

HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT



Property Address: Park Farm House, Wheatsheaf Road, Woodmancote,
Henfield, West Sussex, BN5 9BA

Client: Oliver Clark & Victoria Elliott

Inspection Date: 23rd July 2024

Report Date: 6th September 2024

Prepared by Richard Pocock MSc MRICS

CONTENTS

- 1. INTRODUCTION**
- 2. BUILDING LOCATION AND SITE INFORMATION**
- 3. LISTED BUILDING DESCRIPTION**
- 4. BRIEF HISTORIC BACKGROUND AND INTERPRETATION**
- 5. ASSOCIATIVE RESEARCH**
- 6. ASSESSMENT OF HERITAGE VALUES**
- 7. STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE – MAIN HOUSE**
- 8. OUTBUILDINGS**
- 9. ASSESSMENT OF HERITAGE VALUES – OUTBUILDINGS**
- 9. STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE – OUTBUILDINGS**
- 10. COMMENT ON LAND/BOUNDARIES**
- 11. STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE – OUTBUILDINGS**
- 12. CONCLUSION**

APPENDIX

1. INTRODUCTION

Aspect: Approximately North

Occupation: Owner Occupied

Persons present: Owner

Weather during the inspection: Dry

Inspection Limitations: None of note, though with the ruinous state of some of the outbuildings, some care had to be taken and there were restrictions to access.

1.1 Instructions and Rationale

This appraisal has been carried out to assess the heritage provenance and significance of the subject property and also its various outbuildings. It will also consider the impact of proposed alterations to one of the outbuildings. The appraisal is concerned with the process of conserving the special architectural and historic interest of the building and the character and appearance of its surroundings, whilst providing comment upon both elements of change and alteration to the building.

This appraisal has been conducted in accordance with the general guidelines set out in British Standard 7913:2013 'Guide to the Conservation of Historic Buildings' and also the Historic England publications 'Informed Conservation' and 'Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance' and in particular responds to policies outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). In respect of information requirements, it sets out that:

'In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance.'

Guidance on the implementation and interpretation of historic environment policy has been provided by the Historic England publications including GPA2 'Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment' and GPA3 'The Setting of Heritage Assets'.

Local level planning guidance has been provided for under the Woodmancote Parish Neighbourhood Plan, the Horsham District Planning Framework and other relevant documentation.

Though close to the South Downs National Park, the property lies outside its boundaries. Therefore, no reference has been made to planning policy in this regard.

A site survey inspection of the property was carried out. This was limited to a non-invasive inspection of the various buildings concerned. Background research was conducted using historic mapping databases, archived material, and through reference to material held at the West Sussex Records Office.

The assessment of the proposals has been conducted with reference to a range of texts, particularly the Historic England good practice guides and local authority's appraisal of the conservation area.

2. BUILDING LOCATION AND SITE INFORMATION

Park Farm House, also referred to in this document as 'the building', or 'the property', is located at national grid reference - TQ 22773 17280.

The main farmhouse building aligned with the present frontage facing approximately north. But, as will be noted, this is a reversal of the original alignment of the oldest part of the existing property.

The property does not lie within a Conservation Area

2.1 Mapping Context

The property is to be seen in context on various OS (or other) maps below:



Tithe Map
1845

The tithe map of 1845 is the earliest map that the property is depicted upon that can reasonably be located. The property is denoted with the farmhouse in red and the remaining farm buildings in shaded black/blue. What is evident immediately is the L shaped outline of the farmhouse, before the sizeable 1930s wings were added, together with the original southern alignment of the property in general. There is also little suggestion of the property access, as no trackway is depicted passing through field 305, though the two outbuildings in this field (and boundary of 303) suggest that the access always passed through this way north.

The barn and its northern return are shown, along with the open farmyard to the north, surrounded by farm buildings. The land north of the house is shown as garden/light woodland, but with surrounding fields as arable/other farmland.

A wider view of the land holdings arising from the tithe return/apportionment suggests that this was a considerably sized farm.

The image below shows the farm in its wider context in 1845 and apportionment shows that all but one of the fields below were owned and farmed by Park Farm at the time that the tithe was taken. The farm also owned the cluster of barns shown to the south of the main farm. These still exist as a private property and are no longer part of the estate.



Comparing that to a later post mid 20th century landholding map (below) suggests that the farm maintained much of this land right up until recently.



There are also some notable differences, with at least one of the large western field systems north of the house not being assigned to the farm in 1845, but forming part of its landholding in the 20th century.



1874

The 1874 the map depicts the farm in situ, but with a very slight change of shape to the farmhouse in that the 145 map suggests a small projection to the south west that no longer survives. These were often lean to arrangements and there is no surviving present physical evidence of what this might have been.

Furthermore, the outbuildings are slightly different with an outbuilding shown to the east of the main farmyard being no longer in existence in 1874, but with the presently surviving stable unit (below) now having been built within that intervening 30 years.



This outbuilding can then be fairly accurately dated.



1896

By 1896, there is little evident change to the outline appearance and arrangement of the farm, apart from the typical matter of less detail and a suggestion that the wooded areas north of the house has somewhat been cleared by this date.



1909

By 1909, those fields/garden areas north of the house had been reduced a little and would seem to have now been a more formalised garden.



1946

By 1946, the sizeable north wings had been added, changing the shape of the building considerably, though the farmyard remained broadly unchanged – the infill farm buildings that presently cover the farmyard centre still to be added at this date.

3. LISTED BUILDING DESCRIPTION

3.1 The building has been designated a Grade II Listed Building by Historic England and as such, forms one of the core of listed buildings in England recognised for its national importance and special interest.

3.2 List entry No: 1027122

Designation: Grade II

Date Listed: 9th May 1980

3.3 Description

Probably a C17 or earlier house, probably timber-framed, restored and enlarged and none of irregular-shaped plan. Ground floor red brick, above tile hung. Tiled roof. Modern casement windows. Chimney breast to south wing, Datestone 1726 to west wing. Two storeys. Six windows.

4. BRIEF HISTORIC BACKGROUND AND INTERPRETATION

The below ground floor internal plan has been attached for reference, with a due note that the cellar is depicted mirrored and should be the other way around.



Phase 1 – 16th Century or Earlier


During research, a sales particular of around 1949 was discovered. This document notes the property as being already extended with the northern wings. These wings are almost certainly of 1930s date and are constructed in a manner typical of the era (cavity wall masonry with some timber framing and sacrificial timber facings etc).

Interestingly, the sales brochure proceeds to suggest that the property originally dates back to the time of Henry VIII – thereby pre 1547. No archival documentation for the land, or property could be located in the archival searches yet undertaken that extend that far back, but assessment of physical evidence suggests that there was indeed a building on this site that likely extended as far back as at least the mid-Tudor period.

Unfortunately, understanding of vernacular buildings was somewhat less advanced in the early to mid 20th century and often any substantial timber framing was considered 'Tudor' in the absence of any other definitive evidence, this may explain the slightly fanciful estate agent language. In this case, whilst we are happy that there was an earlier building, the present building is perhaps more complex in its evolution than merely stating that it is a Tudor timber framed house with extensions.

What is key to understanding this building is actually a single, solitary vertical bay post (one of the main vertical posts either at a corner, or along the line of a building – the bays being defined as the space in between these 'box framed' elements). Indeed, all the remaining structure and fabric surrounding this solitary post is predicated by its existence adjacent to the substantial central fireplace.


The bay post is located in the position shown as a red dot in the image below:



The reason for implying such importance to this post is that it is, after inspection, the only suspected in-situ surviving element from pre circa 1620-30.

It is suspected of remaining in situ due to the post's orientation in relation to the fireplace. The roof structure above is most certainly later and should the post have been re-used out of situ to support this structure, then the jowl swelling at the top of the post to take a tease tenon joint for a spanning tie beam would have been oriented 90 degrees clockwise for the purpose of supporting the span of the butt purlin roof tie above. The fact that it is not rotated and that the roof was rather roughly placed above this post in this position against the fireplace strongly suggests that the post was already in existence adjacent to the fireplace structure before the roof and surrounding fabric was added and was merely utilised to allow for the present arrangement. Not only this, but it suggests that the building on the site may have been either L shaped from the outset or had a fireplace axially along the back wall instead of the current lateral arrangement. (However, not enough of the mortise arrangement extending from the back of this post could be seen to assess likely options in this regard).

Furthermore, the post is out of alignment with the remaining bay posts of the current south wall of the house and it is clear from the mortise evidence that the building must have extended in this line to the east. The image overleaf shows the alignment compared to the south wall with a blue line extending:



The alignment and position of the post also allows consideration that, notwithstanding later alterations, the majority of the lower to mid chimney structure likely dates from this homogenous 'Phase 1'. We use the above 'homogenous' description due to the fact that it is not possible to assign any dates either to the stack, or the bay post. In reality, both are highly likely to be of differing dates – with it being more common for such fireplaces to be retrofitted to older open halls from the later 16th century onwards. No possible corroborative evidence can be considered apart from some likely later 16th, or early 17th century bricks seen within the structure of the fireplace. Obviously, no dating was possible in terms of the bay post. Thereby, these can only be ascribed to a catch-all Phase 1.

What is fascinating about the post is that it shows distinct evidence of severe fire damage. Views into the surrounding wall lining was limited, but what can be seen is scorching and the loss by burning of parts of a lateral mortise joint.



Given this and other evidence from the re-used timber around the house, it would be reasonable to assume that this earlier building suffered a severe fire. This has a bearing upon Phase 2 of the building's life, as with reasonable continuation of occupation, one can suggest that the fire must have taken place around the end of the first quarter of the 17th century, requiring a wholesale rebuilding of the house.

Phase 2 – 1630-40

The fact that the property would seem to have been entirely rebuilt after the fire, would certainly explain the lack of other in situ evidence and also the state of some of the re-used elements of timber in the later frame. Some of these are earlier bay posts, scorched and with considerable mortise damage.



The spanning beam in the master bedroom is also re-used out of situ and can be identified as what was a section of wall plate (complete with former mullion window cut outs).



This section of timber indeed could be misleading, as it is installed in such a way as to possibly suggest that it was the end wall of the original building. However, there are certain signs that this is not the case. The position of the window cut outs is wrong, there is a brace position centrally (something that would only be seen on a face wall in that position, not an end wall). Furthermore, the position of the studs does not equate to an end wall and the post ends are not mortised for suitable connective joints of the era. Therefore, it fits far better with interpretation as a section of face wall wallplate, repurposed in this position. However, this end of the house poses some issues in relation to sequencing, as will be outlined below in the section 'Phase 3'.


Nonetheless, there is sufficient older material used in the framing of this building to suggest that if the single bay post remains in situ, that the other re-used timber will have come from that former house.

The re-building of the house seems to have come around the first quarter of the 17th century onwards. Indeed, assessment of individual decorative features in what would have been the high end parlour suggest a date of past 1620 in relation to stop carving (below).




Main Frame and Structure – Bays A through

The diagram below shows the layout of the building in this phase in context to the existing layout.



The diagram below shows the bays as laid out in this Phase 2 building and as corresponding to the roof framing and partitioning. Bays have been assigned a letter for reference.



Roof trusses are sequentially numbered and have not been altered and form the basis of the bay lettering assignment. For instance, trusses 2 and 3 are clearly marked. These correspond to B and C on the diagram above.



The roof had a fully hipped terminal built close to the existing stack, part of which remains in situ under later roof framing for the 'office' end of the building.



This phase was a singular build, with the entire visible structure of the house apart from the single re-used bay post and the lower and mid parts of the chimney structure (both of which date to Phase 1).

Roof

The roof is a butt purlin example with collared rafters. There have been later repairs (some collars are refitted with a ridge board, purlin replacement has occurred in places and also some rafters are replaced). However, the roof remains in situ virtually complete. The roof is interesting in that there are sections of both inline and staggered butt purlin, though quite clearly from the same phase.



The frame is consistent in its layout and construction and shows the building as an 'L' shaped house from the outset. The parlour end chimney stack structure, with its stone footings also dates from this period, though with some later rebuilding.



Wall framing is large square panels, and the herringbone infill panelling is likely to be original to this phase in this instance, rather than a later addition.




The small cellar under the projecting parlour end is also original to this phase, though largely rebuilt internally and also facing masonry has been replaced above. The entry door is early to mid 20th century.



This Phase 2 house stood on slightly rising ground facing approximately south and this was the primary façade.



Indeed, the older front door position remains, though with the doorway masonry altered for a later and slightly wider front door (probably 18th century).



The cellar accessed from the Phase 3 kitchen floor entry also mostly dates from this period.

Phase 3 - early 18th century (1726 onward)

What is conjectural is whether there was any form of structure to the west of the main chimney stack in Phase 2. This takes the position of the present kitchen and cellar entry.

The roof frame of Phase 2 is clear that there was no structure wrapping around the main stack at eaves level. The hip was a terminal end, so any structure beyond the stack must have been single storey. Unfortunately, no physical evidence is conclusive.

The present projection depicted in the blue box below is dated on a date stone to 1726 and the wall masonry certainly suggests that this is broadly accurate.



The re-used material within may have been taken from a pre-existing structure. However, this is conjectural and leads to questions about where the present re-used timber material used within came from, if not from the Phase 1 house.

Nonetheless, this remains an early 18th century kitchen range.

Phase 4 – Post 1870 and pre-1896

Mapping layout, though not always totally accurate, suggests that the extension infill in the south western corner is a probable very late 19th century addition – though it may replace a smaller lean-to arrangement covering a cellar entry.



Phase 5 – 1930s enlargement and refurbishment

The 1930s extension was built as a pastiche, so no historic material exists within it. However, these parts are still protected by the listing and are indicative and representative of their era. So, ceiling fabrication, fireplaces, wall finishes and other decorative elements are to be considered of evidential value in this case and should not be considered any the less important in respect of significance.



Fenestration almost certainly dates from this period and was extended to the entire house to provide a suited match around the building (thus unfortunately losing any older fenestration that may have existed in the process). Nonetheless, the fenestration that now exists is well observed and is of a sort that would not have been out of place in a mid to later 17th century house. The fenestration, despite its 1930s date, remains a key feature of this building.



Other internal joinery is also of similar importance, for instance the various braced doors and also door furniture surviving from the 1930s refurbishment.



5. ASSOCIATIVE RESEARCH

Very few associative records were uncovered, though tenant occupier's names were noted following census returns. These are not relevant to the significance statement and are not outlined here.

At the time of the 1845 tithe apportionment, the farm was actually owned by a Mrs Lucretia Wood, who appears to have owned the property at the tithe for only a short time and was noted as being a widow. Records suggest that she can only have been the owner since post 1833, as an inventory for this property was carried for the then owner, Mr Edward Tidy in this year for the express purpose of the purchase by Mrs Wood.

It would also appear that Mr Tidy did not own the property for long, as it, and a number of other nearby properties, appear to have been owned by a Mr Richard Hoadley, upon whose death in 1829. There looks to have been various probate matters relating to the passing of the property to Mr Tidy. However, this is conjectural at present, due to the lack of Mr Hoadley's direct ownership of the subject farm being definitively established within surviving records and the various probate documents being inconclusive surrounding property matters relating to Park Farm itself.

6. ASSESSMENT OF HERITAGE VALUES

A broad appraisal of the heritage values associated with the building has been carried out relating to its evidential value, historical value, communal value, and aesthetic value. The purpose of assessing these values is to enable an assessment of the building's significance, whether physically manifest in its architectural features, or in some other less tangible form. This approach permits a more considered and objective

assessment of proposed alterations and can inform management of the process of change.

6.1 Evidential Value

- 6.1.1 Evidential value is described by Historic England as both “physical remains” and “evidence of human past activity.” and evidential value is derived through assessment of what is visible and manifest for inspection.
- 6.1.2 Typically with buildings such as this, historic changes were often driven by many interlinking factors, such as changes of use, ownership, fashions, technological change and development and commercial imperatives to allow the building to function suitably for its owners and users. Some changes contribute to the character of a building and some changes may be argued to have resulted in a diluting impact.
- 6.1.3 Externally, whilst alterations and extensions have taken place, these for the most part appear both typical and distinguishable. The sizeable 1930s and later extensive alterations, for instance, are to be considered to have evidential value as they indicate historic evolution.
- 6.1.4 The building retains much character and remains in fair physical order. Traditional materials are still in use. A range of early/mid-20th century fenestration is still in situ around the building.
- 6.1.5 Internally, the building has clearly undergone significant alteration and probably has done so many times as would be expected. Historic plan form of the L shaped house remains broadly evident, notwithstanding the somewhat fragmentary elements of some parts of the timber frame and also the evident alteration and addition to roof framing.

6.2 Historical Value

- 6.2.1 Historic England consider that historical value derives from the ways in which past people, events and aspects of life can be connected through a place to the present. This can be either illustrative, whereby the site can be perceived to represent a period in history, or associative, where a connection with an event or person can contribute to the historic significance of a site.
- 6.2.2 Historic England state that most buildings which date between 1700 and 1840 and remain ‘in anything like their original condition’ are worthy of statutory protection. Park Farm House meets this criteria.
- 6.2.3 The age and development history of the subject property has resulted in a building with an eclectic mix of styles and construction methodologies, all deemed necessary and suitable at the time of construction to perform the functions necessary for those in possession and which provides the building with some illustrative evolutionary value, but this is tempered by the 1930s wings which do tend to detract from understanding the building from the north. Thankfully, the south end of the building remains somewhat untouched and can still be more effectively ‘read’.
- 6.2.4 Associative value can be drawn from knowing at least two, possibly three mid 19th century land owners, but this is of minimal importance.

- 6.2.5 The building spans a considerable historic period and has seen continuous occupation both in relation to residential and agricultural/commercial usage until the present day. This provides the building with general evolutionary interest.

6.3 Communal Value

- 6.3.1 Communal value derives from the meanings of a place for the people who relate to it, or for whom it figures in their collective experience or memory. This can be divided into Commemorative and Symbolic values where the place may invoke emotion or contribute to an individual's or community's sense of place or social values where a place can be a form of catalyst for memories associated with it.
- 6.3.2 The communal value of this property can be considered as moderate. This is due to its lifetime as a farmhouse and being a residential house in private ownership. Its communal value stems, therefore, solely from its combination of general historicity and outward aesthetics.
- 6.3.3 This building and others like it in the vicinity provide a tangible link to the history of the locality and to our continued understanding of the built environment around us.
- 6.3.4 The contribution this and other buildings make to the character of the area serve as a benchmark for future development and as a minimum standard for the quality and aesthetic of development within the vicinity.

6.4 Aesthetic Value

- 6.4.1 Aesthetic value according to Historic England "derives from the ways in which people draw sensory and intellectual stimulation from a place." This value can be attributed to conscious design whether it be predetermined by an architect or the work of a craftsman and can also encompass historic and evolutionary changes to a building.
- 6.4.2 The various elevations can be considered to have fairly equal importance, with the north view showing the extensive 1930s alterations which sought to build upon the general vernacular aesthetic of the surviving building. The south façade gives a more balanced view of the house as it might have appeared in the later 18th/early 19th century onwards but retaining the L shape arrangement of the original 17th century house.
- 6.4.3 Whilst the interior of the building has received significant alterations over the years, the historic charm and a good many features remain, and this contributes immeasurably to the building.

7. STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE – MAIN HOUSE

Following consideration of the above values, it can be considered that Park Farm House presents medium level attributes across the full range of heritage values above, both in respect of original features and also of historic changes and alterations to the building which have occurred progressively over the years. Given its association with the local community in terms of its agricultural/commercial life and its appearance and survival, the designation of listing can be readily understood. Neither the outward appearance nor the inward fabric of the building should be considered of greater or

lesser distinction and changes to each should require sensitive design and careful consideration. Whilst the significance of the building nationally could be considered in line with the grade 2 designation and, thereby medium, the overall historic significance of the building within its local context can be considered as high. Thereby, any changes to the outward appearance will tend to weigh somewhat heavier than perhaps arguably they should.

8. OUTBUILDINGS

The farmyard was once open, but now is covered with the brick barn and the steel portal framed unit.



Little, if any of the surface of the former farmyard survives, though some of the older surface may lie under the modern concrete wash.

8.1 Period Barn



The period barn is fully timber framed and dates in terms of erection, to the 18th century. However, the barn is fabricated with a good deal of older material reused and constitutes a typical barn of a working farm with the use and re-use of older barn material to erect new barns as the need arose.

The barn is fabricated in five bays, though the barn was originally a four-bay structure.

The main bay posts are straight and without jowl swellings. Ties are held in place with iron nailed braces positioned hard under the tie and against the bay posts. Bracing comprises upward braces and the barn has a single rear aisle facing away from the farmyard.



Bracing to the side purlins of the roof frame (a mostly later addition) are straight up from the ties and the ties are re-used, showing indication of being originally centrally braced, or a possible queen strut arrangement when used elsewhere.

Side infill walling is mixed, with some diagonal brace arrangements with intersecting studs – a typically 18th century arrangement. There are some reused curved braces from an earlier barn also used and the arrangement is somewhat eclectic.

As noted above, the barn was originally in four bays. The fifth bay to the west was added in the 19th century. The roof in this bay has a ridge board and the end wall is masonry. The original jack rafter collar for what was evidently a half-hipped terminal can be seen midway along the fourth bay roof apex.



8.2 Open Brick Barn



This is a relatively modern structure, with a bolted trussed roof frame. It is probably only 30 years old or more and now in considerably poor structural condition.



It has no heritage value in context.

8.3 Open Steel Portal Framed Barn



A further modern structure now covering the remainder of the formerly open farmyard. Again, no heritage value can be ascribed to it.

8.4 Garage/Store



This is an intriguing unit, that once faced towards the farmyard but has been repurposed to face out east with the flank wall removed to allow it to become an open 'garage' structure.



Internally, it would appear that the unit was probably always masonry and, indeed, some of the walls are of flint cobble and infill construction, with interior facings. Some later brickwork also survives, though the unit is somewhat of a derelict shell.



Serious structural problems prevail, despite modern attempts to repair and stabilise the structure. Some of these 'repairs' have resulted in loss of fabric, for instance, the removal of the forward tie where it has failed and been replaced with a softwood upper bolted brace.



The unit's timber elements are mostly taken from earlier buildings, for instance, one of the repurposed ties is from a formerly fully timber framed unit as evidenced by the open mortise joint for a teasle tenon arrangement.



The building dates from around the early 18th century, like many of the surviving older outbuildings.

Fenestration remains wholly modern, though little remains in situ.

8.5 Stables



This building is that which can be reasonably dated to anytime between 1845 and 1874 due to its appearance on the latter map. It is brick built and retains its ties and side purlin roof intact, though with modern coverings.



No original fenestration, or joinery survives.

8.6 Stables attached to the Main Barn



These are somewhat interesting, as they are not originally stables. Whilst much of the frontage and also some other elements were re-built in the last 50 years or so, this low run of units was formerly a series of open cattle byres.

This is evidenced by the frontage timber framing, now infilled with modern block.



These show that the unit had dropped head plates and no infilling originally.

Again, the uprights are braced with iron nailed brackets, something of a feature of this farm during the 18th century.



The roof frame is now substantially replaced with a much later 19th, or even early 20th century side purlin frame.



The back wall upon which this cattle byre building was built was actually older than the attached structure, as the frame elements were built off from it by virtue of raising the height of the wall.



We would estimate that the wall is early 18th century in date, with the byres being added within around a generation towards the mid 18th century.

8.7 Dairy



This post WW2 building occupies land to the north east of the former farmyard. It comprises a brick built structure with a corrugated cement sheet roof. There is little of note within, and the building is now in derelict condition.



The design of the building suggests a date of erection around the early to mid 1960s.

8.8 Ruined Cart Shed



This timber framed structure is depicted on the 1845 tithe map and, from what limited structure remains visible, this is a car shed of the early 18th century. The frame is in oak with collared rafters and some stud intersecting panel bracing noted.



Like the main barn, the ties are held with iron nailed brackets and this likely suggests a similar date of erection and also probably the same carpenter.



Unfortunately, the structure appears to be well beyond restoration.

9. ASSESSMENT OF HERITAGE VALUES - OUTBUILDINGS

9.1 Evidential Value

- 9.1.1 The evidential value lies in the surviving buildings that can readily be identified as forming the original farm yard. Though now in poor condition, some clearly still remain and are, in some cases, restorable. Historic changes to farm

outbuildings were driven mainly by circumstance and use as the farm evolved over the years and these are no more than typical of this process, even to the extent of the more modern portal units covering the former open yard.

- 9.1.2 Whilst alterations and extensions have taken place, these for the most part appear both typical and distinguishable.

9.2 Historical Value

- 9.2.1 Historic value comes from the surviving fabric, though fragmentary and in poor condition, of the surviving older buildings. There is no value attributed to the portal structures, nor to the dairy building.

- 9.2.2 Associative value is minimal apart from the link to the working farm itself and held as a whole with the house.

9.3 Communal Value

- 9.3.1 Communal value is also minimal apart from the association with farming and the local community in general.

9.4 Aesthetic Value

- 9.4.1 Aesthetic value is now somewhat low, due both to the condition of the buildings and to the alterations, use of materials and encroachment of the modern portal structures on the main farmyard.

10. COMMENT ON LAND/BOUNDARIES

A general comment notes that some field boundaries remain evident, with some hedge lines able to be identified from the tithe and subsequent mapping.

The main driveway around the south of the house and also leading from the farm yard back up north to the main road is also broadly on this same track as earlier mapping (certainly the later OS maps). The former main route to the farm yard is now somewhat 'obscured' by later change, but follows the line of the straight concrete track shown centrally in the image overleaf:



11. STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE – OUTBUILDINGS

Again, following consideration of Historic England's heritage values, it can be considered that the various outbuildings are distinctly mixed in terms of their presents. Medium level attributes across the full range of heritage values above, both in respect of original features and also of historic changes and alterations to the building which have occurred progressively over the years. Given its association with the local community in terms of its agricultural/commercial life and its appearance and survival, the designation of listing can be readily understood. Neither the outward appearance nor the inward fabric of the building should be considered of greater or lesser distinction and changes to each should require sensitive design and careful consideration. Whilst the significance of the building nationally could be considered in line with the Grade 2 designation and, thereby medium, the overall historic significance of the building within its local context can be considered as high. Thereby, any changes to the outward appearance will tend to weigh somewhat heavier than perhaps arguably they should.

12. CONCLUSION

This report has been compiled to demonstrate both understanding of the historic development of Park Farm and its outbuildings and to consider their present heritage significance against current Historic England heritage indicators.



Richard Pocock MSc MRICS
Desbruslais Chartered Surveyors
07430 771756
richard@desbruslais.co.uk

APPENDIX I

TERMS & CONDITIONS OF ENGAGEMENT FOR HERITAGE RELATED REPORTS, SUCH AS, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, STATEMENTS OF HERITAGE SIGNIFICANCE

Please note: These Terms & Conditions of Engagement form part of the contract between the Surveyor (Desbruslais Chartered Surveyors) and the client. Where these terms are sent to the client by email, they can be accepted and agreed by acknowledging receipt by email return from the client.

Subject to express written/email agreement to the contrary and any agreed amendments/additions; the Terms and Conditions upon which the Surveyor will undertake the inspection is set out below.

1. General

Before the inspection, the client will agree the purpose, aims, objectives and extent of the engagement, together with agreeing any reasonable limitations to research, scope and reporting, and provide a specific description of The Asset to be inspected..

2. The Asset

The Asset is the part of the structure to be inspected. This might be an entire building including external areas, or a specific clearly defined element or elements of the structure or property.

3. The Service

The objective of the service is to give the client professional advice on Listing or Heritage Asset matters, tailored to the purpose of the instruction – which must be suitably outlined prior to engagement, as set out in Sections 1 and 2. The objective will be met either in the form of a desktop written assessment, utilising mapping, documentation, images and other materials supplied by the client, or obtained by The Surveyor for the purposes of the engagement, or in the form of an onsite inspection and written report, also utilising appropriate material research as may be agreed in the scope outlined in Section 1.

The Service does not provide any advice on the condition of the asset inspected. However, where The Surveyor is requested to report on an Asset that is clearly in a state of disrepair, and if previously agreed as a part of The Service, The Surveyor might give an opinion on the condition and whether The Asset is beyond repair and cannot, therefore, be salvaged.

A separate service to report on condition can be provided on request.

4. The Inspection

(a) Accessibility and Voids

The Surveyor will inspect as much of the surface area of the structure as is practicable, but unless agreed prior to the inspection or on site, will not inspect those areas that are covered, unexposed or not reasonably accessible. If opening up of the structure is considered desirable, the client will take all steps possible to assist the surveyor in this regard.

(b) The Surveyor will have a ladder of sufficient height to gain access to a roof hatch or to a single storey roof, not more than 3.0m (10' 00") above the floor or adjacent ground. It will not be possible to physically inspect roofs above this level unless an alternative safe means of access is available. Pitched roofs will be inspected with the aid of binoculars. The Surveyor will follow the RICS and Health & Safety Executive guidance on surveying safely. The surveyor will not walk on flat roofs if there is a risk of damage.

5. Cancellation

The Client will be entitled to cancel this contract by notifying the Surveyor's office at any time up to the close of business on the day before the inspection. In case of cancellation, the Surveyor will refund any money paid by the Client for the Service, except for expenses reasonably incurred. In the case of cancellation by the surveyor, the reason will be explained to the Client.

6. Validity

No term in the agreement between the surveyor and the client is enforceable under the Contracts (Rights of Third Parties) Act 1999 by another person other than Desbruslais Chartered Surveyors or the Client. The survey can report only on the condition at the time of the inspection.

7. Fees and Expenses

The Client will pay Desbruslais Chartered Surveyors the agreed for the report and any expressly agreed disbursements in addition. All fees must be paid prior to the report being issued.

Like many businesses, Desbruslais occasionally pays a referral fee. This is part of a wider marketing strategy that encompasses social media, presentations, entertainment etc. promoting our reputation for quality based on experience and independent, pragmatic reporting. Our priority is always to our client and their professional advisers.

8. Restriction on Disclosure

The report is for the sole use of the named Client and is confidential to the Client and his/her professional advisers.

Unless expressly provided, no term in the agreement between the Surveyor and the Client is enforceable under the Contracts (Rights of Third Parties) Act 1999 by another person other than Desbruslais Chartered Surveyors or the Client. Any such parties rely upon the report at their own risk. The report must not be reproduced, in whole or part, without the prior written consent of the surveyor. We reserve the right to act for and to advise any third party on this same property in the event that the client decides for any reason not to proceed with the purchase.

Desbruslais Ltd. Registered office Laquna Limited, Suite C2, Cinder Hill Lane, Horsted Keynes, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH17 7BA

APPENDIX II

Official list entry

Heritage Category:

Listed Building

Grade:

II

List Entry Number:

1027122

Date first listed:

09-May-1980

List Entry Name:

PARK FARMHOUSE

Statutory Address 1:

PARK FARMHOUSE

The scope of legal protection for listed buildings

This List entry helps identify the building designated at this address for its special architectural or historic interest.

Unless the List entry states otherwise, it includes both the structure itself and any object or structure fixed to it (whether inside or outside) as well as any object or structure within the curtilage of the building.

For these purposes, to be included within the curtilage of the building, the object or structure must have formed part of the land since before 1st July 1948.

[Understanding list entries](#)

[Corrections and minor amendments](#)

Location

Statutory Address:

PARK FARMHOUSE

The building or site itself may lie within the boundary of more than one authority.

County:

West Sussex

District:

Horsham (District Authority)

Parish:

Henfield

National Grid Reference:

TQ 22773 17280

Details

WOODMANCOTE HENFIELD 1. 5404 Park Farmhouse TQ 21 NW 9/316

II

2. Probably C17 or earlier house, probably timber-framed, restored and enlarged and non of irregular-shaped plan. Ground floor red brick, above tile-hung. Tiled roof. Modern casement windows. Chimney breast to south wing, Datestone 1726 to west wing. Two storeys. Six windows.

Listing NGR: TQ2277317280

Legacy

The contents of this record have been generated from a legacy data system.

Legacy System number:

299067

Legacy System:

LBS

Legal

This building is listed under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended for its special architectural or historic interest.