

## Brief Heritage Impact Assessment – Easton Park Garden Village

The following document highlights any heritage assets that could potentially be impacted by development in response to the call for sites, undertaken as part of the draft Local Plan. It considers the significance of these heritage assets, the contribution that setting makes to their overall significance and the likely effect of the proposed development on their setting and overall significance.

For the purposes of this report, the terms **heritage asset**, **setting** and **significance** are used in accordance with the definition set out in the *National Planning Policy Framework Glossary*, 2012 pg. 52-56.

The information used to compile this report has been obtained from the National Heritage List, available on the Historic England website, a review of the supporting documentation submitted in the applicants' *'Easton Park: New Garden Development Prospectus May 2015'* and accompanying information as well as a recent site visit conducted by the Conservation officer, in relation to the proposals and to inform this response.

With regards to wider heritage policy, governmental guidance and good practice guidance, this report takes into account the guidance set out in the *National Planning Policy Framework* (NPPF) 2012, in addition to the NPPG, Historic England's (H.E.) publication *'Conservation Principles: Policies and Guidance'* (2008), the *H.E. Good Practice Advice: 2 and 3* (GPA, 2015) and *'Making changes to Heritage Assets: HE Advice Note 2. The Historic Environment Record for Essex'* has also been consulted. In addition the report takes into consideration the policies set out in the current Uttlesford Local Plan, 2005; in particular policies ENV1 and ENV2.

The following assessment follows the staged approach to proportionate decision taking, as set out in the Historic England guidance document: *The Setting of Heritage Assets: Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning: 3 Published 2015* (GPA 3)

## 1.0 Record of heritage assets, and their setting, that would be affected by the proposed development

### 1.1 Listed Buildings

The list below identifies those heritage assets most likely to be impacted by the proposed development, and is not an exhaustive list of all heritage assets in the vicinity.

Asset Details	List Description	List Ref.
Strood Hall	Grade II. House. Early C19, red brick with grey slate roof. 2 storeys. Off centre front breaks forward with pediment at eaves. Roof at left end at slightly lower level. 5 window range leaded casements at first floor. 2 ground floor bay windows with vertical sliding sashes. Central first floor window has semi- circular head. Porch with timber columns and swept canopy.	1087908
Stone Hall	Grade II*. House. Timber framed and plastered, and plastered brick, and possibly stone. 2 storeys. L shaped plan with square tower like structure, with circular corner tower. Said to incorporate two C14 stone windows, each of 2 trefoiled ogee lights under a segmented head. C16 and C17 red brick chimney stack. Also said to contain a C16 door, C17 panelling, and cambered tie beams. (RCHM 4)	1334091
Terrace East of Easton Lodge	Grade II. Terrace of 6 cottages. Built 1896, by Frances, Countess of Warwick, as servants' quarters for the mid C19 house. Timber framed and plastered brick, with red plain tile roof. 2 storeys. Centre 2 units have one gable to front. Remaining units have small feature gables. All with pierced bargeboards. 6 window range, casements with diagonal glazing bars. Centre section has 2 oriels at first floor, on wood brackets. Verandah to full length of front, on timber posts, with brackets and pierced spandrels.	1334054
Water Tower	Grade II. Water Tower. Built 1902 in red brick with red plain tile pyramid roof and ball finial. Square plan. 2 windows on each side, in semi-circulate recessed arches, with Keystones. Top is corbelled out on moulded bricks, above panels. Square recessed panels with Maynard plaque and	1055812

	date 1902.	
Easton Lodge	Grade II. House. Former servants' quarters to main house. C17, extensively altered in C20. Brick and timber frame, rendered 2 storeys. Modern casement windows. C17 red brick chimney stack.	1097459
Brookend Farmhouse	Grade II. Farmhouse, c.1500 and late C16. Timber framed and plastered with gabled peg tile roof. Of two storeys and 'U' plan form with wings to the rear. Front has gabled, formerly jettied, crosswing and 20 century gabled porch. Windows are a mixture of C17 leaded light casements and early C19 double hung sash windows. Off-centre, canted, two storey bay window with hipped roof. Central gabled dormer window on front and large rear wall stack and later stacks on crosswing. The timber frame is exposed within, with jowled posts, arch braces and remnants of crown post roof in crosswing. Two storey late C16 block is replacement for former open hall.	1322579
The Hoppit	Grade II. C16 house, with C18 extensions to south. Timber framed and plastered, with C18 red brick facade to south wing. Red plain tile roofs. Two storeys. Three window range, double hung vertical sliding sashes. Lean-to extension at rear.	1306822
Flemings Hill Farmhouse	Grade II. Late C16 house, timber framed and plastered with red plain tile hipped roof. Two storeys. Transitional plan, with former crosswing oversailed at north end. Long wall jetty to front. Three window range, C18 double hung vertical sliding sashes with glazing bars. Two semi-hexagonal bay windows to ground floor. Original and C18, red brick chimney stacks. Internally most of the original frame remains with cambered tie beams and lodged side purlin roof. Jowled storey posts. Two pedimented doorcases at rear.	1168672
Barn to South of Flemings Hill Farmhouse	Grade II. Remains of C15 house, converted to barn in C16. Timber framed, weatherboarded and plastered. Five bays long, with crown post tiled roof, jowled storey posts and original windows in situ.	1168676
Bakehouse approx. 7 Metres to South of Flemings Hill Farmhouse	Grade II. Bakehouse late C15 or early C16. Timber framed and plastered with late C18 and C20 red brick cladding to lower walls. Red plain tile roof. Timber frame	1112189

	exposed at one end externally. C18 red brick chimney stack. 1 storey. Single small 2 light window. Originally a crown post roof the actual post has been removed although the remainder survives including the collar purlin. The building is listed as a rare example of an external late-medieval kitchen possibly belonging to the former contemporary farmhouse (now a barn)	
Five Bay Barn to North of Flemings Hill Farmhouse	Grade II. Five bay barn to north of Flemings Hill Farmhouse TL 52 SE 9/6 II GV 2. Late C16, 5 bay barn, timber framed and weatherboarded, and plastered, with half hipped, corrugated iron roof. Half nipped midstrey to north side, has been moved from south side. Framed side purlin roof, with arch braced tie beams, and jowled storey posts. Halved and bladed scarfs.	1112259
Baldwins	Grade II. C16 or earlier gabled crosswing, with attached early C19 range. Timber framed and plastered, with red plain tile and grey slate roof. Two storeys; two:one window range, modern casements. Crosswing formerly jettied, now underbuilt. (RCHM16).	1322541
Broxted Hill	Grade II. Late C16 house, timber framed and plastered, with red plain tile hipped and gabled roof. Two storeys. Originally the house faced south, but now the west is main front. L-shaped plan. C16 south range had parallel rear range added in C17 and north wing C18. Two:one:one, window range, C19 double hung vertical sliding sashes with glazing bars and C19 casements. One ground floor bay window. C19 gabled porch, with red plain tile roof. Modern pargetting. Original red brick chimney stack, and C18 red brick chimney stack. (RCHM17).	1112260
Barn 15 Metres South East of Broxted Hill	Grade II. Barn 15 m to south-east of Broxted Hill (formerly listed as Barn 50 m to south-east of Broxted Hill) TL 52 SE 9/11 19.12.79 II 2. C18 timber framed and weatherboarded barn with red plain tile roof. Three hipped midstreys on east side.	1168679
Kings Farmhouse	Grade II. Late C18 house, with C19 extensions and alterations. Timber framed and plastered, and painted brick. Red plain tile roof, with pierced ridge tiles. 2 storeys. L shaped plan, with C19	1097457

	<p>extensions at rear. 2 window range, C19 vertical sliding sashes with glazing bars. Rear wing has C19 casements with segmental heads. 2 gabled dormers. Front entrance door has flat moulded canopy on brackets and with reeded pilasters. Rear wing has gabled porch. Red brick chimney stack.</p>	
Round House	<p>Grade II. House. C19 in red brick, with red plain tile roof, incorporating courses of Bullnosed tile. 1 storey range with small crenellated circular red brick tower. Tower is also corbelled and decorated with lockstitch patterns. Casement windows in assorted shaped heads.</p>	1097460
Plowlands	<p>Grade II. House. C18 with extensive late additions. Timber framed and plastered with red plain tile roof. 2 storeys with single storey extension at one end. 2 window range C20 casements. Original red brick, end wall chimney stacks.</p>	1366596
Easton Glebe	<p>Grade II*. Mid C18 in red brick with red plain tile roof. 2 storeys. 5 window range C18 vertical sliding sashes with glazing bars and gauged arches. Pediment doorcase with Ionic pilasters. C19 and C20 extensions at rear. C20, semi-circular extension on east end. C18 and C19 detailing internally. One time home of author H.G. Wells.</p>	1334055
Barn Adjacent to Easton Glebe	<p>Grade II. (Excerpt only) Barn. Early C18, timber framed, weatherboarded and plastered with slated, half hipped roof. 4 bays long. Single aisle on south side. Diagonal braces to tie beams. Side purlin roof. Upper floor in east end bays. Early C20 leaded casements and glazed screen from ground to eaves on north side. Re-used C17 panelled door on east end. Easton Glebe was occupied for some time by the writer H G Wells and his family, and it is recorded that this barn was used for children's games and dramatic productions involving well-known literary figures.</p>	1097469

## 1.2 Conservation Areas

The site **does partly** fall within the boundary of the Little Easton Conservation Area.

## 1.3 Scheduled Ancient Monuments

There are **no Scheduled Ancient Monuments** within the boundary.

## 1.4 Sites of Special Archaeological Interest

The list below identifies sites of archaeological interest most likely to be impacted by the proposed development, and is not intended as an exhaustive list of all heritage assets in the vicinity.

Asset ID	Site No.
Stone Hall	TBC
Park Road,	TBC
Easton Lodge	TBC
Cobbs Lane	TBC

## 1.5 Other features of note:

### 1.5.1 Footpaths and Bridleways

There is a network of public footpaths and a bridleway within the boundary of the site. At present these represent routes through open land, formerly belonging to Lord Maynard and approaching Easton Lodge and later a World War II airfield, the presence of which is still evident today.

### 1.5.2 Important Views

There are a number of important views, both within and outside of the site, looking towards the village of Little Easton. Most notable are views from the south, across open countryside which features the prominent water tower on the skyline. Views from surrounding country lanes into the site, particularly adjacent to, or towards heritage assets, are particularly sensitive.

In considering the impact of setting in relation to significance, the former is often associated with views. GPA3 states that **'contribution of setting to the significance of a heritage asset is often expressed by reference to views'**. These views can include a *'variety of views of, across, or including that asset, and views of the surroundings from or through the asset'*.

In addition, views can contribute *'more to understanding the significance of a heritage asset'* and can include *'natural features'* which are 'particularly relevant'.

### 1.5.3 Non-designated heritage assets

The significance of the former World War II airfield, both the airfield itself and supporting outbuildings, which fall within the boundary of the proposed development site, should be recognised and duly assessed as part of any forthcoming proposal. It represents a valid phase in the historic development of the village, and is considered to have communal, aesthetic, evidential and historic value.

#### 1.5.4 Registered Parks and Gardens

A grade II registered park and garden falls within the boundary of the development site, located to the immediate west and north of Tower House, the dwelling which incorporates the Grade II listed water tower in Little Easton.

## 2.0 How, and to what degree, if at all, does the setting of these heritage assets contribute to the significance of these heritage assets?

2.1 GPA3 is clear that 'setting is not a heritage asset', but that its *'importance lies in what it contributes to the significance of the heritage asset'*. Its contribution can depend on a wide range of physical factors within the surroundings of the heritage asset, but can also include *'perceptual and associational attributes pertaining to, the heritage asset's surroundings'*.

2.2 Due to the number of heritage assets listed above, I will address the impact upon heritage assets in terms of groupings; Listed Buildings, Scheduled Ancient Monuments, Sites of Archaeological Interest and other heritage assets as appropriate.

### 2.2.1 Listed Buildings

The site features a variety of listed buildings, some of which form part of a modest and sporadic grouping of development in a small, rural village context, surrounded by open countryside. Others are more isolated farmsteads, benefiting from a secluded and private position, again within the context of the open countryside. The majority are Grade II listed, with the exception of Strood Hall to the South of the site, and Easton Glebe to the east, which are both Grade II\*. Assets generally benefit from an immediate domestic setting, though some are outbuildings, and enjoy an agricultural farmyard setting. They all respond to a wider rural setting which contributes positively to their overall character and significance.

### 2.2.2

There are a number of sites of archaeological interest within the boundary, and as such enjoy both an immediate and wider setting, largely informed by their rural, countryside position.

### 3.0 What would be the effects of the proposed development on that significance, and would this be beneficial or harmful?

Details submitted at present regarding the proposed development and relative significance of the heritage assets are limited, and as such the full impact of the proposal upon the heritage assets is unclear. However, proposed new development of the scale proposed, within close proximity to the heritage assets detailed above, is likely to impact upon their wider agricultural, or rural countryside setting by reason of the development of surrounding open land, which at present serves to inform the character of these buildings, including why and how they came to be located where they are, and their historic function and purpose.

Extensive new development tight to the boundary of an existing modest settlement, which is currently framed by open countryside views, would also cause a degree of harm to their wider setting, which would in turn detract from their significance. Based on the information to hand, it is considered that the proposed development **would cause a degree of harm** to the setting of a number of heritage assets, some of which are Grade II\* listed. This impact is considered to be irreversible in the sense that once development is approved, and implemented, it is highly unlikely that this will be removed in the future, and as such the impact cannot be undone.

In response to this, there would be a **significant public benefit** arising from the proposal, in the form of new housing and associated services for a new community. As such, this could be viewed as mitigation.

Furthermore, the proposed masterplan appears to retain much of the layout of the airfield as part of the proposal. It could be argued that this represents a valid and important phase in terms of the history of the village, and its incorporation within the scheme, would add a unique character to the development and enable the history of the site to continue to be interpreted in future. **This could be viewed as an enhancement.**

In terms of the archaeological sites, development of this land, or that adjacent to the asset may result in the disturbance of 'buried' archaeology, which may inhibit future interpretation and understanding of its significance, **resulting in harm.**

On the other hand, if properly conducted and monitored, localised excavation may better reveal the significance of the heritage asset, thereby resulting in an **enhancement** arising from the development, however, I would defer further comment in relation to this, to the ECC Archaeological Officer or other suitably qualified person.

## 4.0 How might enhancement be maximised, and any harm minimised or avoided?

### 4.1 Enhancement

Asset Details	Benefit	How would this be maximised?
Sites of Archaeological Interest	Localised excavation to better reveal significance of the heritage asset	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Defer to ECC Archaeological Officer or other qualified person.</li> </ul>

### 4.2 Harm

Asset Details	Harm	How would this be avoided?
Listed Buildings	Harm to immediate and wider rural, countryside setting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify alternative site(s) for development</li> <li>Provide a buffer around heritage assets, as necessary, enabling them to continue to be viewed in their historic setting.</li> <li>Seek opportunities to include heritage assets within the site, that can potentially benefit from inclusion in such a scheme in terms of repair and maintenance.</li> </ul>
Sites of Archaeological Interest	Harm to immediate and wider rural, countryside setting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify alternative site(s) for development</li> <li>Provide a buffer around heritage assets, as necessary, enabling them to continue to be viewed in their historic setting.</li> </ul>

In addition to the above, the site boundary is within close proximity to Easton Lodge Gatehouse, a Grade II listed structure which is presently on the Uttlesford Buildings at Risk register. The proposed site occupies what would have been grounds of Easton Hall, with an access route from the south-east serviced by the gatehouse. This structure therefore has great relevance to the historic context of the site. Whilst this is currently shown as being outside of the site boundary, it would be highly disappointing for a development of this scale, on the site in question, not to offer some form of benefit to adjacent heritage assets such as this, which could potentially form part of the development. If treated sensitively, it could provide a further access route to the Garden Village, as a cycle path, pedestrian route or even secondary emergency access route, which could prove an asset to a future scheme.

## 5.0 Concluding recommendation

It is strongly recommended that a full Heritage Impact Assessment be commissioned with regards to the proposed development, if this site is to be recommended. Based on the information available at present, it is unlikely that the proposed scheme could be achieved without causing a degree of harm to the significance of a number of heritage assets; both listed buildings and sites of archaeological interest.

The resulting impact of the development as proposed, upon the setting of these heritage assets is considered to be harmful and would compromise their overall significance. This is likely to result in less than substantial harm predominantly, and would detract from the open countryside setting of the individual assets, and Little Easton village, as a whole. In response to this, the NPPF is clear in paragraph 132 that '**great weight should be given to the asset's conservation**'. I am also mindful here of the guidance set out in policies ENV2 of the Uttlesford Local Plan, 2005.

Whilst the proposal is likely to result in less than substantial harm, contrary to paragraph 134 of the NPPF, 2012, there is a significant level of public benefit arising from such a scheme that would arguably overcome this harm, depending on the proposed mitigation put forward by the applicant in respect of the concerns raised above. Further discussion with the applicant, or supporting information, would be required in order to comment further at present as the information submitted in relation to the historic built environment is lacking.

In the event that the Authority is minded to recommend the site, I would suggest that a full and independent Heritage Impact Assessment be carried out to inform any future masterplan, and that any subsequent proposal should take measures to address the concerns raised above, taking great care to avoid unnecessary and irreversible harm to the significance of the heritage assets detailed above, and their wider setting. In light of this, I would recommend strongly that the submitted masterplan is revised, once this assessment has been carried out, and the layout of proposed housing detailed accordingly. Subject to these measures, I consider that such a scheme could be achieved on the site without causing substantial harm to the significance of the heritage assets detailed above.

# Brief Heritage Impact Assessment – Great Chesterford Garden Village

The following document highlights any heritage assets that could potentially be impacted by development in response to the call for sites, undertaken as part of the draft Local Plan. It considers the significance of these heritage assets, the contribution that setting makes to their overall significance and the likely effect of the proposed development on their setting and overall significance.

For the purposes of this report, the terms **heritage asset**, **setting** and **significance** are used in accordance with the definition set out in the National Planning Policy Framework Glossary, 2012 pg. 52-56.

The information used to compile this report has been obtained from the National Heritage List, available on the Historic England website, a review of the supporting documentation submitted by the applicants, including the 'Cultural Heritage Assessment' provided by Bidwells on behalf of the 'Uttlesford Landowners' and a recent site visit conducted by the Conservation officer, in relation to the proposals and to inform this response.

With regards to wider heritage policy, governmental guidance and good practice guidance, this report takes into account the guidance set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2012, in addition to the NPPG, Historic England's (H.E.) publication 'Conservation Principles: Policies and Guidance' (2008), the H.E. Good Practice Advice: 2 and 3 (GPA, 2015) and 'Making changes to Heritage Assets: HE Advice Note 2. The Historic Environment Record for Essex has also been consulted. In addition the report takes into consideration the policies set out in the current Uttlesford Local Plan, 2005; in particular policies ENV1 and ENV2.

The following assessment follows the staged approach to proportionate decision taking, as set out in the Historic England guidance document: *The Setting of Heritage Assets: Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning: 3 Published 2015 (GPA 3)*

## 1.0 Record of heritage assets, and their setting, that would be affected by the proposed development

### 1.1 Listed Buildings

Asset Details	List Description	List Ref.
Park Farmhouse Park Road, Great Chesterford	C17 timber-framed and plastered building with 2 gables and 2 projecting gabled wings on the south-west side. Two storeys. Modern casements. Roof tiled, with a central square chimney stack and 2 end external stacks. (RCHM 32).	121913
Hinxton Grange	Farmhouse. c.1835 post inclosure, by Wedd William Nash. Gault brick with moulded stone dressings. Slate roofs. Octagonal stacks. Two storeys with symmetrical facade with outer bays slightly advanced and pedimented. Deep eaves. Moulded stone architraves with projecting cornices supported on console brackets and with applied pattern to wooden pelmets.	1318208
Stable and Coach House	GV II Stables and coach house. c.1835. Flint with gault brick quoins and dressings. Slated roof. Two storeys. Central pedimented gable with three first floor hung sash windows with glazing bars. Central double boarded doors flanked by segmental-headed single doors each with single windows. Included for group value.	1128074
Great Chesterford House, Great Chesterford	Red brick house with C18 and C19 external features possibly incorporating an earlier core. The house is 2 storeyed with attics and has a parapet with a raised brick band. On the south front there are 2 two storeyed bays and a central porch. An early C19 addition of one window range extends on the west. The windows are early C19 casements with "Gothic" arched top panes. On the north front there is a gable at the east end and a later gabled wing extends at the west end of the front. Roofs tiled, mansard to the main block,	1171482

	with 3 segmental headed dormer windows on the south front.	
Coach House at Great Chesterford House, Great Chesterford	Early C19 flint building with red brick quoins and dressings. Two storeys. The south gable is weather-boarded. Two window range, casements with "gothic" arched heads. There is a central "gothic" arched doorway with a loft hoist above. Roof pantiled.	1322519

## 1.2 Conservation Areas

The site **does not** fall within the boundary of a Conservation Area, but is located to the north-east of the Great Chesterford Conservation Area.

## 1.3 Scheduled Ancient Monuments

Asset Details	List Description	List Ref.
Romano-Celtic temple 400m south of Dell's Farm	(Excerpt only) Despite damage caused by prolonged ploughing, the Romano-Celtic temple complex 400m south of Dell Farm survives well. Limited archaeological investigations have clearly demonstrated both the size of the complex and the substantial and elaborate nature of its buildings and boundary walls.	1017453

## 1.4 Sites of Special Archaeological Interest

### 1.4.1 Within the Boundary

Asset ID	Site No.
973	4988
974	4978
976	4792

977	4791
931	4855
1023	4858

#### 1.4.2 Outside of the Boundary

Asset ID	Site No.
971	4821
972	4820
1024	4783
1305	4793
1037	4848

#### 1.5 Other features of note:

##### 1.5.1 Footpaths and Bridleways

There are a number of footpaths and bridleways in the vicinity. One footpath in particular, which begins at Park House and continues through **Park Farm**, falls within the boundary, and will be **particularly sensitive** to potential development as proposed.

##### 1.5.2 Important Views

There are extensive views from the C17th farmstead located on the plateau, which permit views of the surrounding open countryside, isolated farmsteads and the rural villages in the distance. In addition, due to the topography of the site, and elevated plateau within it, there are public views from outside the boundary along Walden Road and from within Great Chesterford Village itself, most notably High Street and Carmen Street.

In considering the impact of setting in relation to significance, the former is often associated with views. GPA3 states that '**contribution of setting to the significance of a heritage asset is often expressed by reference to views**'. These views can include a '*variety of views of, across, or including that asset, and views of the surroundings from or through the asset*'.

In addition, views can contribute '*more to understanding the significance of a heritage asset*' and can include '*natural features*' which are 'particularly relevant'.

## 2.0 How, and to what degree, if at all, does the setting of these heritage assets contribute to the significance of these heritage assets?

2.1 GPA3 is clear that ‘setting is not a heritage asset’, but that its *‘importance lies in what it contributes to the significance of the heritage asset’*. Its contribution can depend on a wide range of physical factors within the surroundings of the heritage asset, but can also include *‘perceptual and associational attributes pertaining to, the heritage asset’s surroundings’*.

2.2 Below is a table listing the heritage assets that would be potentially impacted by the proposed development, their setting and the contribution this setting makes to their overall significance.

Asset Details	Type	Setting	Contribution to Significance
Park Farmhouse Park Road, Great Chesterford	Listed Building	Immediate domestic setting adjacent to agricultural outbuildings forming farm complex and surrounded by open fields and arable land resulting in an isolated, rural setting within open countryside.	Both immediate and wider setting inform the character and historic context of the heritage asset, and contribute positively to its overall significance.
Hinxton Grange, Stables and Coach House	Listed Building	Immediate domestic setting and wider rural, countryside setting.	Both immediate and wider setting inform the character and historic context of the heritage asset, and contribute positively to its overall significance.
Great Chesterford House, Great Chesterford and Coach House	Listed Building	Immediate domestic setting on the outskirts of a rural village settlement, to the west, and wider rural, countryside setting to the north east and east.	Both immediate and wider setting inform the character and historic context of the heritage asset, and contribute positively to its overall significance.
Romano-Celtic temple 400m south of Dell's Farm	Scheduled Ancient Monument	Immediate rural, countryside setting with rural village settlement to the west.	Both immediate and wider setting inform, and contribute positively, to its overall significance.
973	Site of Special Archaeological Interest	Immediate agricultural setting and wider rural countryside setting to the north, east and south	Both immediate and wider setting inform, and contribute positively, to its overall significance.

974	Site of Special Archaeological Interest	Immediate agricultural setting and wider rural countryside setting to the north, east and south with historic village settlement to the south.	Both immediate and wider setting inform, and contribute positively, to its overall significance.
976	Site of Special Archaeological Interest	Immediate rural countryside setting and wider rural countryside setting with primary transport links to the west.	Immediate and wider setting contribute positively, to its overall significance.
977	Site of Special Archaeological Interest	Immediate rural countryside setting and wider rural countryside setting with primary transport links to the west.	Immediate and wider setting contribute positively, to its overall significance.
931	Site of Special Archaeological Interest	Immediate rural countryside setting and wider rural countryside setting with primary transport links to the west.	Immediate and wider setting contribute positively, to its overall significance.
1023	Site of Special Archaeological Interest	Immediate rural countryside setting and wider rural countryside setting	Immediate and wider setting contribute positively, to its overall significance.

### 3.0 What would be the effects of the proposed development on that significance, and would this be beneficial or harmful?

**Please note:** Heritage Assets that are considered to be most sensitive to the proposed development are listed below. Assets listed in section 1.0, where the impact is considered to be negligible, have been excluded below for ease of reference.

Asset Details	Impact to significance	Would this be beneficial or harmful?
Park Farmhouse Park Road, Great Chesterford	<p>A) Removal of modern structures and buildings which detract from the immediate setting may better reveal the form of the agricultural yard and associated outbuildings of merit, thereby enhancing interpretation of the site.</p> <p>B) Introduction of built-develop within curtilage of listed building and substantial built-development to the surrounding open countryside. Impact to rural, isolated agricultural and countryside setting. Contrary to <b>133, NPPF, Policy ENV2, ULP</b></p> <p>C) Introduction of new structures such as hotel, community buildings, cafes and restaurants as proposed, in the form proposed is likely to compete with heritage asset(s) and obscure the historic planform and character of the site, which in turn detracts from the immediate setting of the listed building. <b>Potentially 133, NPPF, ENV2, ULP.</b></p>	<p>A) Beneficial</p> <p>B) Harmful</p> <p>C) Harmful</p>
Great Chesterford House, Great Chesterford	Introduction of substantial built-development to the surrounding open countryside to the north-east and Impact to wider rural agricultural setting.	Harmful
Romano-Celtic temple 400m south of Dell's Farm	<p>A) Excavation of surrounding land may better reveal evidence of historic archaeological activity and improve knowledge and interpretation of the context and significance of the heritage asset.</p> <p>B) Introduction of substantial built-development to the surrounding open countryside to the north and impact to wider rural agricultural setting. <b>134, NPPF, Policy ENV2, ULP</b></p>	<p>Beneficial</p> <p>Harmful</p>

	<b>c)</b> Excavation of surrounding land may, cause irreversible harm to buried archaeology which could inhibit future interpretation of the site.	Harmful
973, 974, 976, 977, 931 and 1023	Impact to wider rural agricultural setting.	Harmful

## 4.0 How might enhancement be maximised, and any harm minimised or avoided?

### 4.1 Enhancement

Asset Details	Benefit	How would this be maximised?
Park Farmhouse Park Road, Great Chesterford	Removal of modern structures and buildings which detract from the immediate setting may better reveal the form of the agricultural yard and associated outbuildings of merit, thereby enhancing interpretation of the site.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional funding for the repair and on-going maintenance of the listed building, and associated curtilage listed outbuildings, or non-designated heritage assets on the site.</li> <li>• Future development to preserve and enhance the historic setting of the heritage assets, and reinforce the significance of the assets in terms of form, scale, massing, layout and detail.</li> <li>• Extent of new development to be proportionate to the site, and to retain important vistas both into and from the site.</li> </ul>
Romano-Celtic temple 400m south of Dell's Farm	Excavation of surrounding land may better reveal evidence of historic archaeological activity and improve knowledge and interpretation of the context and significance of the heritage asset.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Defer to ECC Archaeological Advisor or suitably qualified persons.</li> </ul>

### 4.2 Harm

Asset Details	Harm	How would this be avoided?
Park Farmhouse Park Road, Great Chesterford	<p>Introduction of built-develop within curtilage of listed building and substantial built-development to the surrounding open countryside. Impact to rural, isolated agricultural and countryside setting. Contrary to <b>133, NPPF, Policy ENV2, ULP</b></p> <p>Introduction of new structures such as hotel,</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Identify alternative site(s) for development - Recommended</b></li> <li>• Provide buffer around the plateau and listed buildings curtilage, enabling it to be viewed in isolation, in a countryside setting</li> <li>• Consider a reduced proposal, to a more confined area of the site which is least sensitive in terms of impact upon the historic environment, both above and below ground.</li> </ul>

	community buildings, cafes and restaurants as proposed, in the form proposed is likely to compete with heritage asset(s) and obscure the historic planform and character of the site, which in turn detracts from the immediate setting of the listed building. <b>Potentially 133, NPPF, ENV2, ULP.</b>	
Great Chesterford House, Great Chesterford	Introduction of substantial built-development to the surrounding open countryside to the north-east and Impact to wider rural agricultural setting.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify alternative site(s) for development</li> <li>• Consider a reduced proposal, to a more confined area of the site which is least sensitive in terms of impact upon the historic environment, both above and below ground.</li> <li>• Preserve uninterrupted views from the site in question into the open countryside and uninterrupted views from important public vantage points of the listed building in relation to its wider countryside setting.</li> </ul>
Romano-Celtic temple 400m south of Dell's Farm	Introduction of substantial built-development to the surrounding open countryside to the north and irreversible impact to wider rural agricultural setting. 134, NPPF, Policy ENV2, ULP  Excavation of surrounding land may, cause irreversible harm to buried archaeology which could inhibit future interpretation of the site.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify alternative site(s) for development</li> <li>• Provide buffer around the heritage asset, enabling it to be viewed and experienced in relation to its historic rural countryside setting.</li> <li>• Consider a reduced proposal, to a more confined area of the site which is least sensitive in terms of impact upon the historic environment, both above and below ground.</li> </ul>
Selected sites of Archaeological Interest 973 to 1023 as listed above.	Impact to wider rural agricultural setting.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify alternative site(s) for development</li> <li>• Provide buffer around the heritage asset, enabling it to be viewed and experienced in relation to its historic rural countryside setting.</li> </ul>

Selected sites . . . continued		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Consider a reduced proposal, to a more confined area of the site which is least sensitive in terms of impact upon the historic environment, both above and below ground.</li></ul>
--------------------------------	--	--

## 5.0 Concluding recommendation

It is strongly recommended that a full Heritage Impact Assessment be commissioned with regards to the proposed development if this site is to be recommended. I must advise however, that based on the information available at present, it is unlikely that the proposed scheme could be achieved without causing significant harm to the significance of the numerous heritage assets detailed above, most notably Park Farmhouse (Listed Building) and the Romano-Celtic Temple (Schedule Ancient Monument).

The resulting impact of the development as proposed, upon the setting of the heritage assets would compromise their overall significance in my view. In response to this, the 'heritage' benefits arising from the scheme, not to be confused with public benefits, are unlikely in my view to mitigate this harm. The NPPF is clear in paragraph 132 that '**great weight should be given to the asset's conservation**' and whilst I am mindful of the applicants desire to incorporate the boundary of the historic deer park into their masterplan, I must question whether this would be readily interpreted by visitors and occupants alike.

In addition, a heavily built-up residential settlement character is vastly different to the characteristics of a deer park, and I am unconvinced that this could be viewed as mitigation for irreversible harm to the designated heritage assets, which at present can be readily interpreted and appreciated by all in their historic setting. In light of the above, whilst there would be a significant public benefit arising from the scheme in terms of new housing, my recommendation would be that alternative sites are considered in order to achieve this benefit elsewhere, without compromising the heritage assets within what is considered a highly sensitive site.

In the event that the Authority is minded to recommend the site, I would suggest that a full and independent Heritage Impact Assessment be carried out to inform any future masterplan, and that any subsequent proposal should take measures to address the concerns raised above, taking great care to avoid unnecessary and irreversible harm the significance of the heritage assets detailed above and their wider setting. I would strongly recommend that the submitted masterplan is revised, once this assessment has been carried out, and the layout of proposed housing detailed accordingly. Such measures would be necessary in my view in order to arrive at a viable scheme for the site.

# Brief Heritage Impact Assessment – Andrewsfield Garden Village, West of Braintree

The following document highlights any heritage assets that could potentially be impacted by development in response to the call for sites, undertaken as part of the draft Local Plan. It considers the significance of these heritage assets, the contribution that setting makes to their overall significance and the likely effect of the proposed development on their setting and overall significance.

For the purposes of this report, the terms **heritage asset**, **setting** and **significance** are used in accordance with the definition set out in the National Planning Policy Framework Glossary, 2012 pg. 52-56.

The information used to compile this report has been obtained from the National Heritage List, available on the Historic England website, a review of the supporting documentation submitted by the applicants, including the '*Andrewsfield Garden Village Development Vision. June 2015*' document, and '*Technical Report- Landscape. June 2015*' a recent site visit conducted by the Conservation officer, in relation to the proposals and to inform this response.

With regards to wider heritage policy, governmental guidance and good practice guidance, this report takes into account the guidance set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2012, in addition to the NPPG, Historic England's (H.E.) publication 'Conservation Principles: Policies and Guidance' (2008), the H.E. Good Practice Advice: 2 and 3 (GPA, 2015) and 'Making changes to Heritage Assets: HE Advice Note 2. The Historic Environment Record for Essex has also been consulted. In addition the report takes into consideration the policies set out in the current Uttlesford Local Plan, 2005; in particular policies ENV1 and ENV2.

The following assessment follows the staged approach to proportionate decision taking, as set out in the Historic England guidance document: *The Setting of Heritage Assets: Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning: 3 Published 2015 (GPA 3)*

## 1.0 Record of heritage assets, and their setting, that would be affected by the proposed development

### 1.1 Listed Buildings

Asset Details	List Description	List Ref.
Tilehouse Farmhouse	Grade II. House and crosswing mid C16 or earlier with later and C20 additions and alterations. Timber framed and plastered. Red plain tile roof. Main range with gablet and ½ hipped to left, gabled and jettied crosswing and gabled and outshot to right. 2 storeys 1:3 first floor window range, 1:2 ground floor range of small paned casements. C20 gabled, red tiled, open porch and board door with lights. Red brick chimney stack at rear. RCHM 59.	1322301
Home Farmhouse	Grade II. Cottage C16/C17 with later additions and alterations. Timber framed and plastered. Thatched roof, half hipped to right, hipped to left and outshot over lean-to. 2 storeys. 2 window range first floor, 4 range to ground floor of C20 casements. C20 gabled enclosed porch and C20 board door with light. Red brick chimney stacks to left and right.	1306792
Byways/Sunnyside	Grade II. 2 adjoining cottages, C17 or earlier with later alterations. Timber framed and plastered. Two level thatched roof, hipped to left, with four eyebrow dormers. 1 storey and attic, 5 window range of horizontal sliding sashes and small paned casements. Two C20 doors. 2 red brick chimney stacks.	1168880
St Judes	Grade II. House C17 or earlier core, with circa 1819 flint and red brick dressed cladding and matching C20 addition to left, this addition with archway and crosswing. Red plain tiled roof, ½ hipped to crosswing and to right. 2 storeys. 1:3 window range first floor. 1:2 range to ground floor of gothic windows in dressed round head openings. Board door with pointed arch head in matching dressed opening. Dressed quoins and band.	1112735

	Original inglenook fireplace and incorporated bakehouse. Off centre red brick chimney stack. Known as "The Black Horse". Public House 1906.	
Old Leas	Grade II. Cottage C17 or earlier, with later alterations. Timber framed and plastered 1/2 hipped thatched roof with 2 flat head dormers. 1 storey and attic. 3 window range of various small paned casements and horizontal sliding sashes. Plain board door with pentice board over. 1 external and one central red brick chimney stack.	1168887
Mayview Willow Thatch	Grade II. 2 cottages C18 or earlier with later alterations and additions. Timber framed and plastered ½ hipped, thatched roof with 4 flat headed dormers. 1 storey and attics. 4 window range of C19 and C20 casements. 2 doors - one a C20 board door with glazing, the other, a C20 plank and muntin door. 2 red brick chimney stacks. There is a red tiled lean-to to right with boarded door.	1322302
Burnthouse Farmhouse	Grade II. House early C19 bricking-up with C18 or earlier timber framed and plastered rear wing. Red plain tiled roofs. Red brick with yellow brick bands and window dressings. 2 storeys. 4 range casement windows. Central gabled, open red brick porch with red tiled roof and barge boards to gable. 4 panel door with 2 lights. Central red brick chimney stack.	1168893
The Thatch	Grade II. Cottage C17/18 with later additions and alterations. Timber framed and plastered. Thatched roof with two gabled dormers and with central extension forming a porch over the C20 board door with light. 1 storey and attics. 4 window range of diamond leaded casements. Central red brick chimney stack, now plastered. RCHM 62.	1112736
Yew Tree Farmhouse	Grade II. House C18 with possibly earlier core and later additions and alterations. Timber framed and plastered. Red plain tiled roof outshots and rear. 2 storeys. 2 window range to ground floor, 3 to first floor, the central window with round head and	1322340

	glazing bars, the remainder all small paned vertical sliding sashes. Central 6 panel door approached by steps with pediment over. Red brick chimney stacks to right and left. Possible bake oven to left with red tiled roof. A building recorded on the site 1678.	
Yew Tree Farm Barn	Barn possibly C18. Timber framed, part weatherboard, part plaster, with thatched roof hipped to left. Red plain tiled gabled midstrey.	1168851
Bacons Farmhouse	Grade II. House, mid C16 or earlier with later additions and alterations. Timber framed and plastered with jettied crosswing to right. Red plain tiled roof ½ hipped to left, crosswing hipped with gablet. 2 storeys 2:1: window range of small paned casements. C20 enclosed gabled porch and board door. 2 red brick chimney stacks. Small red tiled lean-to to left. A building was recorded on the site as Walter Bacon's in 1323.	1112733
Bacons Farm Barn	Grade II. Barn. Possibly C18. Timber framed and weatherboarded. Central midstrey. Corrugated asbestos roof. Through bracing to walls.	1168859
Badcocks Farmhouse	Grade II. House, C17 crosswing recently restored with C20 additions. Timber framed and plastered with C20 pargetting and C20 range to left and rear. 2 storeys and attic. 2 windows to first floor, 2 to ground floor and 1 to attic of C20 leaded casements. C20 board door to hipped, enclosed red tiled porch. Side purlin roof, jowled storey posts, original chimney stack. A cambered tie beam and a finely moulded ceiling beam from the collapsed hall are incorporated in the C20 build. Red brick chimney stack. Record of a farm on the site in 1472	1112734
Gatehouse Farmhouse	Grade II. House with crosswing to right C16 or earlier, with later additions and alterations. Timber framed and plastered. Red plain tiled roof, with 3 flat head dormers and outshot over C20 glazed porch with board door. 2 storeys 2:2 range of C20 square leaded casement windows. 2 red brick chimney stacks. There is a red tiled	1168992

	single storey extension to right. Records of a farmhouse on this site date to 1327. RCHM53.	
--	---	--

### 1.2 Conservation Areas

The site does not fall within the boundary of a conservation area, but is located in proximity to the Stebbing Conservation Area (west), Rayne Conservation Area (south-east) and Great Saling Conservation Area (north), the two later falling within Braintree District.

### 1.3 Scheduled Ancient Monuments

Asset Details	List Description	List Ref.
Porters Hall Moated Site	The monument includes a moated site situated at Porter's Hall on a hill top overlooking and 1.25km south-east of Stebbing Brook. It includes a rectangular moated area which measures 110m NW-SE by 65m NE-SW. The arms are between 12m and 6m in width and are water-filled, except to the south-west where they have recently dried out. The eastern corner has an irregular extension which measures 30m NE-SW by 20m NW-SE. The southern corner has also been extended along the same line as the south-western arm for a further 32m. Along the southern edge of this arm is a slight bank, 3.5m in width and about 0.4m high which is considered to have been used as a garden terrace. (Excerpt only)	1008701

### 1.4 Sites of Special Archaeological Interest

**Please note:** The table below lists those heritage assets within Uttlesford District only.

Asset ID	Site No.
North of Tilehouse	TBC
North of Poultry House	TBC
Unnamed	TBC
Roman Road/ Stane Street	TBC
South of Badcocks Farm	TBC

## 1.5 Other features of note:

### 1.5.1 Important Views

There are a number of important viewpoints which are likely to be impacted by the proposed development, which should be recognised and considered as part of any future proposal. These include views of Badcocks Farmhouse from the road to the north-east of the listed building, which offer clear views of the farmhouse within its historic countryside setting (Fig 1).



*Fig 1: View travelling from the north-east with Badcocks Farm, the rendered structure clearly visible to the west.*

In addition, views from the main road (Dunmow Road) through Stebbing Green are also considered to be particularly sensitive to change. A number of listed buildings are located on the north-eastern side of the road, and are viewed in relation to the open countryside to the rear, which gently rises upwards to the north. This forms a pleasing and important backdrop to these heritage assets, preserving their historic setting. Views are possible between plots (Fig 2), and also through one particular dwelling, St Judes, which has a striking 'archway' arrangement, permitting views through to the fields behind (Fig 3).



*Fig 2 & 3 respectively: Countryside views are a key component of the setting of these listed buildings.*

Furthermore, views into and out from the site of Bacons Farm, should also be carefully considered.

In considering the impact of setting in relation to significance, the former is often associated with views. GPA3 states that **'contribution of setting to the significance of a heritage asset is often expressed**

by reference to views'. These views can include a *'variety of views of, across, or including that asset, and views of the surroundings from or through the asset'*.

In addition, views can contribute *'more to understanding the significance of a heritage asset'* and can include *'natural features'* which are 'particularly relevant'.

## 2.0 How, and to what degree, if at all, does the setting of these heritage assets contribute to the significance of these heritage assets?

2.1 GPA3 is clear that ‘setting is not a heritage asset’, but that its *‘importance lies in what it contributes to the significance of the heritage asset’*. Its contribution can depend on a wide range of physical factors within the surroundings of the heritage asset, but can also include *‘perceptual and associational attributes pertaining to, the heritage asset’s surroundings’*.

2.2 Below is a table listing the heritage assets that would be potentially impacted by the proposed development, their setting and the contribution this setting makes to their overall significance.

Asset Details	Type	Setting	Contribution to Significance
Tilehouse Farmhouse	Listed Buildings	Immediate domestic setting on the edge of a sporadic settlement of dwellings within a wider open rural countryside setting.	Both immediate and wider setting inform the character and historic context of the asset, and contribute positively to its overall significance.
Home Farmhouse	Listed Buildings	Immediate domestic setting within a sporadic settlement of dwellings within a wider open rural countryside setting.	As above.
Byways/Sunnyside	Listed Buildings	Immediate domestic setting within a sporadic settlement of dwellings within a wider open rural countryside setting.	As above.
St Judes	Listed Buildings	Immediate domestic setting within a sporadic settlement of dwellings within a wider open rural countryside setting.	As above.
Old Leas	Listed Buildings	Immediate domestic setting within a sporadic settlement of dwellings within a wider open rural countryside setting.	As above.
Mayview Willow Thatch	Listed Buildings	Immediate domestic setting within a sporadic settlement of dwellings within a wider open rural countryside setting.	As above.
Burnthouse Farmhouse	Listed Buildings	Immediate domestic setting as part of an agricultural complex, on the outskirts of a sporadic settlement within a wider open rural countryside	As above.

		setting.	
The Thatch	Listed Buildings	Immediate domestic setting within a sporadic settlement of dwellings within a wider open rural countryside setting.	As above.
Yew Tree Farmhouse	Listed Buildings	Immediate domestic setting as part of an agricultural complex within a wider open rural countryside setting.	As above.
Yew Tree Farm Barn	Listed Buildings	Immediate agricultural setting forming part of a complex associated with the domestic farmhouse, with wider open, rural countryside setting.	As above.
Bacons Farmhouse	Listed Buildings	Immediate domestic setting as part of an agricultural complex within a wider open rural countryside setting.	As above.
Bacons Farm Barn	Listed Buildings	Immediate agricultural setting forming part of a complex associated with the domestic farmhouse, with wider open, rural countryside setting.	As above.
Badcocks Farmhouse	Listed Buildings	Immediate domestic setting as part of an agricultural complex within a wider open rural countryside setting.	As above.
Gatehouse Farmhouse	Listed Buildings	Immediate domestic setting as part of an agricultural complex within a wider open rural countryside setting.	As above.
Porters Hall Moated Site	Scheduled Ancient Monument	Overall agricultural setting with domestic hall on the site and a wider rural countryside setting.	As above.
North of Tilehouse	Site of Archaeological Interest	Wider open rural countryside setting, on the outskirts of a sporadic, small settlement.	As above.
North of Poultry House	Site of Archaeological Interest	Open rural countryside setting.	As above.
Unnamed	Site of Archaeological Interest	Open rural countryside setting.	As above.
Roman Road/ Stane Street	Site of Archaeological Interest	Generally open rural countryside setting, but with localised small domestic settlements.	As above.

South of Badcocks Farm	Site of Archaeological Interest	Open rural countryside setting adjacent to agricultural farmsteads.	As above
------------------------	---------------------------------	---	----------

### 3.0 What would be the effects of the proposed development on that significance, and would this be beneficial or harmful?

**Please note:** Heritage Assets that are considered to be most sensitive to the proposed development are listed below. Assets listed in section 1.0, where the impact is considered to be negligible, have been excluded below for ease of reference.

The following list is compiled with reference to the submitted masterplan. Subsequent revision to this plan may alter the resulting impact which should be re-assessed as necessary.

Asset Details	Impact to significance	Would this be beneficial or harmful?
Tilehouse Farmhouse	Introduction of built development to the rear of the dwellings, replacing open-countryside setting with that of an urban settlement. Due to the topography of this is likely to be highly visible, particularly from Dunmow Road, undermining their historic wider setting.	Harmful
Home Farmhouse		
Byways/Sunnyside		
St Judes		
Old Leas		
Mayview Willow Thatch		
Burnthouse Farmhouse	Introduction of built development to wider setting of the heritage asset, replacing open-countryside setting with that of an urban settlement.	Harmful
The Thatch	Introduction of built development to wider setting of the heritage asset, replacing open-countryside setting with that of an urban settlement.	Harmful
Bacons Farmhouse	Introduction of built development to west and south of the site, partly impacting wider setting of the heritage asset and isolating the heritage asset from its historic, isolated countryside setting.	Harmful
Bacons Farm Barn		
Badcocks Farmhouse	Introduction of built development to west and east of the site, impacting views towards the heritage asset and its relationship to its historic rural countryside setting.	Harmful
North of Tilehouse	a) Excavation of surrounding land may cause irreversible harm to the buried	a) Harmful

North of Poultry House	archaeology which could inhibit future interpretation of the site.	
Unnamed	b) Introduction of built development to immediate and surrounding open countryside will impact historic setting.	b) Harmful
Roman Road/ Stane Street	c) Excavation of surrounding land may better reveal evidence of historic activity and improve knowledge and interpretation of the context and significance of the heritage asset.	c) Beneficial
South of Badcocks Farm		

## 4.0 How might enhancement be maximised, and any harm minimised or avoided?

### 4.1 Enhancement

Asset Details	Benefit	How would this be maximised?
North of Tilehouse	Excavation of surrounding land may better reveal evidence of historic activity and improve knowledge and interpretation of the context and significance of the heritage asset.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Defer to ECC Archaeological Advisor or suitably qualified persons.</li> </ul>
North of Poultry House		
Unnamed		
Roman Road/ Stane Street		
South of Badcocks Farm		

### 4.2 Harm

Asset Details	Harm	How would this be avoided?
Tilehouse Farmhouse	Introduction of built development to the rear of the dwellings, replacing open-countryside setting with that of an urban settlement.  Due to the topography of this is likely to be highly visible and is likely to be visible from Dunmow Road, competing with the primacy of the heritage assets, and undermining their historic context.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify alternative site(s) for development</li> <li>Retain the area of land to the rear of the properties (north-east) as open land as part of a forthcoming scheme.</li> </ul>
Home Farmhouse		
Byways/Sunnyside		
St Judes		
Old Leas		
Mayview Willow Thatch		
Burnthouse Farmhouse	Introduction of built development to wider setting of the heritage asset, replacing open-countryside setting with that of an urban settlement.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify alternative site(s) for development</li> <li>Retain the area of land to the rear of the properties (north-east) as open land as part of a forthcoming scheme.</li> </ul>
The Thatch	Introduction of built development to wider setting of the heritage asset, replacing open-countryside setting with	

	that of an urban settlement.	
Bacons Farmhouse	Introduction of built development to west and south of the site, partly impacting wider setting of the heritage asset and isolating the heritage asset from its historic, isolated countryside setting.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify alternative site(s) for development</li> <li>• Retain the area of land to the south and west of the listed building complex, as a buffer of open land as part of a forthcoming scheme enabling its historic setting to continue to be interpreted.</li> </ul>
Bacons Farm Barn		
Badcocks Farmhouse	Introduction of built development to west and east of the site, impacting views towards the heritage asset and its relationship to its historic rural countryside setting.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify alternative site(s) for development</li> <li>• Retain the area of land to the east and preferably also the west of the listed building complex, as a buffer of open land as part of a forthcoming scheme to retain views of the heritage asset from the road, enabling its historic setting to continue to be interpreted.</li> </ul>
North of Tilehouse	<p>Excavation of surrounding land may cause irreversible harm to the buried archaeology which could inhibit future interpretation of the site.</p> <p>Introduction of built development to immediate and surrounding open countryside will impact historic setting.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify alternative site(s) for development</li> <li>• Consider a buffer zone around the heritage assets, and locate new built-development away from these sites.</li> </ul>

## 5.0 Concluding recommendation

It is strongly recommended that a full Heritage Impact Assessment be commissioned with regards to the proposed development if this site is to be recommended.

The resulting impact of the development as proposed, upon the setting of the heritage assets is considered to be harmful and would compromise their overall significance. In response to this, the 'heritage' benefits arising from the scheme, not to be confused with public benefit, are unlikely in my view to mitigate this harm. The NPPF is clear in paragraph 132 that **'great weight should be given to the asset's conservation'**.

However, it should be acknowledged that the proposed development of up to 7,500 houses, would result in a significant public benefit, and it could be argued that this would outweigh the relative harm to the setting of the aforementioned heritage assets. Nonetheless, these buildings represent a finite resource, and once such a scheme has been agreed and implemented, this harm cannot be undone.

As such, I would suggest that a full and independent Heritage Impact Assessment be carried out to inform any future masterplan, and that any subsequent proposal should take measures to address the concerns raised above, taking great care to avoid unnecessary and irreversible harm the significance of the heritage assets detailed above, and their wider setting. In light of this, I would recommend strongly that the submitted masterplan is revised, once this assessment has been carried out, and the layout of proposed housing detailed accordingly. Subject to these measures, I consider that such a scheme could be achieved on the site without causing substantial harm to the significance of the heritage assets detailed above.