Gilston Park, in the mid nineteenth century the village was enlarged and consolidated as Hodgson built new houses to replace older houses he demolished elsewhere on the estate. All the buildings in this group are listed at Grade II.

- 4.41 Older buildings surviving from the historic hamlet include the Plume of Feathers PH and its associated outbuildings; Shiptons; Nos 26 and 30 Eastwick Lane; and Nos 88 and 89 Gilston Lane (all Grade II). All are seventeenth or eighteenth century in origin, timber framed and plastered and generally of two stories with tiled roofs. Nos 27 and 28 Eastwick Lane (Grade II) are estate cottages built for John Hodgson in the 1860s in the Gothic style typical of his work, built in brick with lattice casement windows and slated roofs. They form an attractive group with the older cottages and the pub.

- 4.42 Individually, the listed buildings have architectural and aesthetic significance as well preserved examples of timber framed vernacular buildings of the seventeenth and

eighteenth centuries and as Victorian estate cottages that are part of a larger group of such cottages. They also have historical significance as a historic hamlet enlarged in the mid nineteenth century as part of the reorganisation of the local estate.

4.43 The setting of the buildings around Pye Corner/Gilston village is rural despite its proximity to Harlow, and as a group they have a clear character as a historic hamlet. There are some open views over agricultural fields, but generally topography and existing vegetation give the hamlet a discrete, enclosed character. The setting makes a positive contribution to the significance and appreciation of the assets.

4.44 The heritage value of the group is Medium.

***Group G: Fiddler's Bridge and Cottage***

4.45 This group is near Fiddler's bridge to the south of Pye Corner/Gilston village. It was formerly slightly separate from the cluster of houses to the north around Pye Corner, but has been joined to it by houses of the later nineteenth and twentieth centuries. This group is assessed separately to the group around Pye Corner because of the potential for different impacts especially from any proposed road schemes.

4.46 Fiddler's Cottage (Grade II) is similar in character to the seventeenth-century timber framed and plastered cottages just to the north at Pye Corner, and is a typical example of the early-modern vernacular architecture of the area. Fiddler's bridge (Grade II) is a footbridge over Fiddler's Brook of eighteenth century origin. Built of brick with wooden railings, it has two unequal arches, the smaller norther arch being older and possibly the remains of an earlier three-arched arrangement. When seen from the footpath to the south it forms a group with Fiddler's Cottage. The road formerly crossed the brook here in a ford, with the footbridge for pedestrians. Both the footbridge and the cottage have architectural, aesthetic and historical significance as examples of local vernacular types surviving from an earlier phase of the area's history.

4.47 The setting of this group is more varied than that at Pye Corner to the north. The footbridge forms an attractive group with the listed house looking north, and from the street, Fiddler's Cottage is part of a pleasant group with some Victoria estate cottages and the Edwardian village Hall. However, the new houses at Terlings Park are close by to the south and can be seen together with the listed cottage in views looking south, and there are more twentieth-century houses to the north. The outbuildings to the rear of the house are in light industrial use. The curtilage of the houses are generally enclosed by trees, although there may be some open views over fields in places. Overall, the setting makes a positive to neutral contribution to the significance of these assets.

- 4.48 The heritage value of this group is Low.

***Group H: Eastwick Lodge Farm***

- 4.49 This group is formed by Eastwick Lodge farm, a former model farm that is now mainly a small business complex. It is undesignated but is included in the Hertfordshire HER (HHER 11117). Eastwick Lodge farm was newly built in the 1850s or 60s for John Hodgson of the Gilston estate. It replaced an earlier farm further to the east at Sawbridgeworth Lodge farm (also called South Lodge farm or Lodge farm). The house is similar in character to other Gilston estate farm houses, and is built of brick in a Tudor style with steep slated roofs, sash windows and prominent chimneys. The E-shaped barn complex, also typical of the Gilston estate, is similar to that at Channoeks farm, and has a timber barn at the rear with three lower brick-built wings. The spaces between the wings have been infilled in recent years. There is a further range of brick outbuildings, now apparently converted to residential use, adjacent to the house, and other modern former farm buildings around the complex. The group as a whole can still be understood as a Victorian farm complex, and it has some local architectural and historical interest as one of the Gilston estate model farms.

- 4.50 The setting of the complex includes the busy road at the front, with some glimpsed views of Harlow to the south. To the north are large arable fields, but the rising ground generally blocks longer distance views in this direction. The house is partially enclosed by trees and hedges to separate it from the rest of the complex. The setting makes a neutral contribution to the significance of the group. The heritage value of this group is Very Low.

***Group J: Eastwick Village***

- 4.51 This group comprises Eastwick village including six Grade II listed buildings. Eastwick village is not a conservation area. The village, much of which was built by the Gilston estate in the second half of the nineteenth century, clusters around a crossroads and forms an attractive, picturesque ensemble. The oldest surviving house in the village is the early eighteenth century Culverts (Grade II), an imposing two and a half storey, six bay red brick house built in a classical style.
- 4.52 The Lion Inn (Grade II), formerly Greenman farm, was built as a model farmhouse in 1852 for John Hodgson of the Gilston estate. Built of red brick with slate roofs, it has mullioned casement windows. It was converted to a pub in the late nineteenth century when the former pub, which stood on the site of Nos 66, 67 and 68 Eastwick Road, was demolished. Its former farm yard (undesignated), which is a large C-shaped courtyard with a timber barn at rear and lower brick wings in typical Gilston estate style, has been converted to housing.

- 4.53 Nos 76 and 77 Eastwick Road (Grade II) are a pair of Gilston estate cottages dated 1861. Built of red brick with slate roofs in the standard Gilston estate Tudor gothic style, they have steep roofs, bargeboards, and leaded casement windows. Nos 63 and 64 Eastwick Village (Grade II) are another pair of yellow brick estate cottages probably built c.1872 for John Hodgson. Built in the Gilston estate Tudor Gothic style, they have prominent chimneys, steep slate roofs, leaded casement windows and bargeboards. Nos 66, 67 and 68 Eastwick Road (Grade II) are a group of former almshouses built c.1890 and now converted to houses. They are said to have been built by the Gilston estate, and are rendered with false timber framing. Other Gilston estate buildings in the village include the unlisted Crusader Cottages and a group of red brick cottages on Eastwick Hall Lane at the east end of the village.
- 4.54 Culverts has architectural and aesthetic significance as an attractive early eighteenth-century house; the other assets in this group have architectural significance as attractive mid-late nineteenth century estate buildings, and they also have historical significance for their connection to the rest of the Gilston estate.
- 4.55 The setting of the group is formed by the other houses in the village, which is a compact and clearly defined unit. The undesignated Gilston estate cottages and other undesignated cottages contribute to this setting. The wider setting is rural and feels relatively isolated despite the proximity to the road and to Harlow. The setting makes a positive contribution to the setting of the assets. The heritage value of this group is Medium.

***Group K: Eastwick Church***

- 4.56 This group is formed of Eastwick church, its associated monuments and the former rectory now called Eastwick Manor. There was a priest in Eastwick at the time of Domesday book in 1086, suggesting a church, but the church at Eastwick is first specifically mentioned in 1138 when Baldwin, son of Gilbert de Clare gave it to the abbey of Bourne (Lincolnshire). The church of St Botolph, Eastwick (Grade II\*) was wholly rebuilt except for the west tower in 1872 to designs by A W Blomfield. The thirteenth-century chancel arch was re-erected in the new building, and there is also a thirteenth-century knight effigy. The church is unaisled, and is designed in a thirteenth-century lancet style to mimic the earlier church. It has buttresses to mark the positions of former transepts that were not re-erected, an organ chamber next to the chancel, and a timber north porch. Internally, the reset thirteenth-century chancel arch is very elaborate, with Purbeck marble shafts, and Blomfield mirrored this with Purbeck shafts around the interior jambs of the chancel windows. The three stage tower, retained from the earlier church, has a pyramidal cap roof. The church has considerable architectural aesthetic and historical interest as a medieval parish church largely rebuilt in the nineteenth century by a well known church architect.

- 4.57 The Frampton tomb (Grade II) is a fine chest tomb erected in 1789 to commemorate William Frampton, a London merchant. It has balusters and the corners and a moulded top slab. There are also many other undesignated eighteenth-century headstones in the churchyard. The tomb has aesthetic and historical significance as a well preserved late eighteenth-century chest tomb set among other contemporary monuments.
- 4.58 Eastwick manor (Grade II) was built as the rectory in 1826, possibly incorporating parts of an earlier building. Two stories with an L-shaped plan, it is built of brick in a classical style with hipped roofs. The three bay front has pilasters at the corners and marking the central bay. It is said to retain its original interior. The associated stable and coach house (Grade II) are eighteenth and early nineteenth-century in date, and are timber framed and weatherboarded with red tiled roofs. The house stands in formal landscaped grounds that are enclosed by trees to the south and west, but are more open towards the north. The house has architectural, aesthetic and historical significance as a well preserved example of an early nineteenth century rectory, and the stables are an attractive example of vernacular farm buildings that make an attractive group with the house.
- 4.59 The setting of this group is generally rural, although the main road to the south is an urbanising presence. The church and associated former rectory form a clear group slightly outside of the village centre that is typical of the settlement patterns in the area, occurring also at Hunsdon and Gilston. The setting makes a positive contribution to the significance of the assets. The heritage value of this group is High.

***Group L: Brickhouse Farm***

- 4.60 This group is formed of Brickhouse farm and its associated buildings. Brickhouse farm (Grade II) is an early seventeenth-century brick house, built as a two-storey floored hall with an eighteenth century single south cross wing. It was altered and extended in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, but is said to retain much original framing internally. Brick was a highly unusual material for a vernacular house of this date, and it may have been a lodge associated with Hunsdon park. The associated barn, stable and cattle shed (Grade II) was built in the mid nineteenth century. Although altered it is recognisable as a model farm type, not dissimilar to those on the Gilston estate but much larger, with an exceptionally long 19 bay timber-framed range at the back and lower projecting brick ranges forming internal courtyards. There were formerly two internal brick ranges forming three courtyards, but these have been removed and replaced by modern sheds that are not of interest. The barns form a group with the house.
- 4.61 The house has considerable architectural, aesthetic and historical interest as an early

seventeenth-century brick house that may have been a lodge for Hunsdon park and became a farmhouse. The barns have architectural and historical interest as a very large example of a model farm type barn. The setting of this group is rural and open, and the lack of hedges means that it can be seen from some distance from Church Lane. The setting makes a positive contribution to the significance of the assets. The heritage value of this group Medium.

***Group M: Eastwick Moated Sites***

- 4.62 This group is formed of two Scheduled Monuments, both moated sites, in Eastwick. They are roughly opposite each other on Eastwick Hall Lane to the north of Eastwick village, but despite their spatial proximity, they appear to be unrelated historically, as set out below.
- 4.63 The moated site south-west of Home Wood, on the east side of Eastwick lane, is the remains of the former Eastwick Hall farmhouse that was probably the site of the medieval Eastwick manor house. The c.1840 tithe map and the slightly later estate sale map (Appendix 8) show a complex of buildings on the site that may have included more than one house as well as farm buildings. The site was cleared by John Hodgson of the Gilston estate in the mid nineteenth century and replaced by the new Eastwick Hall farm to the North West (see Group P). The surviving remains include a rectangular enclosure about 100m x 70m surrounded by a 6m wide dry moat on three sides except the south where there is a scarp; inside the enclosure is a rectangular platform that mid twentieth-century excavations suggested was the remains of Eastwick Hall house. There are also at least three other house or building platforms on the site. The top of the monument is largely grassland, which is open and has good views across surrounding countryside, although it is not currently accessible to the public. An ancient holloway to the south and west of the monument marks the former line of Eastwick Hall Lane, as historic maps show that the lane originally ran to the east of the brook and much closer to the moated site than is now the case. The line of the road was probably altered by John Hodgson as part of his reorganisation of the estate.
- 4.64 The other moated site, to the south of Eastwick Hall farm, is slightly smaller, measuring 80m x 70m and is surrounded by a 15m wide ditch on three sides except the south where there is a scarp. The north west part of the moat is wet and fed by a small stream; to the south west is an oblong pond probably associated with the moat. The surface of the ground within the moat, suggesting the remains of buildings. The tithe and estate maps (Appendix 8) show that the moat had water in it on three sides in the mid nineteenth century, but that any earlier buildings had gone by that date. This site was probably associated with the medieval and Tudor park at Hunsdon, which extended into Eastwick parish at that time. It may have been a lodge for the

park.

- 4.65 Despite the proximity of the two monuments, there is no clear historical relationship between them, with one apparently the manor house for Eastwick manor, the other a park lodge for Hunsdon park associated with the Hunsdon estate. Nonetheless, today they form an impressive group that is clearly indicative of the area's historic past. Both monuments have considerable historical significance as well preserved medieval moated sites with evidence for the remains of historic built structures apparently preserved within them.
- 4.66 The setting of the monuments is rural and open. They are accessed via a narrow lane, and isolated from any other settlement. The rising ground to the south and east largely block views in those directions, but there are more open views over rolling countryside especially to the north west. Home Wood is prominent in views to the north east. The setting makes a positive contribution to the significance of the monuments. The heritage value of these monuments is High.

***Map Group N: The Mount and Gilston Park, central section***

- 4.67 This group, which is formed by the central part of the former park at Gilston, includes the Mount moated site (SM), other earthworks, and the associated ditch, probably the former park pale. The remains of the former drive is also still visible as a track. The probable extent of the park at Gilston at various dates is shown on the map at Appendix 9. This part of the park was largely created in the late seventeenth century; the southern part of the park, which was added to the park in the late eighteenth century, is discussed below at Map Group T.
- 4.68 The Mount is a moated enclosure about 75m long by 50m wide with a 12m wide dry moat around it; the central mound is raised about 2m and contains the remains of a flint-faced building. Next to the Mount to the east is another enclosure about 85m x 50m that apparently formerly contained deer house. To the west is a ditch about 4m wide and 1.5m deep that was probably the park pale. It curves towards the north-west and would have enclosed the land to the north.
- 4.69 The Mount is scheduled as a medieval moated site with a Tudor period park keeper's lodge. The Mount is in the formerly detached portion of Sawbridgeworth parish (now Eastwick parish), which may have been part of Pisho park in the middle ages. It is likely that the Mount related to Pisho park and so predates the park at Gilston, as the earliest firm evidence for a park in Gilston parish is late seventeenth century. The Drury map of 1745 (Appendix 8) shows the park at New Place, Gilston, with a boundary that apparently ran along the line of the Mount and the ditch. It is possible that the seventeenth-century park boundary reused an earlier moated feature.

- 4.70 The ditch itself, however, is likely to be late seventeenth-century and relate to the park created for New Place by Humphrey Gore as it runs slightly south of the parish boundary leaving a small strip of Sawbridgeworth to its north. If it related to Pisho park, which was wholly in Sawbridgeworth, there would have been no reason to leave a small strip of land to the north unemparked; it is much more logical that Gore reused an earlier moated site and so took a small portion of Sawbridgeworth to make his new boundary meet the older feature as he enclosed land to the north that was mainly in Gilston parish.
- 4.71 In the later eighteenth century, the park boundaries were extended to the south, but the Mount apparently continued to be an important feature in the park. The tithe map of c.1840 (Appendix 8) calls the eastern part of the Mount mound "Coney Spring", the central part Deer Yard, and the western part Three Plantations, with the moat also shown within this portion. At the far west end of the Mount site was a small cottage with a garden (now demolished), possibly the remains of a lodge.
- 4.72 The Mount was well wooded by the nineteenth century, and running southwards from the Mount on the tithe map was another area of woodland, not shown on earlier maps, called The Chase. The Chase was felled in the mid twentieth century. The trees of the Lime Avenue also apparently continued northwards to the west of the Mount to a band of informal woodland along the footpath across the field along the parish boundary, but this has also been felled and ploughed out. To the west, the ditch connects with Home Wood, an area of ancient woodland also linked to the park at Gilston.
- 4.73 A curving track running north westwards from the Mount before it curves eastwards towards Gilston Park house is the remains of a former drive. First shown in this form on the 1822 Bryant map (Appendix 8), it may have been created in the late eighteenth or early nineteenth century as part of the remodelling of the gardens and park by William Plumer the younger. It connects to the Lime Avenue in the southern part of the park, also created by Plumer. A straight track or footpath running east-west across this part of the park roughly follows the parish boundary, although the latter is much more irregular, and is probably a mid nineteenth-century creation as it is not shown in this form on the Bryant map or the tithe map of 1840 (Appendix 8).
- 4.74 The Mount has considerable archaeological and historical significance as a moated feature of medieval or early modern date associated with the Jacobean park. The ditches and mound are well preserved, and it is likely to contain archaeological remains of significance. The park pale ditch has considerable historical significance as a visible landscape reminder of the early modern park at Gilston. The drive is not obviously a drive in this area, but it can be understood as such from maps and aerial photographs. Enough survives of the ensemble, including the mound, ditch, drive,

and woodland at Home Wood for it to be understood in the context of Gilston Park house and its former park.

- 4.75 The setting of the Mount Scheduled monument today is mainly comprised of agricultural fields to both the north and south. The footpaths are not clearly marked and the monument is not very easily accessible. There are good views of the Mount from the north from the edge of the Gilston Park house complex, which also forms part of its wider setting as does the woodland at Home Wood. To the south, the former Lime Avenue, although badly preserved, is part of the former late eighteenth-century park complex. The setting makes a positive contribution to the significance of the monument and the other historic features in this area.
- 4.76 The heritage value of this group is High.

***Group O: Keeper's Cottage***

- 4.77 This group is formed by Keeper's Cottage (Grade II), built in 1851 for John Hodgson as part of the reorganisation of the Gilston Park estate. Built in a picturesque gothic style that was to become characteristic of the Gilston estate cottages, it was probably designed by PC Hardwick, who also designed Gilston Park house. Keeper's Cottage replaced an earlier keeper's cottage located very close to Gilston Park house in an area that subsequently became part of the gardens. Built of red brick with slate roofs, the building is two stories with prominent chimneys. It sits on the western edge of Home Wood and has a small projecting bay overlooking farmland through a gap in the woodland.
- 4.78 Keeper's Cottage has architectural and aesthetic significance as an attractive example of an early 1850s Gothic-style estate building probably designed by a well known architect. It also has historical significance as an early part of the rebuilding of the Gilston estate for John Hodgson.
- 4.79 The setting of Keeper's Cottage is formed primarily by the ancient woodland of Home Wood, including the long approach through the wood via a private track. The house also has views over open countryside to the west through a gap in the hedge. The presence of a bay window here, and the unusual location of the house on one side of its generous plot, may suggest that this was an intended view. The setting makes a positive contribution to the significance of the house.
- 4.80 The heritage value of Keeper's Cottage is Low.

***Group P: Eastwick Hall Farm***

- 4.81 This group is formed by Eastwick Hall Farm, which is undesignated but in the SMR

(HHER 11116). It was built in the mid nineteenth century by John Hodgson as a model farm to replace older farms elsewhere, including Eastwick Manor farm (SM) and Garman's or German's farm, the site of which was located to the east of the present farm. The house is typical of Gilston estate farmhouses, and is built of brock with slated roofs and prominent chimneys. Its form is less picturesque than some of the other farmhouses. The E-shaped barn is also typical of the Gilston estate model farms, has been greatly altered, with the central projecting range removed and replaced by two larger ranges that fill the central space between the outer wings. Additional farm buildings have been added to the complex more recently. The core of the farm, including the barn and house, have some limited architectural and historical interest as examples of the planned farmsteads built in the mid nineteenth century by the Gilston estate.

- 4.82 The setting of the group is rural and isolated. The house is approached by the single track Eastwick Hall Lane. The complex is surrounded by large open fields on all sides, but a belt of trees on three sides except the south gives the complex a sense of enclosure. The setting makes a positive contribution to the setting of this group. The heritage value of the group is Very Low.

***Group Q: Hunsdon Airfield***

- 4.83 This group is formed of by Hunsdon Airfield and the associated group of Scheduled Monuments. The land for Hunsdon Airfield was requisitioned in 1939 and built in 1940-1. It served as a fighter airbase that was a satellite to North Weald in Essex. It flew Hurricanes and later Mosquitos; the latter were involved in the 1944 'Operation Jericho' raid on Amiens prison to help free resistance fighters held there. It operated until 1947. It had two intersecting runways, the longer of which was about 1600m running NE/SW, and a perimeter road. The runways and the perimeter road survive as tracks and field boundaries and, although the land has been reconverted to agricultural use, are still clearly visible from the air. Part of the site is in use by the Hunsdon microlight club.
- 4.84 There were a range of brick, wood and prefabricated steels buildings associated with the airfield, many of which survive. These are scheduled as fourteen units within a single scheduling entry. They are located in a ring around the perimeter of the site and include seven large pillboxes, most still retaining their machine gun fittings and with associated ammunition stores and trenches; two sleeping shelters; an air-raid shelter; and the former battle headquarters building with its associated defensive trenches, which is mainly underground. The structures are well preserved and in some cases contain remnants of original fittings.
- 4.85 Hunsdon Airfield has historical significance as a well-preserved World War II airfield

with many of its associated structures surviving intact. It is also likely to have some archaeological value for the buried remains of other parts of the complex.

- 4.86 The setting of the upstanding parts of the complex is varied in their immediate localities, with some located in woodland at Black Hut woods and Tuck's Spring. Others near Hunsdon village at Spellers and at Hunsdon Lodge Farm, and the rest scattered in open countryside around the perimeter of the site. The wider setting of the remains is formed by the airfield, which can still be understood as a single complex. The setting makes a positive contribution to the significance of the monument. Hunsdon Airfield has High heritage value.

***Group R: Hunsdon Lodge Farm Buildings***

- 4.87 This group is formed of a group of farm buildings at Hunsdon Lodge farm. They include the Big Black Barn (Grade II\*), the Barn attached to the south end of the Big Black Barn (Grade II), and the nearby Essex barn (Grade II). The Big Black Barn is a sixteenth-century lodgings range probably originally associated with Hunsdon Park. It was converted into a barn in the eighteenth century. Despite the later alterations, it is an important survival of a high status Tudor period lodgings range. Attached to its south end is the eighteenth-century Barn, which is an aisled five-bay barn with a long projecting gabled porch to the west. It is lower than the Big Black Barn. The porch is flanked by lower lean-to stables. The Essex barn is a tall, unaisled six-bay weatherboarded barn with a nineteenth-century slate roof. Typically for an Essex barn, it has a projecting cross-gabled entrance bay on the west flanked by lower lean-to ranges. It forms an attractive group with the Big Black Barn.
- 4.88 There is no house immediately associated with this group, and Hunsdon Lodge Farm house (undesigned) is some distance to the west at the end of Drury Lane on the edge of Hunsdon village. Also nearby, but assessed separately, are parts of the Hunsdon Airfield complex of Scheduled Monuments.
- 4.89 The Big Black Barn has considerable architectural and historical significance as a sixteenth-century Tudor lodgings range probably associated with the royal hunting park at Hunsdon. Although it is much altered, enough remains that its original form can still be understood. The two eighteenth-century barns have architectural and historical significance as well preserved examples of traditional Hertfordshire farm buildings.
- 4.90 The setting of the group is rural and open. Hunsdon airfield is nearby, but it too is open and largely in agricultural use so does not diminish the sense that these are an isolated group of historic farm buildings. The setting makes a positive contribution to the significance of the assets. The heritage value of this group is Medium.

***Group S: Scattered Farms***

- 4.91 This group is formed of by a group of scattered farmsteads in the north east part of the Site. They are similar in character to those in Group 3. This group includes Actons, High Trees and Great Penny's Farm, all Grade II. Actons is a sixteenth century timber-framed house, possibly on an older site, and has apparently been reduced in size. It is partially moated, although the moat is not definitely medieval or even necessarily a moat (HHER 6386). It forms a group with nearby farm buildings, some in domestic use, of the late nineteenth century. High Trees is a small, probably seventeenth century timber framed and thatched cottage standing in an isolated position. Great Penny's has a complex of eighteenth century farm buildings, now mostly converted to residential use, of which only the granary is listed, but the others are included in the HER (HHER 13283). The house has been rebuilt.
- 4.92 Individually and as a group, these assets have architectural, aesthetic and historical significance as examples of sixteenth-century and later vernacular farm houses and farm buildings. They are representative of the type of farmsteads that were once common in this area before the extensive demolition and rebuilding of older farms in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Their setting is rural and open; depending on the approach, they may be perceived as part of a larger group of historic farms scattered along the loop of road to the west of manor of Groves that also includes Fryers, Carters, and Stonards (see Group 3 below). The setting makes a positive contribution to the significance of these assets as historic farmhouses. The heritage value of this group is Medium.

***Group T: Gilston Park, southern part (undesigned assets)***

- 4.93 This area does not contain any designated assets but was formerly part of Gilston Park, and possibly Pisho park in the middle ages, and so is considered an undesigned asset.
- 4.94 The area, which was formerly part of Sawbridgeworth parish and is now part of Eastwick parish, was the southern part of Gilston Park in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Part of it may have been part of Pisho park in the middle ages. In 1694, Sir Humphrey Gore, who enclosed the park at New Place, is said to have held lands in Sawbridgeworth parish that included about 100 acres that had formerly been part of Pisho Park and that included woodland and a lodge. It has been suggested that this included both the Mount and a lodge near the site of the demolished Sawbridgeworth Lodge farm on the Eastwick Road.
- 4.95 The evidence from the Bryant map of 1745 (Appendix 8) suggests that this area was not part of the late seventeenth century park created by Gore, and that it was only

added to Gilston Park in the later eighteenth or early nineteenth century. It was certainly part of Gilston Park by 1822 when the Bryant map was made. Now mainly open agricultural fields, it contains the so-called Lime Avenue, an avenue of trees created in the late eighteenth or early nineteenth-century when the park was extended to the south. First shown on the Bryant map of 1822, the Lime Avenue formed a drive from Eastwick Road, leading straight north to the Mount, where it joined the curving drive sweeping westwards through the central part of the park. The Lime Avenue is now very degraded with only a few trees left along its length.

- 4.96 At the end of the Lime Avenue where it meets Eastwick Road is a small lodge (undesigned). Now known as South Lodge, it was probably built in the early nineteenth century by the Plumers. It may have been contemporary with the early nineteenth century work on New Place house, of which only the porch survives. One storey and low attics with rendered walls and a tiled roof in a Gothic style, it is very different in character to the estate style of John Hodgson's tenure after 1851. It appears on the tithe map of c.1840, where it is described as a lodge, and on the estate sale plan of c.1850 (Appendix 8). Adjacent to the lodge to the west on both sides of the road was a small cluster of cottages and farm buildings; these were demolished by John Hodgson when Eastwick Lodge farm was built further west, but the HER record (HHER 11117) suggests that they dated to the sixteenth or seventeenth century.
- 4.97 As early as c.1840, when the tithe map was made (Appendix 8) this part of the park was primarily in agricultural use, although a strip of parkland was apparently left to either side of the Lime Avenue. A woodland known as The Chase was shown adjacent to the Mount on nineteenth and early twentieth century maps but was felled and ploughed out in the post-World War II period as were the strips of parkland next to the Lime Avenue.
- 4.98 The significance of this area is mainly historical, as the remnants of the late eighteenth or early nineteenth-century extension of Gilston Park including the former drive called the Lime Avenue and the associated lodge. The lodge is an attractive building and has historical interest for its associations with Gilston Park, but has no particular architectural merit or distinction.
- 4.99 The setting of this area includes the Mount and the older park boundary to the north. To the south is the busy Eastwick Road with Harlow clearly visible in the distance. Topography means that there is no easy intervisibility with Gilston Park house, which lies over a slight ridge. The setting makes a generally neutral contribution to the setting of this area, although it is more positive nearer to the Mount.
- 4.100 The heritage value of this area is generally Very Low, with the exception of the area

south of the Mount Moated Site, which is Low.

### **Receptors within 1km of the Site Boundary**

#### ***Group 1: Widford Conservation Area***

- 4.101 This group includes the Widford Conservation Area. The village is medieval in original and was originally a scattered linear settlement along High Street/ Hunsdon Road and Ware Road. The earliest buildings are 17th and 18th century, but much of the conservation area is a 19th century with some modern infill. The parish church is situated close to the westernmost extent of the conservation area, along the north side of Ware Road, slightly isolated from the rest of the village. The remainder of the listed buildings in the conservation area arranged in a broadly triangular layout centred on the convergence of Ware Road and Hunsdon Road, which merge to form High Street progressing to the north. There is later infill in the northern end of the space between the two roads.
- 4.102 The Parish Church of St John the Baptist (grade II\*) is a landmark building in the westernmost part of the conservation area, forming a group with the Old Rectory and Widfordbury Farm (both Grade II) outside the core of the village. The church dates predominantly to the 14th century, with some early 12th century fragments incorporated. It was restored in the late 19th century by GE Pritchett but retains earlier detailing, including 13th century ironwork on the doors and a font of c.1420. The 16th or early 17th red brick century western boundary walls of the churchyard are also listed at Grade II\*, and are a remnant of a Tudor house built on the Site following the dissolution of the monasteries. This gives them considerable historic and architectural interest, as recognised in their grade II\* designation. The Mary Field monument in the churchyard (Grade II), of interest for its design value and age, dates to 1792.
- 4.103 The Old Rectory (Grade II) was built in the 18th century and extended in the early 19th century. It has historic and architectural value as 18th century structures closely associated with the church, and for the quality and survival of their own form. Widfordbury Farm (Grade II) is a 17th century timber framed roughcast house, since subdivided. The associated farm buildings are later. It has historic and architectural interest as a good example of the local 17th century vernacular, and as an attractive feature in the group with the church.
- 4.104 There is a group of listed buildings on the north side of Nether Road all listed at Grade II, including Nos 1 2 Elia Cottages, Nether hall and its associated barns, Nos 1-Nether Street, Endways, and Honeysuckle Cottage. They are built in the local vernacular style, dating to the 17th and 18th centuries, with timber frames and plaster/weatherboarded elevations. They have historic and architectural value as good

surviving examples of vernacular houses and farm buildings in this part of Hertfordshire, and form an attractive group in the north east of the conservation area.

- 4.105 There is another group of listed buildings on the east side of Hunsdon Road/ High Street, also all listed at Grade II, including Barnfield, Chestnut Tree Cottage, Netherton House, Priory Row, Wanns Cottage, Priory Farm House and associated barns and stables, Adams Farm and associated barns and stables, The House of Orange, Bullards, Nos 1 and 2 Sylvesters opposite Bell Inn, Yew Tree Cottages and Hillside Cottages.
- 4.106 They are good examples of local vernacular buildings, consisting predominantly of houses and farm buildings dating to the 17th and 18th centuries, some with 19th century additions. The buildings are predominantly timber framed, with a mixture of brick, plaster and weatherboarding to their external elevations. The exceptions are Chestnut Tree Cottage and Netherton House, both slightly later in date with red brick elevations, and Gothic and Regency detailing respectively. Individually, the buildings are good examples of local vernacular construction, and collectively illustrate the development of the area and early streetscape. The group makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.
- 4.107 Another group of assets is located on Ware Road in the west of the conservation area. Widford JMI School (grade II) dates to circa 1875, and was probably designed by GE Pritchett, of nearby Bishops Stortford. It is grey brick with polychrome brick and terracotta dressings, forming a Gothic style local board school. It has historic and architectural interest as a late 19th century Board School, and is an attractive feature in the conservation area.
- 4.108 Westbury and North View Cottages (all Grade II) are 17th or 18th century dwellings with timber frames and plastered brick walls in the local vernacular. They have historic and architectural interest as good examples of houses of this period. Ash View Rest Home, The Lodge and the Coach House (all Grade II) are built in brick, with 19th century additions for the Pawle family, a local family of note, whose association with the properties contributes to its historic interest. The Lodge was formerly a dairy associated with the house, and later converted to a house.
- 4.109 Goddards, Little Goddards, Little Goddards Cottage, The Bell Inn, Swan House and Barn, Wheelwrights, Porch Cottage Widford Stores, The Old Cottage, Bourne Cottage and the K6 telephone kiosk outside post office (all Grade II) are located on the west side of High Street/ Hunsdon Road. They form a varied group of buildings at the village centre, dating predominantly to the 17th and 18th centuries, with most altered during the 20th century. The elevational treatments consist of weatherboarding and plaster, with some use of brick. Goddards forms a landmark in

the group, and was formerly used as the Young Gentlewomen's Academy in the early 19th century. The building has further historical value through associations with literary figures of note, including Charles and Mary Lamb. The receptors have historic and architectural value as good examples of residential and farm buildings in the local area from a variety of periods, and collectively illustrate the development of the streetscape and make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

- 4.110 Abbotts Farmhouse (Grade II) is at the south of the conservation area, to the south of Abbotts Lane. It is a late medieval house with a timber frame and roughcast elevations, and is possibly originally the house of John Abbott, who was resident in 1435. The house has a large, early 20th century extension to the west, built for Francis Pawle. It has historic and architectural value as a 16th century dwelling house with multiple phases of alteration, and by virtue of its association with various local figures of note.
- 4.111 Within the conservation area, the built development including the many listed buildings and the later infill, forms the setting for the individual assets. Infill development and vegetation generally blocks views outwards from the village. There are views north from the Church of St John the Baptist which make a positive contribution to its appreciation as a church associated with a rural parish, but views to the south and east are limited by interposing mature vegetation and copses. The wider setting of Group 1 is rural in character, consisting predominantly of arable fields and sporadic areas of woodland that makes a positive contribution to the setting of the conservation area as a whole.
- 4.112 The heritage value of the Parish Church of St John the Baptist is High. The remainder of the receptors in group 1 are of Medium heritage value.

### ***Group 2: Hunsdon Village***

- 4.113 Group 2 consists of the Hunsdon Conservation Area including approximately 28 listed buildings. It is situated adjacent to the western boundary of the Site, in close proximity to Hunsdon Airfield, which is discussed elsewhere in this chapter. A very small part of the Conservation Area is within the Site.
- 4.114 Tanners (grade II\*) is a 16th century timber framed hall house in an H plan, which has since been subdivided into two separate houses. It is of particular historic and architectural interest as a good example of a 16th century hall house.
- 4.115 The east range of the Fox and Hounds Public House (grade II) was rebuilt in the 18th

century, and converted for use as a pub in the 1830s. It retains some historic features to the interior, including an 18th century cornice to the ground floor rooms, and a marble fire surround.

- 4.116 The remaining listed buildings along High Street comprise Number 15, set back beside number 17 (grade II), Spellers Cottages (grade II), Hunsdon Stores (grade II), Down House (grade II) and The Pump House (grade II). These are 16th and 17th century dwellings with timber frames and plaster elevations, which have undergone later alterations. They are situated along High Street.
- 4.117 2 and 4, 21, 24 and 26 Drury Lane (grade II) and Orchards (grade II) are dwelling houses along Drury Lane. The houses date to the 17th and 18th centuries, built in roughcast with timber frames, and set over two storeys. They are of historic and architectural interest as good examples of 17th and 18th century dwelling houses in the local vernacular style.
- 4.118 The village pump and surrounding railing (grade II) dates to the early 19th century. It has historic and architectural (design) value as part of the early 19th century village infrastructure, located in the centre of the junction between High Street and Drury Lane.
- 4.119 The Cottage Tinkwood Cottage (grade II), Brook Cottage Post Office (grade II), The Old Post Cottage (grade II), Bela Down House (grade II), Shuttles (grade II), White Horses (grade II), 1 and 3, 20, 29-39, 34, 41, 53 High Street (grade II), Netherhall (grade II), Village Hall (grade II) and The Crown Public House on the corner of Acorn Street (grade II) line High Street and Drury Lane.
- 4.120 The buildings consist predominantly of 18th and 19th century houses of two storeys, constructed with timber frames, roughcast elevations (except for Netherhall, which has polychromatic brickwork) and old red tile roofs, and form the core of the conservation area. The Village Hall is a converted school building with adjoining houses, and the Crown Public House was formerly three 19th century houses, converted in the 1920s. Shuttles and the Old Post Cottage are slightly earlier in date, and the latter has red brick to the front elevation. It should be noted that Netherhall is different from Nether Hall in Group 1.
- 4.121 The receptors possess historic and architectural value as evidence of the early development in Hunsdon, and make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.
- 4.122 This group has an open, rural setting amongst arable fields. To the immediate south east is Hunsdon Air Field, which is a flat open plain which contains a number of

scheduled monuments dating to the Second World War, and makes a positive contribution to the setting of the receptors. The village has a predominantly inward-focussed character, centring on the intersection between Drury Lane and High Street, and the wider landscape makes a limited positive contribution to its setting. In our professional judgment, taking into account the methodology at Section 2.2, the heritage value of this group is High, owing to the antiquity of the settlement, its coherent and recognisably ancient form, and the extensive collection of historic buildings and related features.

***Group 3: Farms west of Gangies Hill***

- 4.123 Group 3 consists of seven listed buildings situated along the north side of an unnamed road to the west of Gangies Hill. They are constituent parts of three farms; Stonards, Carters and Fryers.
- 4.124 The listed buildings at Fryars are Fryars and detached bake house 5 metres to north (grade II), Farm building at Fryars 30 metres east of house (grade II). The farm is believed to be the centre of the 13th century Manor of Freres, though the farm buildings surviving date to the 18th and 19th centuries. Carters (grade II) and Farm buildings at Carters 20 metres east of house (grade II) are situated to the east, and date to the 18th and 19th centuries. The receptors at both farms are good examples of the local vernacular, with timber frames and weatherboarding.
- 4.125 Stonards (grade II) and the barn 20 metres north (grade II) date to circa 1700, with the Granary at Stonards 50 metres north north east of Farmhouse (grade II) added at some point during the 18th century. The house is red brick, and the barn timber framed with weatherboarding in the local vernacular style.
- 4.126 The receptors are of historic and architectural interest as good examples of historic agricultural buildings in this part of Hertfordshire.
- 4.127 The buildings are set within working farm complexes, including modern buildings, which relate to their historic function and make a positive contribution to their setting. The wider setting of the buildings is largely rural, located adjacent to a quiet, unnamed country lane to the south. The lane includes mature vegetation, and is lined with tall hedgerows. The surrounding landscape makes a limited positive contribution to the heritage value and appreciation of the receptors.
- 4.128 The heritage value of this group is Medium.

***Group 4: North West of High Wych***

- 4.129 Group 4 contains two listed buildings located to the north west of the core of High

Wych, to the east of the Site. These are the Manor of Groves (grade II) and Jeffs (grade II).

- 4.130 The Manor of Groves is a neo-classical style country house, remodelled in the early 19th century, and now in use as a hotel. It retains its historic interior, including a cantilevered stair and modillion plaster cornices. The receptor has historic and architectural interest as a remodelled country house, situated within its former park, which comprises its setting and makes a positive contribution to its heritage value.
- 4.131 Jeffs is situated to the south west of the Manor of Groves. The receptor is a 17th century house, with two storeys arranged in an H plan form, and weatherboarding to west ends. It has historic and architectural interest as a good example of a house of this date, and of the local vernacular. Its setting is contained within its private garden, which is bordered by tall hedges, occluding much of the surrounding landscape.
- 4.132 The heritage value of this group is Medium.

***Group 5: High Wych Conservation Area***

- 4.133 Group 5 is formed of the High Wych Conservation Area, which is the subject of an Appraisal adopted by the council in 2014.
- 4.134 The Conservation Area contains 181 listed buildings, including a mixture of 17th and 18th century buildings and a high number dating to the later 19th century, which contribute to the understanding of its multi-phased development and historic village character. Plot boundaries and roads are frequently lined with mature hedges, and there is sporadic tree planting through the area, which contributes to its rural character.
- 4.135 The Parish Church of St James the Great (grade II\*) forms a landmark building in the conservation area, which was built in 1860-1861 by GE Pritchett in the Early English Style, with uncoursed knapped flint walls and a red tile roof. The church has a round tower which forms a focal point in the conservation area. It is noted in Pevsner (1977) as being "as original in its handling of Gothic forms as anything in the Art Nouveau of forty years later". It retains features of note to the interior, including its original painted decoration and red and white brickwork. The church has considerable historic and architectural interest as a good example of a Gothic style mid-19th century church, and for its association with GE Pritchett.
- 4.136 The primary setting of the church is comprised of its churchyard, which is a green open space with some tree planting, bounded by a low wall to High Wych Road, and hedges to the north, east and south. The hamlet of High Wych, for which it is the parish church, makes a positive contribution to its setting, having a small, rural

character.

- 4.137 The conservation area contains a number of designated other heritage receptors, of which, those discussed below fall within the study area.
- 4.138 Bakers Farm House (grade II) and the Stable block at Bakers Farm adjacent to west end (grade II) consist of an 18th century dwelling house with a timber frame and rough plaster, and its associated 19th century stable block. The farm house is of historic and architectural value as a good example of an 18th century house, and has further group value with the adjacent stable block, which was constructed for a local race horse owner, EB Barnard. It consists of an L shaped block in Arts and Crafts style with single store ranges to the east and west and a 1.5 storey centre. The stable block is of historic and architectural interest as a good example of a late 19th century stable block, and for its association with a local figure of note.
- 4.139 The conservation area has a mixed setting, with 20th century residential development forming part of the settlement of High Wych to the east, and agricultural land forming the wider landscape to the north, east and south. These allow for some distant views west from the conservation area, which take in the eastern fringe of the Site. The rural setting makes a positive contribution to the setting of the conservation area.
- 4.140 In our professional judgment, the heritage value of this group is High, due to the concentration of listed buildings within the conservation area, and its coherent historic form.

***Group 6: Redericks Farm***

- 4.141 Group 6 is situated to the east of the Site, and consists of three listed buildings associated with Redericks Farm. These are the Aisled Barn 12 yards east of the house (grade II\*), Redericks Farm House (grade II) and Stable 30 yards south of the house (grade II).
- 4.142 The asset with the greatest value in the group is the Aisled Barn 12 yards east of the house (grade II\*), which consists of a five bay aisled barn, possibly dating to the 15th/16th century. The stable was added in the 18th century and Redericks Farm House is a 17th century dwelling with 19th century alterations. The receptors have historic and architectural value as good examples of farm buildings of varying date.
- 4.143 The receptors have a predominantly open, rural setting, consisting of arable farm land with traditional hedgerow boundary treatments. Copses to the north and south limit the visual relationship with the surrounding land. To the south east is the Temple Fields Industrial Park, though this is partially occluded by a tree belt flanking the River Stort. The rural setting makes a positive contribution to the appreciation of the

receptors as farm buildings.

- 4.144 The Aisled Barn is of High heritage value, and the remainder of the receptors are of Medium heritage value.

***Group 7: Harlow Roman Temple***

- 4.145 Group 7 consists of Harlow Roman Temple (Scheduled Monument), which is situated to the south east of the Site, approximately 600m from the site boundary, and is believed to have been built on the site of an earlier Celtic temple. The outline of the structure is demarcated at ground level with paving slabs. The Temple is set within an industrial estate, which prevents intervisibility with the wider landscape. The group has no visual or other setting relationship with the land at the Site, and thus is scoped out of further assessment.

- 4.146 The heritage value of this group is High.

***Group 8: Mark Hall North Conservation Area***

- 4.147 Group 8 consists of the Mark Hall North Conservation Area, which is situated to the south of the Site. It is not presently the subject of an Appraisal. The conservation area is the former site of a Jacobean country house, known as the Markshall Estate, which was demolished in 1950. Its heritage value is derived from two principal phases of development; the historic estate, and the 20th century redevelopment of the area with residential properties.

- 4.148 The conservation area contains seven buildings included on the statutory list, of which six are grade II and one is grade I listed.

- 4.149 The Church of St Mary the Virgin (grade I) is a landmark building within the conservation area, situated at its southern extent along First Avenue. It forms a 12th century former parish church with later additions during the 15th and 16th centuries. The Church is situated adjacent to Mark Hall Park, which forms the main area of open space within the conservation area, consisting of a grassed area with some tree planting and a children's play area. To the west and north east of the park is 20th century residential development, with Harlow Museum to the south east.

- 4.150 Harlow TOC H (grade II), Wall from Stable Gateway along Muskham Road (grade II) and Triple Range of Outbuildings, formerly house attached to stable block at Mark Hall (grade II) are associated with the former Markshall Estate. They date to the 17th and 18th century, and consist of is a triple range of outbuildings, formerly a house, and a red brick wall which were attached to the stable block at Mark Hall. Harlow TOC H dates to circa 1700, and is a red brick and weatherboard two storey building

formerly associated with Mark Hall. They are of historic and architectural interest as remnants of an earlier phase of development in the area.

- 4.151 The lawn and attached wall to south (grade II), the lawn and attached walls and terrace (grade II) and Contrapuntal Forms Sculpture (grade II) date to the mid-20th century, and are 1950-1951 blocks of flats, by Frederick Gibberd. The Lawn is a ten storey block of flats by Frederick Gibberd, with an irregular trapezoid plan. It was the first residential tower built in Britain, and was granted a Ministry of Health housing medal in 1952. The Contrapuntal Forms Sculpture is a work by Barbara Hepworth, which possesses design value and is an important piece of public art in the conservation area. These receptors derive their historic and architectural value from their illustration of the post-war early development of Harlow new town, and for their association with Gibberd, who was consultant architect planner for Harlow. Public art, including the Hepworth work, was an important part of the overall scheme for the area.
- 4.152 The conservation area and receptors within are separated from the Site by the Temple Fields industrial park, and the railway line. The heritage value of the Church of St Mary the Virgin is High. The heritage value of the remaining receptors in this group is Medium.

***Group 9: Town Park/ Nettlewell Cross Conservation Area***

- 4.153 Group 9 is situated to the south of the Site, within the urban development of Harlow. It consists of the Town Park/ Nettlewell Cross Conservation Area, and five listed buildings within its boundary. The conservation area is focussed on Harlow Town Park, a large area of designated open space designed originally as a 'village green', situated on formerly agricultural land associated with Spurriers Farm. The land was purchased by the Council and designed as a public park by Dame Sylvia Crowe, opening in 1957. The park is an attractive landscaped green public space with mature trees, a café and other amenities, surrounded by 20th century residential development. It is the subject of a management plan published by the Council in 2015 (updated 2016).
- 4.154 The earliest buildings in the conservation area are Hoppits (grade II), Marshgate Farmhouse (grade II) and The Greyhound Public House (grade II), which are timber framed buildings dating originally to the 16th century, with a later Victorian extension to the latter. Hill House Farmhouse (grade II) is a late 17th century red brick building with three chimneystacks, and 6 School Lane (grade II) is a late 19th century house. The receptors have historic and architectural value as examples of earlier phases of development in this part of Hertfordshire, and make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

- 4.155 The group is separated from the Site by development in the north of Harlow, including Harlow Town Railway Station, and the busy single carriageway at Edinburgh Way. The heritage value of this group is Medium.

***Group 10: Former Gilbeys Headquarters***

- 4.156 This group is indicated on the map as a non-designated heritage receptor as it is included in the Essex Historic Environment Record (EHER 31651 and 31652), but the buildings have been demolished. The heritage value of this group is Nil.

***Group 11: Harlow Station***

- 4.157 This group is comprised of Harlow Town Station including platform Structures (grade II), which is situated to the south of the Site, at the northern fringe of the development of urban Harlow. The station building and platform structures built in 1959-1960 by HH Powell, the Regional Architect for the Eastern Region, along with project architects. It was published in the Architects' Journal in 1960, described as "a punctuation mark in a linear system at the point at which it meets the outside world". The station is clad in light grey brick, with a central double height concourse linked to two platforms by an overbridge. It has historic and architectural value through its association with Harlow New Town, and for the quality of its design. The association with HH Powell further contributes to this interest.
- 4.158 The station is set adjacent to 20th century development to the south, including a Travelodge, and a number of takeaways and other amenities with accommodation above, which make a positive contribution to the sense of the station as a destination, and contextualises it firmly within the development of the 20th century new town. The heritage value of this group is Medium.

***Group 12: Burntmill Lane***

- 4.159 This group is formed by 46 Burntmill Lane (grade II). It is situated to the north of the River Stort, adjacent to the Moorhen Marina, which is immediately south of the receptor.
- 4.160 The building is an early 19th century cottage ornée, consisting of a single storey in red brick with grey brick dressings. It was formerly the Lodge to Terlings Park house, which has since been demolished. The receptor is of historic and architectural interest as an attractive surviving example of a 19th century lodge.
- 4.161 No 46 Burntmill Lane is set within a private garden, with boundary planting demarcating its extent. The wider setting is heavily altered; the country house with which it was historically associated has long since been demolished, and to the north

and east of the property is a large, modern housing development at Terlings Park. The eastern boundary with Burntmill Lane is planted with a thick tree boundary. The loss of its original context detracts from its significance. Its heritage value is Medium.

**Group 13: North of Little Parndon**

- 4.162 This group of receptors is situated to the south of the Site, at the northern fringe of Harlow, adjacent to the River Stort at Parndon Lock. The group consists of three listed buildings and two scheduled monuments. The Site of Parndon Hall (Scheduled Monument) and Little Parndon Moated Site (Scheduled Monument) are located on the north and south of the River Stort, and are below ground features, visible in the land, surrounded by trees. The Essex Historic Environment Record indicates that the monuments survive as two parts of a moated manorial site with earthworks, including the north, east and south sides of the moat.
- 4.163 Parndon Mill House (grade II) is a three storey brick house dating to the mid-18th century. The house has historic and architectural interest as a good example of a 17th century dwelling. It is closely associated with the Little Parndon Watermill (grade II), which is a mid to late 19th century steam and water mill, built in whitewashed brick and standing four storeys in height. It retains its water turbine to the interior. The mill has historic and architectural (design) value as a good example of a 19th century watermill. The Church of St Mary (grade II) dates to the 19th century, with high Victorian trefoil windows, and an early-English style arch to a south-east priest's door.
- 4.164 The setting of the receptors is somewhat altered by development to the south, including industrial units to the north of Elizabeth Way, and a car dealership adjacent to the west end of the church. The River Stort is a prominent feature in the setting of the group, forming an attractive canalised waterway with its towpath. To the north, the wider setting of the receptors is predominantly rural, with fields bounded by hedgerows. The A414 is between the Site and the receptors, and is a busy traffic route through the area.
- 4.165 The heritage value of the Site of Parndon Hall and Little Parndon Moated Site is High. Parndon Mill House, the Church of St Mary and Little Parndon Watermill are of Medium heritage value.

**Group 14: Roydon Lea**

- 4.166 Group 14 consists of Roydon Lea Farmhouse (grade II), situated to the south of the Site. The farmhouse dates to the 17th century, with 18th and 19th century additions. It has two stock brick chimney stacks, and three sashes under brick arches to the first storey. It has historic and architectural value as a 17th century farmhouse with later

alterations.

- 4.167 The setting of the group is comprised of assorted farm buildings, many of which are brick with corrugated roofs. The immediate setting of the farmhouse is planted with mature vegetation, which occludes much of the surrounding landscape. It is separated from the Site by the A414, which is a busy transport route in the wider setting of the farmhouse. The heritage value of this group is Medium.

**Group 15: Briggens**

- 4.168 Group 15 is focussed on Briggens Park (grade II RPG), to the south west of the Site, and contains a number of listed buildings.
- 4.169 Briggens Park was added to the Register of Historic Parks and Gardens in 2009. It dates to the 18th century, and retains features added in 1708 by Charles Bridgeman with later Edwardian additions by Lord Hunsdon. It has subsequently been adapted following the use of the building as a hotel, and part of the park is now a golf course. The park is entered from the north, along a tree lined approach which dates originally to 1720, and was replanted in the 20th century. The receptor derives its historic and architectural (design) value from its association with Charles Bridgeman, later Royal Gardener, and as a good example of a designed 18th century landscape, albeit with later additions.
- 4.170 The landmark building within the park is Briggens House Hotel and attached upper terrace and tank at west, along a drive, 300m south of the lodge (grade II), which dates originally to 1719, by mason Christopher Cass, and has 19th and early 20th century alterations. The receptor is a former country house, now a hotel, facing west, and set within its own landscaped park, and has historic and architectural value as a good example of a 17th century country house.
- 4.171 The remaining receptors are ancillary structures associated with the house. The kitchen garden walls, central sundial pillar and two gates at Briggens House Hotel 100m east of house (grade II) date to the 18th century, and comprise red brick walls and a Portland stone pillar. These are believed to date from the 1770s, as part of the works carried out for the Blackmore family. The stable block at Briggens House Hotel (grade II) also dates to the late 18th century. It forms a rectangular block in grey brick, and to the interior, retains two oak newel posts, which are retained from an earlier structure and are good examples of Jacobean carving.
- 4.172 The Lodge at Briggens House Hotel and gates and gate piers at Briggens House Hotel 300m north of house (grade II) date to the early 19th century. The gates and gate piers have neo-classical style cast iron gates and piers at the entrance to the

north drive to the house. The Lodge is a single storey gate house in grey brick, situated at the northern extent of the park, close to the junction with the A414. These receptors form part of the approach to the historic house. The west terrace walls, steps and seat at Briggens House Hotel 20m south of house (grade II) form the terrace walls and steps to the Briggens House building. These date to circa 1908, and are built in plum brick.

- 4.173 The receptors have historic and architectural value as part of the historic development of the Briggens Estate, and collectively possess group value.
- 4.174 The setting of the group is primarily contained within the Briggens Park, which is an attractive designed historic landscape, later adapted to accommodate a gold course. To the north of the park is the A414, a busy main road which is a negative feature in the setting of the park and lodge. The wider setting of the park is rural, with the River Stort forming the eastern boundary, and some development including Roydon village to the south, with the southern boundary and gates and gate lodges close to Royston station. This contributes to their setting as part of a transition from the village outside to the enclosed landscape within the gates. The heritage value of the receptors in this group is Medium.

***Group 16: Hunsdon Mill***

- 4.175 Group 16 is situated to the south west of the Site, to the east of Briggens Park, in close proximity to the River Stort and A414. The group comprises five designated heritage assets.
- 4.176 Mead Lodge (grade II) is a two storey 18th century house with mid-19th century remodelling. It has a timber frame and plaster construction, and retains features such as its Doric pillared porch. The coach house block at Mead Lodge 10 metres south of house (grade II) was added in the early 19th century and has two storeys with a white weather boarded range.
- 4.177 Hunsdon Mill House with attached stables, coach house and retaining walls (grade II) was built in the 17th century with 16th century moulded beams. The eastern range dates to the 17th century, with 19th century ranges to the west. Hunsdon Pound House (grade II) is two combined mill cottages which date originally to the 18th or early 19th century. The bridge, abutments and base of the former watermill at Hunsdon Mill House 25m south of house (grade II) consists of a 17th or 18th century bridge in red brick with two arches. The base of the watermill retains historic features including the intake sluices, 19th century cast iron raising gear and three millstones. The receptors form an attractive group at the river crossing. The receptors have historic and architectural interest as evidence of an earlier phase of development in

the area, and as good examples of their constituent parts. The 19th century watermill complex and earlier bridge possesses design value by virtue of their function.

- 4.178 The setting of this group of receptors is closely associated with the River Stort, which runs from the south west to the east of the group. The wider setting has been altered by the construction of the A414, which is a busy traffic route lined with tree planting, and is a detracting feature in the setting of the assets to the north. The heritage value of the receptors within this group is Medium.

***Group 17: Hunsdonbury- Acorn Street and Eastwick Road***

- 4.179 This group is situated to the west of the Site, close to its boundary. It consists of development to the south of Hunsdon, arranged predominantly along Eastwick Road and Acorn Street to the west of the Site in a broadly linear arrangement to the east of the B180, along Acorn Street and Church Lane.
- 4.180 Rosemary Cottage, Rose Cottage and Rosella (grade II) are a former 17th century house which was subdivided during the 19th century. It has a timber framed structure with old red tile roofs and plaster exterior. The public pump 12 metres north of Rosemary Cottage (grade II) is cast iron and dates to the 19th century, situated adjacent to the former house, with which it has group value.
- 4.181 Farm Cottage, the similar range extending to north and the stable and archway joined to the north west corner at Hunsdon Stud Farm (grade II) is a range of stables, with the eastern portion dating to the 17th century, and an early 19th century northern range. The eastern portion are believed to be the former stables to Hunsdon House, prior to the construction of a later block.
- 4.182 Copthall Farmhouse (grade II) is a two storey 17th century house, in an Artisan Mannerist style. Spellers (grade II) and Nine Ashes Farmhouse opposite the lane to Hunsdonbury (grade II) are early 19th century houses. Copthall Farmhouse is faced in colour washed brick with a plastered upper floor. Nine Ashes Farmhouse incorporates part of an earlier, 16th century structure which was built for Sir Thomas Forster (a figure of local note who is buried in the nearby Church of St Dunstan), and later demolished by Nicholas Calvert in the early 19th century.
- 4.183 The remaining receptors in the group are of varied date, but are all associated with Nine Ashes Farm. The west barn at Nine Ashes Farm 65m north west of house (grade II) and Dovecote at Nine Ashes Farm north north east of house (grade II) date to the 16th century, with the latter forming an octagonal brick structure, subsequently been converted for use as a farm cottage.
- 4.184 The walls, gates and piers of an enclosure at Orchard House along roadside and

surrounding the property (grade II) form an enclosure bounded by 16th century red brick walls, which was formerly a walled garden associated with Nine Ashes. The gates, piers, garden gate and frontage wall at Nine Ashes Farm 45m west of house (grade II) are a feature of the original late 16th century house. The stables at Nine Ashes Farm 40m west north west of house (grade II), which date originally to the late 16th century, with a later 18th century frontage, form a square single storey structure in red brick, with timber framed, weather boarded partitions within to create twelve loose boxes.

- 4.185 The east barn at Nine Ashes Farm 15m north west of dovecote (grade II) dates to the 17th century, and has seven bays, with a timber frame and weather boarded red brick. It has historic and architectural interest as a good example of the local vernacular. The granary at Nine Ashes Farm 24m north of Dovecote (grade II) dates to the late 18th/early 19th century, and is a single storey timber framed structure with weatherboarding. The gate piers date to the 18th century, and are part of the earlier 16th century frontage wall, with a 19th century wrought iron gate. The wall is red brick with English bond brickwork and black diapering. The receptor has historic and architectural interest as a 26th century boundary wall. The shelter shed at Nine Ashes Farm 60m north west of house (grade II) and north west implement shed at Nine Ashes Farm 70m north north west of house (grade II) are early 19th century structures. They span 5-6 bays with brick plinths, timber frames and weatherboarding, and are good examples of an early 19th century farm building in the local vernacular style.
- 4.186 The assets have group value derived from their association with Nine Elms Farm, and historic and architectural value as good examples of vernacular farm buildings of various periods.
- 4.187 The group is situated to the south of Hunsdon village, amongst sporadic areas of tree planting interspersed with small cultivated fields. The receptors within are spread out, with mature hedges and deciduous vegetation forming a common boundary marker. This limits visibility across the wider landscape, which rises slightly towards the west. The quiet, rural setting makes a positive contribution to the appreciation and heritage value of the designated assets. The heritage value of the receptors in this group is Medium.

***Group 18: South of Hunsdonbury***

- 4.188 Group 18 forms part of the same settlement as 17, but it is situated to the south of Hunsdonbury, a lane which links Church Lane to the east with the B180 to the west.
- 4.189 Hunsdonbury (grade II) is a former country house, rebuilt in 1832, and partially

demolished in the mid-20th century. The house is two storeys in white brick with stone dressings, with a vaulted stucco cloister to the east. The receptor was built as the Rectory to the church, and is notable for its Gothic style and well preserved early 19th century interiors.

- 4.190 The other receptors have group value with the property by virtue of their historical associations with Hunsdonbury, for which they were 19th century ancillary structures in the Gothic style. The Gate House (grade II) was formerly a wing of Hunsdonbury, which was separated following the demolition of the central portion of the building. North Lodge (grade II) is polychromatic brick with a red tiled roof, and the East Lodge (grade II) has roughcast elevations. Mistletoe House the coach house (grade II) is a converted stable block and coach house in red brick, arranged around two former stable yards. The buildings possess historic and architectural interest as a Gothic-style estate buildings of this period.
- 4.191 The Mock ruin in garden of Longcroft (grade II) dates to circa 1832, and is a mock ruin of a Gothic style medieval church tower with diagonal corner buttresses, in the garden of Hunsdonbury. The building has historic and architectural interest as a 19th century garden feature designed to form a group with Hunsdonbury and the gatehouse.
- 4.192 The setting of the properties is mixed, with extensive woodland to the west, which creates a secluded, enclosed character for the area. To the east is the core of Hunsdon, which has a more village-centre feel, with residential properties within defined plot boundaries visible across agricultural fields. The surrounding area is predominantly rural, which makes a positive contribution to the setting of the receptors. The assets in this group are of Medium heritage value.

***Group 19: Hunsdon House***

- 4.193 This group is located to the south of Hunsdonbury, to the west of the Site and to the north of its south western extent. It is focussed on Hunsdon House and the receptors in its immediate environs.
- 4.194 Hunsdon House to east of Parish Church (grade I) was first built in the mid-15th century for William Oldhall, and formed a moated brick tower house. The property reverted to the Crown following the death of John Oldhall at the Battle of Bosworth in 1485, and was later altered first for Henry VIII from 1527-1530. This phase of alteration saw the house converted to a palatial Tudor property, and was home to Mary I, and Prince Edward, who famously had his portrait painted with the house in the background.

- 4.195 As a Tudor royal residence, the house was associated with extensive hunting grounds, and was the centre of the honour of Hunsdon. Queen Elizabeth I later granted the house to Sir Henry Carey, who was created Lord Hunsdon. The Carey family subsequently carried out further alterations in the early 17th century, and the moat later filled in.
- 4.196 The house retains Classical 19th century interiors to the ground floor, with a chimneypiece dating to 1882.
- 4.197 Hunsdon house has exceptional historical interest through its association with the Tudor royal family, as evidenced by its presence in the backdrop of William Scrots' portrait of Edward VI (1546/1547). It also has very high architectural interest as a 15th century country house adapted for use as a royal residence, albeit subject to later alterations.
- 4.198 Hunsdon House Lodge 280m north of Church (grade II) dates to the mid-19th century, and is a Gothic style lodge, one and a half storeys in height, built in red and black brick. It has historic and architectural interest derived from its function as a 19th century gatehouse associated with Hunsdon House, and from its Gothic style.
- 4.199 Hunsdon Deer Park is included in the Hertfordshire Historic Environment Record (HHER 6551) as a medieval- post medieval deer park. Hunsdon Park was first enclosed in the mid thirteenth century by Henry Engayne, lord of Hunsdon manor at that time. The extent of the park is not known at this date, but the ditch to the north of Hunsdon house may have been part of its boundary. The park was extended under Richard Duke of York (later Richard III) in 1446.
- 4.200 Henry VIII is known to have hunted here whilst staying at Hunsdon, and it is believed that there were three parks in the area at this time: an 'old park', a 'new park' and 'Goodmanneshyde Park', with the latter two probably established between 1526 and 1529. The importance of the park is illustrated by the presence of a brass dedicated to park-keeper James Gray (d.1591) in St Dunstan's Church. They are believed to have later been disparked, and cartographic evidence suggests that the area was in use as agricultural land in the 18th century.
- 4.201 The exact location of the park is unknown, but is discussed more in Appendix 7 (Site History). The park is included here as an undesignated heritage receptor by virtue of its historic association with Hunsdon House.
- 4.202 The Parish Church of St Dunstan (Church of England) ¾ mile south of village (grade I) dates to the early 14th century, and is an unaisled church with an early 15th century west tower and spire. During the construction of Hunsdon House circa 1450, the

church was renovated and given a new roof. Later phases of alteration and restoration took place in 1603-17, 1830 and the later 19th century.

- 4.203 Features of interest include the timber porch, which is the oldest in the country, and 15th century nave roof. The interior of the church retains a number of features of value, including a 17th century hexagonal pulpit and octagonal font, and are a number of monuments which make a positive contribution to its heritage value, including 16th century recessed wall monument to Sir Thomas Foster, a brass on the chancel wall dated 1495, and a number of 18th century mural monuments.
- 4.204 A number of 18th century monuments in the associated churchyard are designated grade II, and possess historic and architectural (design) value as attractive, well-crafted memorials which form a group in the setting of the church. These are the Taylor Monument in Hunsdon Churchyard 6m south east of chancel (grade II), Campbell Monument in Hunsdon Churchyard in the angle of chancel and south chapel (grade II), Walker Monument in Hunsdon Churchyard next to stables north north east of chancel (grade II) and Mead Monument in Hunsdon Churchyard 23m north of north porch (grade II).
- 4.205 The receptors have a rural setting, south of the village of Hunsdon, and are arranged in close proximity to Church Lane. There are extensive views to the west and south from the Church of St Dunstan, which is bordered by a low brick wall. Hunsdon House is set within its own private garden, which is bordered to the west by a belt of mature, deciduous trees, preventing visibility from the public road. The wider setting consists of agricultural land, interspersed with tree belts and copses. The original deer park with which the property was associated is no longer in evidence in the landscape.
- 4.206 Hunsdon House and the Parish Church of St Dunstan are of Exceptional heritage value for their association with figures and events of national importance. The remaining receptors in this group are of Medium heritage value.

***Group 20: West of Lord's Wood and the Wilderness***

- 4.207 This group is situated to the west of the Site, from which it is separated by a band of woodland to the west of Hunsdon. The group consists of seven designated heritage assets.
- 4.208 Olives Farm House along track 220m from road (grade II\*) is in origin a 15th century timber framed open hall house with a crown post roof, and has 17th century additions including a floor, chimney and kitchen wing. The house takes its name from the Olive family, who obtained land in the parish in 1344. It has considerable historic and architectural interest as a good example of a 15th century hall house with a crown

post roof.

- 4.209 The barn at Olives Farm 55m west south west of the farmhouse (grade II) dates to the 17th century, with a timber frame and weatherboarding over six bays. The stables and attached granary at Olives Farm 45m north west of farmhouse (grade II) form an early 19th century structure consisting of a single storey stable block and two storey projecting brick granary. The stables at Olives Farm 20m north west of the house (grade II) also date to the early 19th century, consisting of the eastern portion of the aforementioned stable and attached granary structure. These are all ancillary structures associated with the historic farm, of historic and architectural interest as good examples of agricultural architecture in the local vernacular.
- 4.210 The Old Bungalow at Olives Farm 90m south south west of house (grade II) is a timber framed early 19th century house with plaster and weatherboarding to the exterior. The house has historic and architectural value as a good example of the local vernacular, and through its association with the complex of buildings at Olives Farm.
- 4.211 Bonningtons (grade II) is a 17th century country house which was altered in 1687 and again in circa 1725. It has a double-pile plan with two storeys to the south front added circa 1900. The house is of historic and architectural interest as a 17th century country house, with later alterations. The garden wall, gates and gate piers at Bonningtons 100m north of house (grade II) date to the 16th or early 17th century, with gates dating to circa 1725. They have historic and architectural (design) value for their illustration of the historic boundaries of the property, and as good examples of a wall and gates of this date.
- 4.212 This group has a rural setting within an area characterised by arable fields interspersed with copses of woodland, and sporadic farms. To the east of the group are a series of copses to the west of Hunsdon which screen views to the east. The B180 forms the main transport link through the area, though the receptors are set back from the road within their own plots. The open setting makes a positive contribution to the setting of the assets. Olives Farm House is of High heritage value. The remaining assets in this group are of Medium value.

***Group 21: West of Briggens***

- 4.213 This group is situated to the west of Briggens Park, to the south west of the Site. The group shares close associations with the receptors within Briggens, though are not contained within the park. The group contains three listed buildings, which are associated with home farm, part of the wider Briggens complex. Briggens Home Farm house and attached wall at east (grade II) consists of a house and attached wall

dating to the late 16th century, with symmetrical late 19th century wings to the rear. The original house retains its 16th century timber frame. It has historic and architectural value as a 16th century dwelling house, albeit with alterations.

- 4.214 The Stables and attached cart house at Briggens Home Farm 30m north north east of house (grade II) is a single storey 18th century stable, refronted in the 19th with the addition of a cart house. The aisled cattle shed at Briggens Home Farm 50m north north west of house (grade II) is a vernacular farm building situated close to the farm house. The cattle shed dates is grey brick with vertical weatherboarding, and has aisles to the interior. Its list entry notes that the receptor derives evidential value from its illustration of the changes in farming during the 19th century.
- 4.215 The assets are situated to the north and west of Briggens Park, with which they take their names and have historical associations as part of a related farmstead. However, their setting is heavily altered, with the use of the farm as a timber yard, and the construction of the A414 to the immediate north, which are negative features in the setting of the assets. The heritage value of this group is Medium.

**Group 22: Stansted Bury**

- 4.216 This group of assets is situated to the south west of the Site, to the west of Briggens. The built assets are located within the Stansted Bury Registered Park, with the exception of the Old Church of St James, which is to the immediate east of the park boundary.
- 4.217 The Old Church of St James (grade I) dates to the 12th century, with flint rubble construction incorporating Roman tiles. The church also has a 13th century font and 15th century crown-post roof, and a 16th century pulpit. The church is now redundant and is in the care of the Churches Conservation Trust. The church has considerable historic and architectural interest as a good example of a 12th century parish church with alterations from subsequent centuries.
- 4.218 The church is contained within a boundary of mature vegetation and trees, which limits visibility over the wider landscape. To the north of the church, a busy traffic interchange has been created between the A414 and B181, the noise from which detracts from the secluded setting of the church.
- 4.219 Stansted Bury (grade II RPG) extends to approximately 25 ha, and was laid out in the 18th century with avenues, creating a partially enclosed circuit ride to the north, separated from the landscape beyond by a tree belt. The park also includes an ice house to the west, and a kitchen garden 30m south east of the house. Within the park are terraces dating to the 16th century, with the remains of a possible canal to the

north of the main terrace. The main approach is now from the west, though this was previously from the south, past the east end of the Church of St James.

- 4.220 Stansted Bury (grade II\*) is the manor house of Stansted, with the oldest part dating to the late 15th century, when it formed part of the Abbey of Waltham, before passing to the Crown in 1531. Alterations were undertaken in the 17th century, including the addition of a further storey with timber frame. The building retains some of its original leaded casements, and a gabled brick range to the east which appears unaltered since 1689. It has considerable historic and architectural interest as a good example of a 17th century manor house, and is set within its landscaped park. The Registered Park contains eight other designated heritage receptors, which are not located within the study area.
- 4.221 The setting of this group is predominantly rural, contained within the Stansted Abbots Park, and the land beyond to the south and east, which is in close proximity to Briggens (grade II RPG). To the north, the setting has been heavily altered by the construction of the A414, which runs close to the northern boundary of the park, which is lined with tree planting. The setting makes a positive contribution to the setting of these assets.
- 4.222 The heritage value of the Parish Church of St James and Stansted Bury is High. The heritage value of Stansted Bury Park is Medium.

***Group 23: Receptors within Urban Harlow***

- 4.223 This group is situated to the south of the Site, within the developed area of Harlow town. It contains a group of assets centred near Parndon Hall. Parndon Hall (grade II) is an Italianate red brick mansion built in 1867 for Joseph Arkwright, grandson of Richard. The building is of interest for its original oak staircase, and friezes depicting members of the Arkwright family. It has historic and architectural interest as a 19th century house built for a member of a notable family, and retains original features to the interior.
- 4.224 The group also includes three barrows; Bowl Barrow 230m north of Harlow Hospital (SM), Bowl Barrow 140m north of Harlow Hospital (SM) and Bowl Barrow 110m north-east of Harlow Hospital (SM). These are prehistoric burial mounds with considerable archaeological value. They are visible as earthworks mounds, varying from 14-30m in diameter, and standing up to 2m in height.
- 4.225 Also in this group is the Meat Porters Sculpture (grade II), which was sculpted in bronze by Ralph Brown for the Harlow Arts Trust between 1956 and 1960. It is part of the scheme of public art implemented across Harlow in the mid-20th century.

- 4.226 This group is contained within the urban development of Harlow, and this setting makes little or no contribution to its heritage value or appreciation.
- 4.227 The heritage value of the bowl barrows 230m north of Harlow Hospital, 140m north of Harlow Hospital and 110m north east of Harlow Hospital is High. The heritage value of the remaining receptors is Medium.

***Group 24: Sayes Park Farm***

- 4.228 This group is situated to the east of the Site. Sayes Park farm is not listed but it is in the HER (HHER 9348). It is a model farm built in 1856 for John Hodgson of the Gilston estate as part of his extensive rebuilding of all of the older farms on the estate. It has the typical form of Hodgson estate cottages, with an E-shaped barn complex comprising a higher timber barn and the rear and lower brick projecting ranges. The barn has been altered, with the loss of part of the central range and the infilling of one of the courtyards. The house is in the Gothic style typical of the estate. There is also a pair of estate cottages and several later farm buildings.
- 4.229 This group has some limited architectural and historical significance as an undesignated model farm built for the Gilston estate. The setting is rural and open and contributes to the significance of the assets. The heritage value of this group is Very Low.

## 5.0 SITE CAPACITY FOR DEVELOPMENT

### Introduction

- 5.1 Following the methodology in HEAN3, Step 3, this section assesses the capacity of the Site for development with particular reference to the significance of heritage assets. It relies on the baseline set out in Section 4 above. The Site is broken down into nine sub-areas, shown on the map at Appendix 2. Within these sub-areas, heritage assets have been identified; heritage assets outside the sub-area that have the potential to be affected by development within that area have also been identified as part of this assessment.
- 5.2 The understanding of heritage assets, their significance and setting is based on the baseline in Section 4 above. The baseline included all designated assets within 1km of the Site and all undesignated assets such as buildings in the Sites and Monuments Record within 500m. It is assumed that there will be no change to the fabric of any designated assets.
- 5.3 Assets further than 1km from the Site boundary are not included in the baseline for this assessment, although they have the potential to be affected by development on the Site. Beyond 1km, any impacts will relate to setting only and will be wholly dependent on the forms of development proposed. Therefore, at this stage these impacts cannot be quantified, but given the topography, orientation and position of assets, vegetation and interposing buildings we judge that it is unlikely for there to be any material impacts on assets located more than 1km from the Site.
- 5.4 The Site red line includes, and this section considers, the potential road links to Harlow at the southern edge of the area, but does not consider road links elsewhere such as from Hunsdon or Sawbridgeworth. These would be a matter for further consideration if development were to come forward for relevant areas of the Site.

### Area 1: South West

- 5.5 Area 1 is located in the southwestern part of the Site. It was formerly part of Hunsdon park, and Brickhouse Farm may have been a lodge for the park, but no other park-related features survive. The landscape character is modern arable fields with few hedgerows. There are a few small areas of woodland, none of them designated ancient woodland. Church Lane runs north-south through this area, and the power lines run across the northern part of this area.
- 5.6 Within the area, Brickhouse Farm and its associated barns (both Grade II) are a heritage constraint. Their existing setting is rural, and they stand on rising ground so that they are visible in some longer distance views such as from Church Lane. Their

significance is primarily architectural and historical, and the setting makes a positive contribution to this significance. Subject to suitable buffers and a sympathetic form of development in the area immediately surrounding these assets, development in their setting is not likely to cause unacceptable harm to their overall significance.

- 5.7 In the vicinity of Area 1, key heritage constraints include Eastwick Church (Grade II\*), Eastwick manor (Grade II) and village (buildings listed at Grade II); the two moated sites at Eastwick (Scheduled Monuments); Hunsdon House (Grade I), Hunsdon church (Grade I) and the associated grounds; and Briggens RPG and associated Grade II listed buildings.
- 5.8 Eastwick manor (Grade II), and Eastwick church (Grade II\*) and Eastwick village are located to the east of Area 1. The setting of both the church and the village is rural despite its proximity to the road, and makes a positive contribution to the significance of these assets. Because of the distance, subject to height constraints and appropriate forms of development, development within Area 1 is not likely to cause harm to the setting or significance of the moated sites.
- 5.9 The westernmost of the moated sites is located about 300m from the edge of this area, with the other about 500m away. The setting of the monuments is open. Because of the distance, subject to height constraints and appropriate forms of development, development within Area 1 is not likely to cause harm to the setting or significance of the moated sites.
- 5.10 Hunsdon House (Grade I), Hunsdon church (Grade I), and the associated structures listed at Grade II have an enclosed setting within the house's large grounds. In turn the grounds are well enclosed with trees. Subject to suitable buffers and appropriate height constraints to avoid taller buildings being seen from within the area around the house, development on Area 1 is unlikely to have a significant impact on the setting or significance of these assets.
- 5.11 The northern edge of Briggens (RPG GII) is south of Area 1 on the other side of the busy A414 road; the associated house and its associated structures (Grade II) further away. The park and house are both eighteenth-century and are a well preserved ensemble despite the conversion of much of the park to a golf course. The park at Briggens is separated from Area 1 by the busy road and a thick band of trees; however there may be longer distance views into Area 1 from the high ground within the park near the house to the higher ground within this area. Development in Area 1 would potentially cause change to these views and some harm to this aspect of the significance of the RPG. The immediate views from the house across the park would not change, and the buildings themselves would also be unchanged. The degree of harm to the significance would be dependent on the form and nature of the

development in Area 1, and could be wholly or partially mitigated by ensuring the development respects views from the RPG.

5.12 The heritage sensitivity of Area 1 is Low. It is suitable for development subject to appropriate consideration for the setting and significance of heritage assets.

5.13 Measures to protect heritage assets in this area and allow development to proceed could include:

- Providing suitable buffers around the heritage assets at Brickhouse Farm to protect their setting;
- Restricting heights as appropriate to avoid new buildings being visible from the Hunsdon House or Hunsdon church;
- Considering height and form of development in the setting of the Eastwick moated sites; and
- Considering the form of development visible from the Briggens Park RPG and designing the new development to avoid it being prominent in these views.

#### **Area 2: Eastwick Village and Eastwick Moated Sites**

5.14 This area comprises a corridor running north-south along the historic Eastwick Hall Lane. Eastwick village (buildings listed at Grade II) and church (Grade II\*) are medieval, and north of the village the site of Eastwick Hall manor house is a Scheduled monument. Also forming part of this area is another Scheduled Monument that was probably formerly a lodge for Hunsdon park, and Eastwick Hall farm, a mid nineteenth-century model farm. The ancient woodland at Home Wood forms a natural eastern boundary to this area. The line of Eastwick Hall Lane was altered in the mid nineteenth century when the former manor house was demolished, and the older road survives there as a holloway. The area has a rural character and especially near the scheduled monuments feels remote. In places the ground rises quite steeply in this area and may block views of development and play a role in how development is perceived in the setting of heritage assets.

5.15 Heritage constraints within Area 2 include Eastwick village (buildings listed at Grade II) including Eastwick Church (Grade II\*) and Eastwick Manor (Grade II); the two moated sites (Scheduled Monuments); Keeper's Cottage (Grade II); and Eastwick Hall Farm (undesigned, in SMR).

5.16 The church of St Botolph, Eastwick (Grade II\*) and the former rectory Eastwick Manor (Grade II) form a group outside the village. They stand together in large grounds that

are well enclosed by trees to the south and west but are more open to the north. There are limited views of the church tower in approaches along the lane. Subject to suitable buffers and an acceptable form of development in the immediate vicinity, it is likely that these assets could accommodate development nearby without any materially harmful impact on their cultural value or significance.

- 5.17 Eastwick village contains six buildings listed at Grade II, all houses or former houses of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The village has a compact form and the historic buildings largely form each other's settings. There is some existing modern development to the east of the village. The ground rises to the northwest of the village and may block some views in this direction. Widening of Eastwick Hall Lane and intensification of use of that road would have a harmful impact on the listed buildings in the village. However, subject to approach access routes elsewhere, suitable buffers and an appropriate form of development in the vicinity of the historic buildings, the wider area around Eastwick village could accommodate development without materially harming its cultural significance.
- 5.18 The two moated sites stand opposite each other on Eastwick Hall Lane to the north of the village. That on the east is the remains of Eastwick Hall, probably the medieval manor house, demolished in the mid nineteenth century. That on the west may have been associated with a lodge for Hunsdon Park. Although they have no clear historical relationship to each other, today they form a group in the landscape. The setting of the monuments is rural, and they stand on rising ground, making them visible, in varying degrees, in the landscape. The eastern monument has an upstanding expression as a feature, because of the topography, and can be identified over distance as such, but its particular value is not evident from a distance. An understanding of its identity/status enables one to appreciate what its setting contributed to its location, in relation to the land form. An electricity pylon is located near the western monument.
- 5.19 Development in the setting of both monuments needs careful consideration to ensure that their settings are respected, and in particular there is potential for harm arising from encroachment of development on the south and east sides of the group. This part of the setting experiences the urban influences of Harlow to a degree, with filtered views of the settlement through trees, over distance. The noise of the A414 is an urbanising influence and the pylons likewise intrude. The landscape setting to the north has a more rural aspect, as a result, and presents an attractive rolling land form and views which do not include urban development.
- 5.20 An allocation here also presents opportunities for the direct management and enhancement of the Scheduled monuments, including their better interpretation and improved access (in an appropriate form) to them.

- 5.21 Keeper's Cottage (Grade II) was built in the mid nineteenth century a part of John Hodgson's reorganisation of the Gilston estate. Although located in Home Wood, it is seemingly deliberately positioned on the western edge of the wood with views out over fields. Any development near Keeper's Cottage should respect its setting, through setting back. The block of ancient woodland here is an element in the non-designated Gilston Park, apparent on plans from at least the late eighteenth century. Development to the west of this listed building, seen in its woodland setting, would cause be likely to cause limited harm to the setting of the asset and so undermine one of its values. This harm can be mitigated by sensitive design and landscaping.
- 5.22 Eastwick Hall Farm is undesignated but is in the HHER. It is a mid nineteenth-century model farm built by John Hodgson of Gilston. Its farmyard is well enclosed by trees except to the south. Its significance is limited, and development nearby is unlikely to cause significant harm to it.
- 5.23 Key heritage constraints near Area 2 include: Hunsdon Airfield (Scheduled Monument); and the parkland of the former Gilston Park (undesignated) including the Mount (Scheduled Monument).
- 5.24 Hunsdon Airfield is a WWII airbase with associated structures (Scheduled Monument) located adjacent to the northern part of this area. Its significance is largely contained within the airfield itself, and development nearby is unlikely to have any materially harmful impact on its setting or significance.
- 5.25 The parkland of the former Gilston Park is undesignated, but is the remains of a seventeenth and eighteenth-century park associated with New Place house (remains Grade II) and later Gilston Park House (Grade II\*). The Mount (Scheduled Monument) is the remains of a moated site associated with the medieval Pisho Park and later with Gilston Park. Part of the park ditch also survives adjacent to the Mount. Gilston Park is adjacent to Area 2 but separated from it by Home Wood and Gibson's Shaw in the north and smaller tree belts in the south. Gilston Park house (Grade II\*) is further enclosed by tree belts within the park and is unlikely to have any views into Area 2. Subject to suitable buffers, and appropriate forms of development, in particular restrictions on height so that buildings are not visible from Gilston Park or Gilston Park house, development in Area 2 is unlikely to have a harmful impact on the significance of the assets in Gilston Park.
- 5.26 Area 2 as a whole has Medium sensitivity, with particular areas of High sensitivity around the moated sites. Development is not likely to be appropriate in close proximity to the moated sites, nor is intensive development likely to be appropriate immediately adjacent to Eastwick church and village. However, subject to suitable buffers and an appropriate form of development near the heritage assets, this area can

accommodate some development.

5.27 Measures to protect heritage assets in this area and allow development to proceed in this area could include:

- Particular regard to the sensitivity of the two moated site Scheduled Monuments and their settings and near Eastwick church and village in relation to the landscape;
- Carefully laid out development in the wider setting of Eastwick village, Eastwick church, and the moated site Scheduled monuments;
- Provision of suitable buffers to protect the setting of heritage assets, incorporated within with the layout;
- Consideration of heights to ensure buildings are not prominent in views from Gilston Park house and its grounds including the undesignated Gilston Park; and
- Retaining Eastwick Lane as a narrow country lane with access to the development provided elsewhere.

### **Area 3: Hunsdon Airfield**

5.28 Hunsdon Airfield is located on the west side of the Site and forms the heritage constraint that is the whole of Area 3. It comprises the former World War II airbase, still recognisable in field patterns and tracks, and a group of associated structures such as pillboxes and trenches that are Scheduled Monuments. The Hunsdon Microlight Club uses part of the site for its airfield. The land is in use for modern agriculture, with no hedgerows, but there are a few small areas of woodland including ancient woodland at Black Hut Wood. The Big Black Barn (Grade II\*) is also within Area 3. It was formerly a lodge for Hunsdon Park, and the track leading to it from the village may have been part of the park boundary.

5.29 The Scheduled Monuments at Hunsdon Airfield and the complex of listed barns at Hunsdon Lodge Farm, including the Grade II\* Big Black Barn, are the key heritage constraints inside this area.

5.30 The Hunsdon Lodge Farm group currently has an open agricultural setting that contributes to their significance, but the primary significance of the buildings lies in their fabric. The Big Black Barn is an important example of a sixteenth-century lodgings range converted to agricultural use and the associated barns are good examples of early eighteenth century agricultural buildings. This group could accommodate development around it if the immediate setting of the group was treated

sensitively and if the buildings were restored appropriately.

- 5.31 At Hunsdon Airfield, the individual parts of the Scheduled Monument gain significance from their association with the other parts and with the remnants of the airfield itself. Nonetheless, it is considered that this area could support development. For instance, the runways might dictate main road patterns, and the built parts of the monument could be preserved and interpreted.
- 5.32 The allocation presents significant opportunities to enhance the management and presentation of the built parts to the airfield.
- 5.33 Key heritage constraints outside Area 3 include Hunsdon House (Grade I), Hunsdon church (Grade I), associated structures (Grade II) and the associated garden areas; and Hunsdon village (Conservation Area with many listed buildings at Grades II\* and II).
- 5.34 Hunsdon House (Grade I), Hunsdon church (Grade I), and the associated structures listed at Grade II have an enclosed setting within the house's large grounds. In turn the grounds are well enclosed with trees including a wide tree belt towards the airfield. Subject to suitable buffers and appropriate height constraints to avoid taller buildings being seen from with the area around the house, development on the airfield site is unlikely to have a significant impact on the setting or significance of these assets. Development in this area may be visible from some upper rooms in the mansion, but unlikely to be visible from any great rooms on the ground or first floor. It has not been possible to inspect these areas (the house is in private occupation), but if development comes forward in this area, at the relevant planning application stage this relationship should be considered.
- 5.35 The historic parts of Hunsdon village including the Conservation Area and the majority of the listed buildings form a compact and discrete entity along High Street. Intervening modern development to the east of High Street is likely to block most views towards the Site, although there are occasional glimpsed views eastwards between houses. There are also some views out from assets at the edge of this area along Drury Lane and Acorn Street. Here suitable buffers and tree planting may help to mitigate any effects from development in this area. Access routes and traffic would need careful consideration to avoid over burdening the historic main streets of Hunsdon village.
- 5.36 The sensitivity of this area is therefore Low. Except for the small area of ancient woodland, it is suitable for development subject to appropriate consideration for the setting and significance of heritage assets.

5.37 Measures to protect heritage assets in this area and allow development to proceed in this area could include:

- Respecting the form of the airfield and the Scheduled Monuments;
- Providing suitable buffers around heritage assets to protect their setting; and
- Restricting heights to avoid new buildings being visible from the Conservation Area or in the setting of listed buildings.

#### **Area 4: North**

5.38 This area comprises agricultural land and ancient woodland to the north of Gilston church and Hunsdon airfield. The majority of the field patterns in this area are eighteenth and nineteenth-century with twentieth-century alterations, but there are some older field patterns in eastern part of this area. High Trees and Great Penny's Farm (both Grade II) are within Area 4, and Actons farm (Grade II) is immediately adjacent to it. The whole area rises towards the north but slopes down to the east and west around the edges. Therefore any development in this area will need to consider height to ensure it is not over prominent in long range views.

5.39 The woodland runs along the northern part of this area, and is likely to preclude extensive development in the northern part of Area 4 if it is to be preserved. However, it might be suitable for recreational uses such as a park.

5.40 High Trees, Acton's and Great Pennys farms (all Grade II) are houses and related farm buildings mainly of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Their settings are rural and isolated, and they are located within the area of scattered ancient woodland. Any new development in this area should have regard to their setting.

5.41 Important heritage constraints near the Site include Hunsdon Lodge Farm (buildings listed at Grade II\* and II); Hunsdon airfield (Scheduled Monument); Hunsdon village (Conservation area and listed buildings); Gilston church (Grade I); the scattered settlement near Manor of Groves; and Widford (Conservation Area and listed buildings).

5.42 Hunsdon Lodge farm is a group of farm buildings including the Big Black Barn (Grade II\*) a sixteenth-century former lodge for Hunsdon park and other eighteenth-century barn. Its setting is rural. This group could accommodate development nearby if the immediate setting of the group was treated sensitively and if the buildings were restored appropriately, providing a direct benefit.

5.43 Hunsdon Airfield is a WWII airbase with associated structures (Scheduled Monument)

located adjacent to the northern part of this area. Its significance is largely contained within the airfield itself, and development nearby is unlikely to cause any real harm to its cultural value.

- 5.44 The historic parts of Hunsdon village including the Conservation Area and the majority of the listed buildings form a compact and discrete entity along High Street. The edge of Area 4 is located along the eastern edge of the northern part of the village and takes in a very small part of open land at the edge of the Conservation Area but no listed buildings within it. With the exception of Old House (Grade II\*), the historic parts of Hunsdon village are located in the southern part of the village. Intervening development, including modern development to the east of High Street, is likely to block most views towards the Site, although there are occasional glimpsed views eastwards between houses. There are also some views out from assets at the edge of this area along Drury Lane and Acorn Street. Here suitable buffers and tree planting may help to mitigate any effects. Assuming development of a low form near the village, then the scope for harmful visual impacts will be limited and potentially nil. Access routes and traffic would need careful consideration to avoid over burdening the historic main streets of Hunsdon village.
- 5.45 Gilston church (Grade I), the nearby Johnston monument (Grade I) and the associated group of Grade II assets are to the south of this area, and are discussed in more detail as part of Area 5 below. Area 4 forms part of the wider rural setting of the church. On the north, towards Area 4, the churchyard is partially enclosed by trees, and the rising topography also blocks some views in this direction.
- 5.46 Impacts of development in Area 4 on the wider setting and the significance of the church are likely to be much less significant than the impacts of development in Area 5, which is immediately adjacent to, and to the south of, the church. Sympathetic forms of developmental including informal layouts and suitable building types near the church are likely play an important part in preserving its setting, and height restrictions may be useful to prevent it being overwhelmed. Further away to the north and west, development could look to create views of the church from the north and west. Accordingly, this element of any future application should be carefully considered and design parameters, in the case of an outline application, be developed in consultation with the authority and Historic England.
- 5.47 The scattered settlement near the Manor of Groves hotel in High Wych is similar in character to High Trees, Great Penny's and Actons, being mainly Grade II listed farmhouses of the seventeenth- and eighteenth centuries with associated farm buildings (some also designated at Grade II). Their settings are rural and open, but they are generally well contained within their own complexes, and topography may also block views towards the site in some places. The Manor of Groves hotel (grade

II) is nearby, but it is well enclosed within its former park, now a golf course, and is unlikely to be affected by development in Area 4.

5.48 Widford is a Conservation Area and contains many listed buildings. The majority of the listed buildings face E/W across High Street, Hunsdon Road and Ware Road, but there are some open views towards Area 4 from the southern part of the CA including near Abbots Farm (Grade II) and the church (Grade II\*). It is far enough away to not be in the direct setting of these assets, but care should be taken to ensure that any development visible from these assets is a sympathetic height and form. Access arrangements and traffic patterns will need to be carefully considered to avoid undue impacts on the historic roads in the Widford CA

5.49 The sensitivity of Area 4 is Medium. The northern part adjacent to the ancient woodland is unlikely to be suitable for extensive development. Care also must be taken with the form of development in the vicinity of the church to preserve its setting, but the rest of Area 4 is less sensitive and could accommodate development.

5.50 Measures to protect heritage assets in this area and allow development to proceed in this area could include:

- Preserving ancient woodland;
- Restricting heights where necessary to avoid new buildings being visible from the Conservation Area or in the setting of listed buildings.
- Respecting the setting of heritage assets, especially the Grade I listed church;
- Maintaining an area of open land to the south of the church;
- Use of informal layouts and suitable building types near the church;
- Using height and density restrictions in the vicinity of the church;
- Creating views of the church from the north and west, and preserving views from the south.

#### **Area 5: St Mary's Gilston Church**

5.51 This area forms the immediate surroundings of St Mary's church, Gilston (Grade I) and associated designated assets including the Grade I listed Johnston monument and Church Cottages (Grade II). It has been no more than a tiny cluster of houses around the church for at least two centuries, although Overhall farm was formerly the site of Overhall manor.

- 5.52 The southern edge of this area is formed by the woodland to the north of Gilston Park house, and part of the western edge is formed by the ancient woodland at Home Wood. To the east is Golden Brook. Although this area was apparently never part of Gilston Park, the tree lined footpath leading from the church to the house dates to at least the late seventeenth century. It is shown on early maps and provides a link between the house and the parish church. Development in this area may provide an opportunity to restore it. The curving lane in front of the church is also historic. The land is now agricultural use and forms the primary setting for the church and associated listed assets.
- 5.53 The setting of Gilston church is very sensitive, particularly to the south, and any development in this area would need to be treated with great care. It is unlikely to be suitable for intensive, dense forms of development. It is intended for the larger part of the land south of the church, currently in arable use, to remain open. This land will provide open space for the development with a combination of some grass pitches and informal parkland. The setting of the church group is rural, with the approach via a narrow lane. Any development near the church should seek to preserve its setting. The sense of openness of the land to the south should be retained. Sympathetic forms of development including informal layouts and suitable building types near the church are likely to play an important part in preserving its setting, and height restrictions may be useful to prevent it being overwhelmed.
- 5.54 In particular, the area to the south of the church forms an important part of its setting, providing open views from the church and views looking towards the church from the footpath along the edge of the woodland to the south. The larger part of this land is intended to remain open and will form part of the allocation's green infrastructure. Any development proposed on the margins of this land will need to respect the views of the church. Accordingly, this element of any future application should be carefully considered and design parameters should be developed in consultation with the authority and Historic England.
- 5.55 The relatively enclosed nature of this area means that potential impacts on other heritage assets are likely to be relatively limited to a small number of assets including Gilston Park house (Grade II\*) and associated assets; and Channock's Farm (Grade II).
- 5.56 Gilston Park house (Grade II\*) and the other assets in its grounds are separated from Area 5 by a band of trees. Visual impacts on Gilston Park house from development in Area 5 are not likely but there is a potential for impacts from noise, light pollution and increased levels of activity, which would need to be assessed at outline stage and mitigation identified if required.

- 5.57 Channock's Farm (Grade II) is a mid nineteenth-century model farm built by John Hodgson of Gilston Park. It stands on rising ground across the brook to the south east. It is an inward facing group, but the area around the church forms part of its wider setting. Development in Area 5 would alter this setting, but is unlikely to have a significant effect on the significance of these assets.
- 5.58 The sensitivity of Area 5 around Gilston church is High. The area to the south of the church is particularly sensitive, and the larger part is proposed to be left open as part of the allocation's green infrastructure. Any development on the edges of this land will need to be carefully considered in terms of density, design, layout and landscaping.
- 5.59 Residential development near the church has the potential to bring more people to use the church, which would be a benefit in keeping it in benefit use.
- 5.60 Measures to protect heritage assets in this area and allow development to proceed in this area could include:
- Retain a substantial area of open space to the south of the church to conserve its setting
    - Using informal, naturalistic forms of development near the church to help preserve its setting;
    - Avoiding dense forms of development in this area;
    - Retaining views of the church from the south;
    - Creating new views of the church from within any new development;
    - Avoiding higher buildings that would be visible from Gilston Park house or that would overwhelm the church, as these will not be suitable for this area;
    - Avoiding indirect impacts such as noise or light pollution on Gilston Park house;
    - Retaining the historic lane to the church as a narrow lane, providing access to any development elsewhere; and
    - Retaining and restoring the historic footpath from the house to the church.

#### **Area 6: Gilston Park House**

- 5.61 This area comprises the grounds of Gilston Park house (Grade II\*) and associated

listed assets (all Grade II). This area is excluded from the Site red line, but is included in this assessment for completeness and because it was assessed in the L-P Archaeology DBA. The boundary of Area 6 here differs from L-P's area 4 (see their Figure 19) and also the Site red line in that it excludes High Gilston and the Old Rectory. These are included here in Area 8 as they are outside of the main curtilage around Gilston Park house.

- 5.62 Gilston Park house replaced the sixteenth-century New Place house, of which only a fragment (Grade II) survives near the lake. The group at Gilston Park house is well enclosed by trees and woodland to the north, west and east. There are some more open views southwards towards the former parkland of Gilston Park (Area 7), but these are relatively limited in extent and primarily located in an area well to the rear of the house and near the lake.
- 5.63 There is no clear visual relationship between this group and any nearby heritage assets except the Mount (Scheduled Monument). The Mount was a medieval moated associated with the former Pisho park and reused as part of the late seventeenth-century Gilston Park. The adjacent ditch was part of the seventeenth-century park boundary.
- 5.64 The sensitivity of Area 6 is Very High given the large number of sensitive heritage assets and the importance of their setting. This area is not likely to be suitable for development.

#### **Area 7: Remains of Gilston Park Designed Landscape**

- 5.65 This area comprises the remains of Gilston Park, an undesignated asset which was formerly parkland, some features of which survive, dating mainly to two phases in the late seventeenth century and the late eighteenth or early nineteenth century (see Appendix 9). It relates the former New Place house and Gilston Park house (Grade II\*) to the north. The northern part of Area 7 forms part of the setting for Gilston Park house (Grade II). Gilston Park is now largely in arable cultivation, but there is also an area of ancient woodland at Home Wood and Gibson's Shaw.
- 5.66 Surviving heritage assets in Area 7, all relating to the park include the Mount (Scheduled Monument), a moated site that was probably originally associated with the medieval Pisho park; a ditch that formed part of the seventeenth-century park boundary (undesignated); the Lime Avenue, a very degraded avenue of trees that was formerly a drive to the house (undesignated); and an associated lodge (undesignated).
- 5.67 The Mount was a medieval moated associated with the former Pisho park and reused

as part of the late seventeenth-century Gilston Park. The adjacent ditch was part of the seventeenth-century park boundary. Any development in this area should retain the relationship between the Mount, the ditch, and Gilston Park house.

- 5.68 The Lime Avenue, now very degraded, and the associated lodge (undesigned) were probably created in the late eighteenth or early nineteenth century when Gilston Park was extended to take in the area between the ditch and the road.
- 5.69 Development in this area would present an opportunity to restore the Lime Avenue and to enhance other park features, including the Mount SM and the ditch through presentation and (subject to suitable constraints) access to the monument.
- 5.70 Key heritage constraints outside this area that are likely to be impacted by development within Area 7 include Gilston Park house (Grade II\*) and associated structures (Grade II); Gilston Village including Fiddler's Bridge (buildings listed at Grade II); Eastwick village (buildings listed at Grade II); Eastwick moated sites; and Eastwick Lodge farm (undesigned).
- 5.71 Gilston Park house and Gilston Park have a clear historical relationship as the latter was the parkland for the house. Although there are now trees along the boundary between the house's gardens and the former parkland, there are still views into the parkland in places.
- 5.72 Gilston village (formerly Pye Corner) and Fiddler's Bridge are a cluster of seventeenth-nineteenth century vernacular houses and estate cottages along Eastwick Road. This group is located across the road from Area 7, but while most of the houses face west, there is an existing band of trees along the west side of Eastwick Road in this area that blocks views to the west. This band of trees could be strengthened. There is also the potential for impacts from noise, traffic, light pollution and increased levels of activity. These should be avoided if possible by careful consideration of road layouts and placement of development.
- 5.73 Eastwick village is a cluster of seventeenth-nineteenth century vernacular houses and estate cottages. It is located to the west of Area 7. The historic listed buildings are largely clustered in together in the western part of the village, and there is modern development to the east of the historic centre of the village, but Area 7 forms part of the wider setting of the village. Any development in Area 7 should respect the setting of the assets in Eastwick village.
- 5.74 The Eastwick moated sites are a pair of moated sites along Eastwick hall lane to the north west of Area 7. The two moated sites stand opposite each other on Eastwick Hall Lane to the north of the village. That on the east is the remains of Eastwick Hall,

probably the medieval manor house, demolished in the mid nineteenth century; that on the west may have been associated with a lodge for Hunsdon park. Although they have no clear historical relationship to each other, today they form a group in the landscape. The setting of the monuments is rural and they stand on rising ground, making them discernible in the landscape especially when seen from the north. An electricity pylon is located near the western monument. Development in the setting of both monuments needs careful consideration to ensure that their settings are respected. Development will present opportunities to enhance the presentation and management of the monuments.

5.75 Eastwick Lodge farm is undesignated but in the HHER. It is a nineteenth-century model farm for the Gilston estate that has been altered in the twentieth century. Its setting to the front is formed by the busy A414 road; to the rear there is a small former gravel quarry and open agricultural fields. Rising ground generally blocks longer views to the north, and the buildings are primarily perceived in relationship to the road. They have little or no relationship with Gilston Park house or the surrounding parkland. Development in its setting is unlikely to cause harm to its significance.

5.76 The sensitivity of Area 7 is Medium, with particularly high sensitivity around the Mount Moated Site. Measures to protect heritage assets in this area and allow development to proceed in this area could include:

- Providing buffers to retain the setting of the Eastwick Scheduled Monuments and the Mount with careful consideration to ensure that their settings are preserved;
- Retaining a sense of the relationship between Gilston Park house and its former parkland;
- Creating buffers to protect the settings of heritage assets, especially at Gilston village (Pye Corner) and Eastwick village;
- Retaining the visual relationship between the Mount, the ditch, and Gilston Park house;
- Retaining and improving the Lime Avenue;
- Strengthening the band of trees west of Gilston village to provide a buffer for heritage assets to the east in Gilston village;
- Considering impacts on heritage assets especially on the listed buildings at Gilston village and around Gilston Park house from noise, traffic, light pollution and increased levels of activity; and

- Respecting the setting of the assets in Eastwick village through appropriate buffers.

#### **Area 8: The East**

- 5.77 This area is located to the east of Church Lane, Gilston and includes the Golden Brook valley to the east of the church. Heritage assets in this area include Channock's farm, the Old Rectory and High Gilston (all Grade II). There are two areas of ancient woodland at Sayes Coppice and Golden Grove, and a small area of more recent woodland to the south of Channock's farm. Otherwise, this area is large agricultural fields created in the twentieth century by amalgamating eighteenth and nineteenth-century enclosures. All three of the listed buildings are associated with John Hodgson's revamping of the Gilston estate in the mid nineteenth century. Channock's farm is a model farm with a well preserved barn complex, High Gilston was the school, and the Old Rectory replaced the original rectory near the church. All three have open settings to farmland.
- 5.78 Heritage constraints outside of this area include Gilston Church (Grade I) and nearby assets; Gilston Village/Pye Corner (buildings listed at Grade II); Pole Hill Farm (Grade II); and Gilston Park house (Grade II\*) and associated assets.
- 5.79 The northern part of this area also forms a part of the wider setting of the Grade I Gilston church, but the churchyard and the valley around the brook provide a natural buffer here that there is unlikely to be a significant impact on the setting or significance of the church. Development heights should be carefully considered to avoid or limit visual impacts in the setting of the church.
- 5.80 Gilston village includes a group of seventeenth-nineteenth century buildings along Eastwick Road to the south of Area 8. Their setting is generally comprised of other buildings in the group, but some have open views over countryside to the east and north. Care should be taken to provide suitable buffers for these assets and to avoid impacts from increased noise and traffic.
- 5.81 Pole Hill farm is an eighteenth century farmhouse on Eastwick Road. Its setting is already compromised by the large gravel pit and landfill site to the south, but care should be taken to avoid impacts from increased noise and traffic.
- 5.82 Gilston Park house (Grade II\*) and associated assets (all Grade II) is separated from Area 8 by bands of woodland along Church Lane and by its own grounds. Providing that suitable buffers are introduced, there are not likely to be any significance impacts on Gilston Park house from development in Area 8. Care should be taken to avoid taller buildings that might be visible from the house.

- 5.83 Except for the areas of ancient woodland, Area 8 is suitable for development. Care should be taken to provide suitable buffers to protect the setting of the heritage assets. Consideration of building heights is also necessary to ensure they are not prominent in the setting of heritage assets including those outside this area, such as Gilston church and Gilston Park house.
- 5.84 The sensitivity of this area is Low. Measures to protect heritage assets in this area and allow development to proceed in this area could include:
- Provision of suitable buffers for heritage assets;
  - Consideration of building heights to avoid buildings being over prominent in the setting of heritage assets including Gilston church, Gilston village, and Gilston Park house; and
  - Careful planning of road layouts to avoid impacts from noise and traffic.

#### **Area 9: A414 Road Corridor**

- 5.85 This group comprises the land immediately adjacent to the A414 road, its extension along Eastwick Road and areas to the south that would be required for road crossings to link any development to Harlow. Key heritage constraints along the road include the groups of Grade II listed assets at Fiddler's Corner, Pye Corner/Gilston village and Pole Hill. Eastwick Lodge farm is undesignated but in the HHER. The A414 is a historic road from London and was improved in the mid to late twentieth century to create a dual carriageway as far as the roundabout at Fifth Avenue. There are also groups of heritage assets near the road, especially on the south side. The road itself has only very limited intrinsic historic interest, but it is more sensitive to the east of the roundabout where it runs directly past the listed buildings around Pye Corner.
- 5.86 The key heritage constraint within this area is the group at Fiddler's Bridge and Pye Corner/Gilston village. These are eight buildings listed at Grade II at Pye Corner, all houses of the seventeenth-nineteenth centuries; there is another seventeenth-century house and an eighteenth/nineteenth-century footbridge at Fiddler's Corner; and Pole Hill Farm (Grade II) is an eighteenth-century farm. The Gilston village assets, Fiddlers Bridge and Pye Corner form an almost continuous group with some modern infill and are clearly the remains of a historic hamlet adjacent to the road. Pole Hill is slightly further out but still related to the rest of the group. Given the proximity of these assets to the road, any road improvements in this area will need to be handled with care to avoid significant harm to their setting or damage to the assets themselves. Increased noise and traffic are also likely to be considerations.
- 5.87 Heritage constraints near the road corridor include Stansted Bury park (RPG GII);

Briggens park (RPG GII); Hunsdon Mill (buildings listed at Grade II); Brickhouse Farm (buildings listed at Grade II); Eastwick church (Grade II\*), Eastwick Manor (Grade II), and Eastwick village (buildings listed at Grade II); Parndon Mill (buildings listed at Grade II) and Little Parndon and Parndon Hall moated sties (SM); Harlow Town station (Grade II); Redricks Farm (buildings listed at Grade II\* and Grade II); and Stort river and Stort Navigation (undesigned).

- 5.88 These assets are remnants of older settlement in this area, including historic villages, farms and mills. The Stort river valley is not designated, but forms a historic corridor that is now a popular leisure route and marks the historic county boundary. The existing dual carriageway is already a negative influence in the setting of many of these assets. Depending on the exact layout of any new roads, there is a potential for these assets to be affected by development of the road, including changes to their setting, damage to the assets themselves, and increased noise and traffic. When designing any new road layouts, care should be taken to minimise these impacts. New north-south roads crossing the river should be placed so as to minimise intrusion into the Stort river area. There is the scope for environmental improvements to the Stort, and these should be discussed at the planning application stage with the Canals and Rivers Trust.
- 5.89 The sensitivity of this area is Low overall although the significance of individual assets may be Medium. There is a potential to upgrade the A414 road and provide additional links into Harlow to the south subject to appropriate consideration for the setting and significance of heritage assets.
- 5.90 Measures to protect heritage assets in this area and allow development to proceed in this area could include:
- Avoiding damage to the physical fabric or setting of heritage assets when designing new road layouts;
  - Designing new road layouts to minimise noise and traffic in the immediate vicinity of heritage assets;
  - Placing any new north-south links to minimise intrusion into the Stort river corridor; and
  - Where necessary, providing suitable buffers around heritage assets to protect their setting.

### **Area Analysis Conclusions**

- 5.91 This analysis has identified key constraints within the Site. With careful planning and

certain constraints, the vast majority of the Site, except for Area 6 immediately around Gilston Park house, is suitable for development in heritage terms.

- 5.92 As well as Gilston Park house and its surroundings, this analysis has highlighted the special sensitivity of the area around the Eastwick Monuments in Area 2; the area around of Gilston Church, especially to its south in Area 5; and the area around the Mount Scheduled Monument in Area 7 on the southern edge of the former parkland of Gilston House. Great care will need to be taken to ensure that the setting of these assets is preserved.
- 5.93 As well as these key assets, the setting of Eastwick church and village, Brickhouse Farm and the Big Black barn at Hunsdon Lodge farm will need to be carefully considered as part of any future development proposal, as will Hunsdon Airfield and its scheduled monuments.
- 5.94 Around the edges of the Site, key heritage assets include Gilston village (Pye Corner), Hundson House, Hunsdon village, and the settlement around Hunsdonbury. Slightly further afield, Widford, and the Registered Parks and Gardens as Briggens and Stanstead Bury need to be taken into careful consideration.

## 6.0 AVOIDANCE OF HARM AND MAXIMISING ENHANCEMENTS

- 6.1 Following the methodology in HEAN3, Step 4, this section sets out ways in which development within the Site could avoid harm to the heritage assets identified above and look to enhance them.
- 6.2 With careful planning and certain constraints, the vast majority of the Site, except for Area 6 immediately around Gilston Park house, is suitable for development in heritage terms. However, we understand that there are other considerations which indicate that development should be limited to the southern and eastern parts of the site. These constraints were identified via the L-P DBA as part of the Concept Framework process and have informed the proposed allocation in draft policy GA1.
- 6.3 In particular, the south and east parts of the Site are located near the existing urban development in Harlow. Development in this area would connect well with the existing development and new transport links would be easy to create. The Stort River and its wetlands creates a natural green wedge between Harlow and any new settlement to the north. However, in contrast, the north and, in particular, the north-western parts of the Site around Hunsdon airfield are located in an area characterised by the distinctive historic villages of Hunsdon and Widford that are set in open countryside. The roads through these villages are small and the settlements are mainly located along these roads. They form a key part of the historic character of the area. Development in this part of the site would, in our view, put undue pressure on these villages and lead to a coalescence between the historic villages. Accordingly, development to the south and east of the Site is preferred.

### **Proposed Allocation GA1**

- 6.4 The proposed site allocation is set out in draft policy GA1 and the allocation areas is shown on the map at Appendix 3. This divides the site in two, restricting built development to the area to the east and south of the powerlines, with the rest of the site proposed to be transferred to a community interest company, trust or other vehicle/mechanism that ensures long term governance. The proposed allocation excludes Area 6 around Gilston Park house, a small part of Area 8 near Gilston Park house, and the portion of Area 2 around Eastwick village. All of Area 3 (Hunsdon Airfield) and the majority of Area 4 including the sensitive areas of ancient woodland are proposed to be open land. A few smaller exclusion areas within the site are also proposed, especially immediately around heritage assets such Brickhouse farm and Channocks farm.
- 6.5 The proposed allocation in GA1 reflects the constraints on the northern and north-western part of the Site, and, in our view, strikes an appropriate balance between

allowing development and preserving heritage assets.

### **Avoiding Harm within the Allocation area GA1**

- 6.6 The analysis in Sections 4 and 5 above identifies three areas of particular sensitivity within the allocation area where there is the potential for substantial harm to heritage interests. Care will be required at the planning application stage to mitigate that potential harm, reducing it to acceptable levels or removing it entirely.
- 6.7 These areas comprise: the area around the Eastwick Monuments in Area 2; the area around of Gilston Church, especially to its south in Area 5; and the area around the Mount Scheduled Monument in Area 7 on the southern edge of the former parkland of Gilston House. Care will need to be taken to ensure that the setting of these assets is preserved.
- 6.8 For the Eastwick moated site monuments, considerations to avoid harm to the setting and significance of the monuments could include:
- Development needs to give particular consideration to the setting of the two moated site Scheduled Monuments;
  - Retaining open views to the north of the monuments and across the valley providing buffers to the south. The position of the moat is discernible because of the trees on top of it;
  - Retaining Eastwick Lane as a narrow country lane with access to the development provided elsewhere.
- 6.9 For the area around the church, provisions to protect the setting of the church and minimise harm to its setting and significance could include:
- Retain a substantial area of open space to the south of the church to conserve its setting;
  - Use of informal layouts, naturalistic forms of development and suitable building types near the church;
  - Avoiding dense forms of development in this area;
  - Using height and density restrictions in the vicinity of the church, particularly to the south east and south west;
  - Retaining the historic lane to the church as a narrow lane, providing access to any development elsewhere; and

- Retaining and restoring the historic footpath from the house to the church; and
- Retaining views of the church from the south;
- Creating new views of the church from within the new development.

6.10 For the area around the Mount scheduled monument, provisions to protect the setting of the monument and minimise harm to its setting and significance could include:

- Retaining the visual relationship between the Mount, the ditch, and Gilston Park house;
- Giving particular consideration to the setting of the monument;
- Providing buffers around the monument integrated into the layout of any design;
- Restricting development to the north of the ditch, especially near the monument;
- Retaining a sense of the relationship between Gilston Park house and its former parkland; and
- Retaining and improving the Lime Avenue.

6.11 Therefore, the assets within the allocation area can generally be protected through the use of suitable buffers and careful planning of any new development to respect their settings. The above guidelines are initial ones, more detailed approaches to be decided at application stage.

6.12 As well as the key assets noted above, the setting of Eastwick church and village, Brickhouse Farm and the Big Black barn at Hunsdon Lodge farm will need to be carefully considered as part of any future development proposal.

6.13 It will be important to create buffers to protect the setting of heritage assets immediately adjacent to the allocation and/or surrounded by the outer red line, including those at Gilston village (Pye Corner) and Eastwick village. As well as buffers around the assets, care will need to be taken of traffic management arrangements in these areas.

6.14 Care will also need to be taken to preserve the significance of Hunsdon airfield when laying out any park or recreational land in this area

#### **Avoiding Harm outside the Allocation area GA1**

6.15 Outside the allocation area, the restriction of development to the area to the east and

south of the powerlines provides a natural buffer for the assets to the west and north of the site including Hunsdon house (Grade I) and the nearby church (Grade I), and the Hunsdon and Widford conservation areas with their many listed buildings. Keeping development to the east of the power lines will also avoid coalescence between the historic settlements along the western edge of the Site.

- 6.16 For the assets outside the west of the site, including Hunsdon village, Hunsdon house, Hunsdonbury, and Widford, avoiding development on this side will also avoid putting pressure on the road systems through these historic villages, thus helping to preserve their setting.
- 6.17 Other design factors to consider for preserving the setting of heritage assets to the west of the allocation area include
- Restricting heights as appropriate to avoid new buildings being prominent from the Hunsdon House or Hunsdon church; and/or
  - Considering whether any development would be visible from any status rooms within Hunsdon house.
- 6.18 To the south of the site, especially to the south-east, the urban edge of Harlow has few heritage assets. The historic parts of Harlow, including the Old Town conservation area and the station are embedded within the modern Harlow town development, so already have an urban setting.
- 6.19 The setting of Gilston village and Fiddler's bridge at the south-east corner of the allocation area will need to be considered in connection with the development of road layouts in this area as well as in the placement of the built development near to it, to avoid the built development being over prominent in these settings.
- 6.20 Land to the south-west of the allocation area is more open and contains the more sensitive assets of Briggens and Stanstead Bury RPGs, and the groups of assets at Hunsdon and Parndon mills along the Stort river valley, which forms a popular recreational route. The setting of the heritage assets around Parndon Mill and Harlow town station will need to be considered in laying out a crossing of the Stort in this area.
- 6.21 Measures to protect the setting and significance of heritage assets to the south of the allocation may include:
- Taking care of views out from Briggens park RPG and designing the new development to avoid it being prominent in these views;
  - Providing suitable buffers around the heritage assets to protect their setting;

- Restricting heights as appropriate to avoid new buildings being visible from the sensitive buildings and conservation areas, including from Briggens park RPG, Standstead Bury RPG, and the Town Park conservation area;
- Considering the wider setting of heritage assets in designing development along the southern edge of the allocation;
- Careful planning of road layouts to avoid impacts from noise and traffic;
- Careful placement of any new north-south links to minimise intrusion into the Stort river corridor.

6.22 To the east of the allocation area there are far fewer heritage assets in what is largely open countryside, but care will need to be taken of the design of development edges to ensure they are sympathetic to the wider setting of heritage assets such as the scattered farmhouses and the High Wych conservation area. The open countryside to the east of the site outside of the allocation area also provides a natural buffer for assets at a slightly greater distance including Sawbridgeworth and Pisho park RPG.

6.23 To the north of the allocation, the area of open land proposed to be left in the north west part of the site will provide a natural buffer towards the conservation area at Widford and further away at High Wych. With regard to the scattered settlement to the north-east of the Site, care will need to be taken that the development is not overly prominent in their wider setting.

#### **Maximising Enhancements through the Allocation Site GA1**

6.24 There is scope to enhance heritage assets within the Site through the proposed development allocation.

6.25 For Gilston church, which is now little used, in principle forming a new settlement near to a church can enhance its cultural value as a community building since the new residents will increase the congregation and the use of the building for christenings, weddings, funerals and other events. It may also be able to serve new functions as a focal point for the community.

6.26 There is also scope to create new views of the church from the north and west, and to retain and enhance views of the church from the south as these are not now very accessible to the public. Such new views can enhance appreciation of the asset.

6.27 The allocation presents significant opportunities to enhance the management and presentation and conservation of Hunsdon airfield.

- 6.28 Development in area of the former Gilston Park parkland would present an opportunity to restore the Lime Avenue and to enhance other park features, including the Mount SM and the ditch through presentation and (subject to suitable constraints) access to the monument. Critically, the former parkland, now in arable use, can be turned back to an amenity landscape, designed and managed in a way that enhances nearby assets. Again new publicly accessible views can potentially be created of Gilston Park house.
- 6.29 There is also scope to enhance the presentation and interpretation of the two moated sites at Eastwick.

#### **Proposed Allocation GA2**

- 6.30 Proposed river crossings, discussed in draft policy GA2, have been developed in connection with Harlow District Council and reflect their preference for crossings that link into the developed northern parts of Harlow. These areas are also less sensitive in heritage terms than a river crossing further west, although there are still some heritage sensitivities in particular at Pye Corner and Fiddler's Bridge of the eastern crossing and at Parndon Mill and Harlow Town station, close to the southern part of the central crossing
- 6.31 Through the imposition of conditions on any planning permission, it may be possible to secure improvements to the Stort river valley and the interpretation and understanding of assets along it. Such benefits will be delivered through planning obligations. The heritage strategy on sites such as this should be integrated with the landscape framework, at application stage. This is achievable by the use of conditions and a planning obligation.

## 7.0 NPPF SOUNDNESS TESTS

7.1 HEAN3, Step 5, requires an assessment of “whether the proposed site allocation is appropriate in light of the NPPF’s tests of soundness”. The NPPF paragraph 182 sets out four tests to consider in judging whether a local plan is “sound”. These include whether it is

- Positively prepared;
- Justified;
- Effective; and
- Consistent with National Policy.

7.2 This HIA demonstrates that the plan has been positively prepared because it has allocations that are based on objective assessments. This HIA is based on a comprehensive survey of the surrounding area, and assesses all of the heritage assets within 1km of the allocation area, and looks at the potential impacts of development on them.

7.3 In our view, the proposed allocation set out in the plan at draft Policy GA1 and GA2 is justified. It meets the need for additional development in this area, while at the same time avoiding impacts on important heritage assets including Hunsdon House, the Hunsdon and Widford conservation areas, and the Hunsdon airfield scheduled monument through its shape and layout, including inner exclusion areas. There will be an impact on the settings of Gilston church, the Mount Scheduled Monument and the Scheduled Monuments, but harmful, significant effects in these areas can be mitigated and potentially avoided through careful design, landscaping, open space, buffer zones, protection of key views and better management and interpretation of assets where appropriate.

7.4 In terms of effectiveness, we consider that the allocation is likely to be deliverable and it takes into account cross-boundary strategic priorities such as linking the development to the existing built areas of Harlow.

7.5 The allocation is also consistent with national policy, notably the policies in Chapter 12 of the NPPF as draft policy GA1 seeks to minimise harm to heritage assets and seeks to provide enhancements where these are possible. The relevant policies in the NPPF allow, we note, the balancing out of any harmful residual impacts, should mitigation not be fully possible.

7.6 More detailed considerations of specific impacts, notably on the moated site

scheduled monuments, the Mount scheduled monument and Gilston church can come forward at an application stage. This will include more detailed work on the development parameters, landscape and design guidelines.

## 8.0 CONCLUSIONS

- 8.1 In conclusion, our view is that the allocation of the Gilston Area, as proposed by policy GA1 and GA2, is more than adequate. The impact on the historic environment will not just be acceptable but may actually be beneficial given the range of enhancements, direct and indirect, which can be implemented over time, as the development comes forward in accordance with the policy in GA1 and GA2.
- 8.2 In respect of development within the allocation, any planning applications for the Site will need to provide detailed information to show how the historic objectives in the policy of GA1 and GA2, specifically the need for the design of the development and its landscaping to mitigate setting impacts on the significance of these important and sensitive assets, have been complied with. Matters such as appropriate density/site coverage, layout and scale (height and footprint) will then need to be carefully considered in the development of any proposal for the Site. This HIA will inform this assessment.
- 8.3 The planning application stage is the appropriate stage for overall extent of development and development criteria to be assessed by the Council and conditioned if considered necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms. This level of detail is not needed to ascertain whether the proposed allocation for the Gilston Area is sound and for the reasons already outlined in section 7 above, it is our view that the propose policy in GA1 and GA2 is more than adequate to ensure that the development of the Site will not result in substantial harm to heritage assets.