

**Committee:** Assets of Community Value & Local Heritage List  
**Title:** Local Heritage List  
**Date:** Wednesday, 7 April 2021  
**Portfolio Holder:** Councillor Colin Day, Portfolio Holder for Communities, Youth, Public Safety and the Police and Fire Service Liaison  
**Report Author:** Bruce Tice, Local Heritage Lead, 01799 51067

---

## Summary

1. This report seeks the approval of members of the Assets of Community Value and Local Heritage List Committee for the publication of the second edition of the council's Local Heritage List (LHL).
2. The first edition LHL was approved by Cabinet in October 2018. This second edition proposes the addition of a further 60 assets.
3. The document in question is a collection of non-designated heritage assets across the district, identified through nomination by town and parish councils, neighbourhood plan groups, historical groups, the public and officers.
4. Each entry has been assessed against a range of selection criteria (approved by Cabinet in June 2017) and found to meet a minimum of two criteria.
5. The list does not represent an exhaustive district wide survey but is the second edition of the LHL, which will continue to be a rolling document and updated periodically. The experience of the Local Heritage List project, so far, indicates that the process is both important to and popular with local communities.

## Recommendations

6. That the committee approves the second edition of the Local Heritage List at Appendix 2.

## Financial implications

7. There are limited financial implications arising from the publication of the Local Heritage List. The approved document would simply be uploaded to view on the council's website, at minimal cost and links to the document circulated to council officers, members and parish/ town councils by email. We will also write to the owners of the properties on the agreed list.

## Background papers

8. The following papers are referred to by the author in this report.
  - Appendix 1: Report of public participation on the Uttlesford Local Heritage List 4

January – 15 February 2021

- Appendix 2: Local Heritage List, April 2021

## Impact

9.

Communication/consultation	A six-week public consultation has been carried out
Community Safety	None
Equalities	None
Health and Safety	Health and Safety/Covid secure procedures were observed during site visits to collect data
Human Rights/Legal Implications	The approval of the LHL is not considered to impact upon Human Rights or carry Legal implications, as it does not impose additional planning constraints
Sustainability	None
Ward-specific impacts	None
Workforce/Workplace	The requirements of the project were met with existing contractual resources from the conservation project/Local Heritage Lead officer/Planning Support Team and GIS Officer

## Situation

10. Following the agreement of the principal of preparing a Local Heritage List in 2017, a first edition Local Heritage List was approved in October 2018.
11. Subsequently, a number of new nominations were submitted to the council for inclusion on a second edition of the list. In addition a number of assets had been proposed / re-proposed for inclusion, principally:
  - POW Camp 116, Mill Lane, Hatfield Heath (LHL ref. 418) – proposed by Cabinet resolution 4 April 2018
  - WWII Nissen huts formerly Little Easton Airfield, Park Road, Brookend, Little Easton (LHL ref. 423) – withdrawn from the first edition LHL but re-proposed
12. Other proposals were made by town and parish councils, neighbourhood plan groups, historical groups, the public and officers. The nominated assets have each been visited and assessed against the agreed selection criteria. A number of the nominated assets did not satisfy the minimum of two criteria and have accordingly not been included on the draft list. A further number were not able to be assessed due to Covid restrictions on site access. These have been held

over for a subsequent list.

13. The process of collating nominations, assessing the assets against the selection criteria and producing the draft list was managed by the Local Heritage Lead officer as part of the project role, and remit of proactive conservation work.
14. Inclusion on the Local Heritage List does not introduce additional planning constraints on the property or structure in question, but should be viewed as a material planning consideration when applications relating to these assets are submitted and determined.
15. Where a property is included on the list, and a planning application is submitted in relation to it, the impact of the proposed development on the significance of the non-designated heritage asset should be considered as part of the decision making process. If the proposal would cause serious harm to, or total loss of significance, or any specific features identified in, but not limited to, the asset's description, then a balanced judgement should be made when determining the application.
16. Existing Article 4 Directions which may be in place on the properties identified on the Local Heritage List will be unaffected by their inclusion on the list, but it is expected that their inclusion will be considered and given due regard when applications relating to works restricted by an Article 4 Direction, are considered as part of a planning application.
17. This draft list was published for a full six-week public consultation, which ran from 4 January to 15 February 2021. Full details of the consultation, publicity and responses received can be found in Appendix 1.
18. A total of 57 formal responses were received during the public consultation period. The majority of the responses were in support either of the general principle of the Local Heritage List, or approved of the nomination of particular sites. A total of five responses received raised an objection either to the principle of the Local Heritage List, or the inclusion of individual assets. Other responses made general comments or suggested amendments and corrections. Two comments indicated an appetite amongst some local people for the future application of Article 4 Directions to provide protection for selected architectural features. One comment expressed concern that a property on the first edition list has recently been demolished.
19. The final draft report has been amended to reflect the comments received and officer decisions made as part of the public consultation.

20. Table of main consultation responses.  
All responses are contained in full in Appendix 1.

Consultation response	Officer comment
<p><b>Approvals</b> 29 comments in favour of approving the nomination of POW Camp 116, Mill Lane, Hatfield Heath (LHL ref. 418)</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>11 comments in favour approving the nomination of the WWII Nissen huts formerly Little Easton Airfield, Park Road, Brookend, Little Easton (LHL ref. 423) and Brookend Farm Stables, Park Road, Brookend, Little Easton (LHL ref. 424)</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>5 comments supporting the nomination of the Wall to Shortgrove estate, Sparrowend Hill and London Road (LHL ref. 426) and Spigot mortar emplacement, adjacent to Sparrowsend Cottages, London Road (LHL ref. 427) or suggesting additional protection for properties at Shortgrove</p>	<p>Noted. A number of additional assets have been nominated by consultees. These will be considered for inclusion in a future edition of the LHL. Other advice to be offered on protecting the historic environment.</p>
<p>2 comments concerning approval for the future application of Article 4 Directions to provide protection for selected architectural features</p>	<p>Consideration of a future programme of Article 4 designation.</p>
<p><b>Objections</b> 1 objection to the nomination of the of POW Camp 116, Mill Lane, Hatfield Heath (LHL ref. 418)</p>	<p>The site has been surveyed and approved for nomination as a heritage asset by UDC. There is also significant public support for including this site.</p>
<p>1 objection on behalf of the site owners the nomination of the WWII Nissen huts formerly Little Easton Airfield, Park Road, Brookend, Little Easton (LHL ref. 423)</p>	<p>The site has been surveyed and approved for nomination as a heritage asset by UDC officers and by Essex County Council Place Services who both agree that, in spite of the later alterations the buildings meet sufficient criteria for designation. Whilst there are other examples of surviving Nissen huts elsewhere, many of these are just single units or in a place of</p>

<p>1 objection on behalf of the property owners to the nomination of 15 Summerhill Road, Saffron Walden (LHL ref. 430)</p> <p>2 objections by the property owners to the nomination of 7-9 Blythwood Gardens, Stansted Mountfitchet (LHL ref. 444)</p> <p><b>Other comments</b> A number of responses corrected information, provided an update on the status of nominated assets or offered additional supporting evidence. Two comments are of note:</p> <p>Wrought iron Croyden Gate, Former Friends School, Saffron Walden (LHL ref. 432) has been removed from the site to storage</p> <p>Homely, The Street High Easter (LHL ref. 165) has been demolished</p>	<p>secondary deposition. The examples here present a collection of huts in their original configuration which is a rarer situation. They are, as such, considered to have a notable aesthetic value, to be important as a grouping and, in such a configuration, rare. There is also significant public support for including this site.</p> <p>Whilst modernist buildings are, in themselves, not rare, buildings of such quintessential design are scarce in Saffron Walden. The construction of light red brick, probably of local manufacture, and prominent use of Crittall/Critall style windows give a local take on the national style. Many modernist structures have been lost in the locality and retaining those that remain will contribute to the aesthetic and architectural diversity of the area.</p> <p>Comments and additional information received as part of the consultation prompted a review of the entry and re-survey of the site. As a result, the property was not considered to meet the minimum selection criteria and has been removed from the draft list.</p> <p>As the asset is no longer in situ the entry has been withdrawn from the draft list. Should the gate be re-instated then consideration will be given to re-adding it to the list.</p> <p>This is to be regretted. The property has now been removed from the first edition of the list.</p>
--	--

21. A total of two assets have been omitted from the final list in response to the consultation. These were entries:

- LHL ref. 432 - Wrought iron Croyden Gate, Former Friends School
- LHL ref. 444 - 7-9 Blythwood Gardens.

22. The current list comprises 60 entries, and nearly 90 individual assets. Some assets identified for nomination were not included, as they failed to meet the minimum selection criteria or were already listed by Historic England. A record of these properties has been retained, and exemplifies the need to identify and protect important non-designated assets in the district, before they are subjected to unsympathetic modernisation and alteration, which diminishes their overall significance. A further number of nominated assets could not be surveyed due to Covid restrictions. Details of these have been retained and they will be assessed for a future edition of the list.

## Risk Analysis

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigating actions
Inability to identify non-designated heritage assets within the district may lead to applications being determined without due regard or consideration for their local, historic, significance.	3	3	The Local Heritage List offers a method of formally identifying these assets, and ensuring they are highlighted as part of the constraints information when applications are submitted.
Without a clear set of criteria for assessing such assets, refusals and appeals against unsympathetic works may be undermined.	3	3	The Local Heritage List is supported by a robust selection criteria which gives weight to the designation of an asset as being a non-designated heritage asset giving the application of relevant paragraphs from the NPPF, 2018 greater transparency.

1 = Little or no risk or impact

2 = Some risk or impact – action may be necessary

3 = Significant risk or impact – action required

4 = Near certainty of risk occurring, catastrophic effect or failure

