



EAST END GREEN CONSERVATION AREA

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AND MANAGEMENT PROPOSALS



ADOPTED 25 JULY 2018

East Herts District Council
Pegs Lane, Hertford, SG13 8EQ

CONTENTS

	Paragraphs	Page
1. Introduction	1.1- 1.15	2
PART A – CONTEXT		
2. Legal and Policy framework	2.1- 2.18	7
PART B – CONSERVATION AREA CHARACTER APPRAISAL		
3. Origins and historic development	3.1- 3.9	11
4. Heritage and Environmental Designations and the criteria used to identify other important environmental features	4.1- 4.11	25
5. Character Analysis	5.1- 5.15	28
6. Summary of special interest of the East End Green Conservation Area	6.1- 6.8	41
7. Summary of Issues	7.1- 7.8	42
PART C- CONSERVATION AREA MANAGEMENT PROPOSALS		
8. Management Proposals	8.1- 8.15	44
Schedule of Enhancement proposals	8.15	47
Appendix 1 - Checklist		48
MAPS		
Map 1. Location Map		5
Map 2. Character Analysis Map		28
ILLUSTRATIONS		
Aerial photograph 2010		6
Fig 1. Griffin map of 1732		16
Fig 2. Dury and Andrews map of 1776		16
Fig 3. Bryant map of 1822		17
Fig 4. OS Preliminary map of 1833		17
Fig 5. Tithe map of 1838		18
Fig 6. OS map of 1863		19
Fig 7. OS map of 1880		20
Fig 8. OS map of 1898		21
Fig 9. OS map of 1923		22
Fig 10. OS map of 1972		23
Fig 11. OS map of 2017		24

EAST END GREEN CONSERVATION AREA CHARACTER APPRAISAL AND MANAGEMENT PROPOSALS

Adopted 25 July 2018

This Character Appraisal has been produced by officers of East Hertfordshire District Council to identify the special architectural or historic interest, character and appearance of the East End Green Conservation Area, assess its current condition, identify threats and opportunities related to that identified special interest and any appropriate boundary changes.

The Management Proposals section puts forward initiatives for the Conservation Area designed to address the above identified threats and opportunities that will preserve and enhance its character and appearance.

A public meeting was held on the 18 April 2018 to consider the draft Character Appraisal and the Management Proposals – for the latter, as required under s.71 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. The draft document was then put to public consultation between 18 April and 1 June 2018. The comments received by the Council have been included in this document where appropriate. The document was formally adopted by full Council on 25 July 2018 upon the recommendation of the Executive Committee.

The content of Character Appraisals written from 2015 which include this paragraph differ slightly from predecessor documents. Selected revisions have been incorporated to reflect changes to legislation, the emerging District Plan, nomenclature, consolidation and other improvements resulting from experience gained to date.

1. Introduction.

1.1. The historic environment cannot be replaced and is a resource that is both fragile and finite. Particularly in an age when society and its needs change with rapidity, the various historic and architectural elements of conservation areas can be perceived to interact in a complex manner and create a 'unique sense of place' that is appreciated by those lucky enough to reside in such special places and the many interested persons who appreciate and visit them.

1.2. East Hertfordshire District has a particularly rich and vibrant built heritage, featuring 42 conservation areas and approximately 4,000 fine listed buildings displaying a variety of styles representative of the best of architectural and historic designs from many centuries. Generally and very importantly the clear distinction between built form and open countryside has been maintained.

1.3. The District is situated in an economically buoyant region where an attractive environment, employment opportunities and excellent transport links, road, rail and air, make it a popular destination to live and work. In addition to London, a short commuting distance away, the District is influenced by other factors beyond its administrative area, such as Stansted Airport and the towns of Harlow and

Stevenage. With such dynamics it is inevitable that the historic environment will be subject to pressures which emphasize the need to protect it.

1.4. The East Hertfordshire Local Plan Second Review, adopted in April 2007, recognises these facts and commits the Council to review its conservation areas and their boundaries. The production of this document is part of this process.

1.5. Conservation areas are places which are considered worthy of protection as a result of a combination of factors such as the quality of the environment, spatial characteristics, the design and setting of the buildings or their historic significance. In addition to the individual qualities of the buildings themselves, there are other factors such as the relationships of the buildings with each other, the quality of the spaces between them and the vistas and views that unite or disrupt them. The relationship with adjoining areas and landscape, the quality of trees, boundary treatments, advertisements, road signage, street furniture and hard surfaces, are also important features which can add to or detract from the special interest, character and appearance of a conservation area.

1.6. This document was produced in accordance with Historic England guidance, the most recent of which is Advice Note 1 'Conservation Area Designation, Appraisal and Management' (2016). The Character Appraisal recognises the importance of the factors listed above and considers them carefully. Now approved, this document is to be regarded as a 'material consideration' when determining (deciding) planning applications. The Management Proposals section puts forward simple practical initiatives that would preserve the Conservation Area from identified harm and also any appropriate projects and proposals that would, as and when resources permit, enhance its character and appearance.

1.7. The recommendations concerning non-listed buildings and structures are normally formed by the field-workers observations made from the public realm and seldom involve internal inspection or discussions with owners. Thus such recommendations contained in this Character Appraisal might be subject to reconsideration through the planning application process, where that is necessary, and which would involve the submission of additional information. Similar considerations apply to estimating dates of buildings.

1.8. This Conservation Appraisal:

- Identifies the special architectural or historic interest, character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
- Identifies elements that make a positive contribution to the above special interest, character and appearance of the Conservation Area that should be retained, preserved or enhanced;
- Identifies neutral elements that might be beneficially enhanced or, alternatively, replaced by something that makes the above positive contribution;
- Identifies detracting elements it would be positively desirable to remove or replace;

- Reviews the existing boundaries to ensure that they clearly define the Conservation Area and align with distinct changes of character with outside areas such that the Conservation Area is both cohesive and defensible;
- Identifies threats to the Conservation Area's special interest, character and appearance and any opportunities to enhance it;

1.9. The Management Proposals section:

- Puts forward any required boundary changes to omit or add areas to the Conservation Area that would make it both cohesive and defensible;
- Proposes measures and initiatives that address the threats to the Conservation Area's special interest, character and appearance identified in the Character Appraisal;
- Proposes initiatives and projects that exploit the opportunities identified in the Character Appraisal that both preserve and enhance the Conservation Area's special interest, character and appearance
- Puts forward appropriate enhancement proposals mindful of any funding constraints;

1.10 The document was prepared with the assistance of members of the local community and includes additional input from the public through the public meeting and the consultation exercise.

1.11 Acknowledgement and thanks are recorded to Hertfordshire County Council whose Historic Environment Unit has been particularly helpful and Peter Newson dip.arch RIBA (retired) for his detailed knowledge of the history of the area.


1.12. This document is written in three parts:

Part A - Legal and Policy Framework.


Part B – Character Appraisal;

Part C - Management Proposals.

1.13 Location of the Conservation Area within the East Herts District



Map 1. Location Plan



Aerial photograph 2010

PART A - CONTEXT

2. Legal and Policy framework.

2.1. The legal background for designating a conservation area is set out in Section 69 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. This states that the Council shall from time to time (now defined as 5 years) review its area and designate as conservation areas any parts that are of '*special architectural or historic interest the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance*'. The same section of the Act also requires that councils undertake periodic reviews.

2.2. Section 71 of the Act requires Councils to, from time to time (now defined as 5 years), '*formulate and publish proposals for the preservation and enhancement*' of conservation areas, hold a public meeting to consider them and have regard to any views expressed at the meeting concerning the proposals.

2.3 The production of a Conservation Area Character Appraisal, which identifies the special interest and the threats and opportunities within a conservation area, is an essential prerequisite to the production of s.71 Management Proposals (although, interestingly, it is the production of the latter that is the statutory duty).

2.4. Planning Controls. Within conservation areas there are additional planning controls and if these are to be justified and supported it is important that the designated areas accord with the statutory definition and are not devalued by including land or buildings that lack special interest.

2.5. Planning permission is required for the demolition of a building in a conservation area but is subject to certain exceptions. For example, it does not apply to listed buildings (which are protected by their own legal provisions within the 1990 Act) but is relevant to other non-listed buildings in a conservation area above a threshold size set out in legislation*. Looking for and assessing such buildings is therefore a priority of this Appraisal.

2.6. Certain ecclesiastical buildings (which are for the time being used for ecclesiastical purposes) are not subject to local authority administration provided an equivalent approved system of control is operated by the church authority. This is known as the 'ecclesiastical exemption'. Importantly in such circumstances, church authorities still need to obtain any other necessary planning permissions under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2.7. Permitted Development. The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England), Order 2015 defines the range of minor developments for which planning permission is not required. This range is more restricted in conservation areas. For example, the Order currently requires that the addition of dormer windows to roof slopes, various types of cladding, satellite dishes fronting a

* The demolition of a building not exceeding 50 cubic metres is not development and can be demolished without planning permission. Demolition of other buildings below 115 cubic metres are regarded as 'Permitted Development' granted by the General Permitted Development Order, subject to conditions that may require the Council's 'prior approval' regarding methods of proposed demolition and restoration.

highway and a reduced size of extensions, all require planning permission in a conservation area.

2.8. However, even within conservation areas there are other minor developments associated with many non-listed buildings that do not require planning permission. Where further protection is considered necessary to preserve a conservation area from harmful alterations carried out under such 'Permitted Development Rights', the law allows Councils to introduce additional controls if appropriate. Examples of such controls can commonly include some developments fronting a highway or open space, such as an external porch or the demolition of some gates, fences or walls or their alteration. The removal of existing architectural features that are identified as being important to the character or appearance of a conservation area (such as chimneys, traditional detailing or materials, porches, windows and doors or walls or railings) can be made subject to protection by a legal process known as an 'Article 4 Direction' which withdraws 'Permitted Development Rights'. The use of such Directions needs to be made in justified circumstances where a clear assessment of each conservation area has been made. In conducting this Character Appraisal, consideration has been given as to whether or not such additional controls are appropriate.

2.9. Works to Trees. Another additional planning control relates to trees located within conservation areas. Setting aside various exceptions principally relating to size, any proposal to fell or carry out works to trees has to be 'notified' to the Council. The Council may then decide whether to make the tree/s subject to a Tree Preservation Order. This Character Appraisal diagrammatically identifies only the most significant trees or groups of trees that make an important contribution to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area, particularly when viewed from the public realm. Other trees not specifically identified may still be suitable for statutory protection through a TPO. There is currently one TPO within the Conservation Area; on the frontage of certain dwellings facing the Green from Keepers Cottage east to the dell.

2.10. Some hedges may be protected by the Hedgerow Regulations 1997. This legislation is extremely complicated and only applies in certain situations that are determined by the location and extent of the hedge, its age and or its historical importance, the wildlife it supports and its number of woody species. Whilst the Regulations do not apply to domestic garden hedges, such garden hedges which are considered to be visually important have been identified. It is hoped their qualities are recognised by owners and the community and will be retained.

2.11. National Planning Policy Framework. The principle emphasis of the framework is to promote 'sustainable development'. Economic, social and environmental factors should not be considered in isolation because they are mutually inter-dependent and collectively define what is sustainable development. Positive improvements in the quality of the built, natural and historic environment should be sought, including replacing poor design with better design. Whilst architectural styles should not be imposed (unless, of course the conservation area is of homogenous architectural style – which is not the case with East End Green) it is considered essential to reinforce local distinctiveness.

2.12. Of particular relevance to this document, the National Planning Policy Framework advises as follows:

- There should be a positive strategy in the Local Plan for the conservation of the historic environment and up-to-date evidence used to assess the significance of heritage assets and the contribution they make.
- Conservation areas. Such areas must justify such a status by virtue of being of *'special architectural or historic interest'*.
- Heritage assets. A heritage asset is defined as *'a building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest. 'Heritage asset' includes designated heritage assets and assets identified by the local planning authority (including local listings)' and non-designated assets – for example archaeological assets.*
- Considerable weight should be given to conserving such heritage assets and the more important they are the greater the weight. For example the effect of an application affecting a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account and a balanced judgment reached. Substantial harm to or loss of a grade II listed building should be exceptional whilst harm to heritage assets of higher status, e.g. a grade I or II* listed building should be wholly exceptional.
- Local Planning Authorities should look for opportunities for new development within conservation areas to enhance or better reveal their significance and proposals that preserve such elements should be approved.
- The use of Article 4 Directions to remove national permitted development rights should be limited to situations *'where this is necessary to protect local amenity or the well being of the area...'*
- Green areas. Such areas of particular importance can properly be identified for special protection as Local Green Spaces in selected situations.

2.13. East Hertfordshire's Environmental Initiatives and Local Plan Policies. East Hertfordshire is committed to protecting conservation areas and implementing policies which preserve and enhance them; to support their preservation through the publication of design and technical advice and to be pro-active by offering grants and administering a Historic Buildings Grant Service. With regard to the latter, grants are awarded on a first-come-first-served basis in relation to works which result in the maintenance of listed buildings and other unlisted buildings of architectural or historic interest. Details are available on the Council's website.

2.14. In respect of the above the Council has produced a number of leaflets and guidance notes that are available on line. These 'guidance notes on the preservation and repair of historic materials and buildings' provide useful information relevant to the preservation and enhancement of conservation areas. They will be updated as resources permit.

2.15. The Council also has a 'Heritage at Risk Register', originally produced in 2006 and updated in 2016 and 2017. This document is available on the Council's website. There are no such buildings within the East End Green Conservation Area.

2.16. The East Herts Local Plan was adopted by the Council in 2007. The 'saved' policies set out in the plan remain in force and are relevant in relation to conservation area and historic building considerations. The Local Plan and its policies can be viewed on the Council's website or a copy can be obtained from the Council (contact details are set out at the end of this document).

2.17. In accordance with the requirements of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the Council is in the process of preparing a planning policy document which will replace the 2007 Local Plan. This will be known as the East Herts District Plan (DP). Once adopted the DP will contain the relevant Council planning policies. As currently drafted, this emerging District Plan advises that new development within a conservation area should, *inter alia*, conform with the content of the relevant Character Appraisal.

2.18. East End Green Conservation Area was first designated on 28 January 1981. This is the first review of the Conservation Area and production of a Character Appraisal or Management Proposals since then.



The Wellhead gear. Now relocated (see 3.1.4) and Part C – Management Proposals

Part B – CONSERVATION AREA CHARACTER APPRAISAL

3. Origins and Historical Development

3.1. There are 5 entries within the County Archaeologist's Historic Environment Record for East End Green. They summarized as follows:-

3.1.1 EAST END GREEN, HERTINGFORDBURY

HER Ref: MHT 30272

Post-medieval hamlet around a green

East End Green is a small green on Woolmers Lane, an area of common land with lanes and tracks coming in at the corners. Typical of the dispersed settlement pattern in Hertfordshire, often called Ends or Greens. Like many Greens, it has a farmstead, East End Farm [16387], and cottages scattered around its edges. A number of buildings shown on early maps have not survived to the present day – notably on the paddock and its surrounds. The oldest extant building, The Cottage, dates to the late 15th or early 16th century. The 1838 tithe map shows only six houses as well as the farm, and some empty plots which imply a loss of population, although the 1880 OS map may show some of them planted as small orchards. By 1880 the house on the paddock at the NE end of the Green had been demolished, to be replaced by an orchard.

3.1.2 EAST END GREEN FARM, EAST END GREEN, HERTINGFORDBURY

HER Ref: MHT 16387

Post-medieval farmstead with brick farmhouse.

The farmhouse at East End Green Farm was built c.1800. It replaced an earlier farmhouse, probably vernacular in style but also two storeys with attics. The present house is in stock brick with white brick dressings and tiled roof with three dormer windows in a polite style. Three bays wide with original lean-to outshuts at each end, and a central entrance. At the back is a central full-height staircase wing. Some surviving original features, including fireplaces and the upper part of the staircase. The house was extended and altered in the 20th century, both lean-to outshuts having been extended to the rear. In the early 20th century a weatherboarded range was added to the right (a dairy), single-storey and attics with dormers. This connects the house with the barn, which is 17th or 18th century, timber-framed and weatherboarded on a brick base, four bays long and with double doors on both sides in the second bay from the house. The c.1800 house evidently replaced an earlier farmhouse. Listed Grade II.

The farm was restored from 1988 onwards by the writer Frederick Forsyth; the house faces SE onto the courtyard lined with weatherboarded buildings including the barn, other barns, stables, a grain store and a dairy. Most have been converted into domestic occupation. Major additions to the farm buildings were put up in the 20th century, but the layout has not otherwise altered.

3.1.3 KEEPER'S COTTAGE, EAST END GREEN, HERTINGFORDBURY

HER Ref: MHT 31400

Late 16th or early 17th century timber-framed house, divided into two cottages in the 19th century and extended as one house in the 20th century.

Keeper's Cottage is a two-storey timber-framed house built in the late 16th or early 17th century. Originally three bays wide with lobby entry plan, it had a central door and central ridge chimneystack, and a catslide roof over a continuous lean-to outshut at the rear. Single-storey and attic two-bay brick addition with front gable added in the 20th century; the central door blocked and replaced with a new entrance in the extension. Inside the house is exposed timber framing. The house is shown on the 1838 tithe map occupying one of three house plots on the south side of the green [30272]. The 1880 OS map shows it divided into two cottages, with outhouses on the west side of the plot. It remained divided until the 20th century.

3.1.4 SITE OF WELLHEAD GEAR, EAST END GREEN, HERTINGFORDBURY

HER Ref: MHT 5675

Late 19th century well on the Green, the superstructure demolished in the late 20th century.

Wellhead gear with a simple iron arch and pulley ring springing from a circular yellow brick wall 3ft high. Probably erected by Earl Cowper c.1890. The wellhead was removed and the well covered over by 1994.

'Well' is marked on the 1898 and 1923 OS maps towards the SW end of the Green and beside the road which enters the common land from the west. The 1923 map shows it as a circular structure, which accords with the surviving elements discovered recently.

They are presently (2017) located within the grounds of Orchard Cottage in the field to the south of The Cottage. See photo on p.10. In addition, the well site has apparently been rediscovered (2018). A potentially interesting restoration project – see Part C Management Proposals).

3.1.5 THE COTTAGE, EAST END GREEN, HERTINGFORDBURY

HER Ref: MHT 30273

Late medieval timber-framed hall house, altered to a lobby entry plan

Timber-framed hall house built in the late 15th or early 16th century as a two-bay open hall. Upper floor inserted and a brick chimney stack built through the ridge in the late 16th to mid-17th century giving it a lobby entry form. Now a single-storey and attic house on a brick plinth. Side and rear extensions were added in the 20th century, so the entrance is now off-centre.

The 1838 tithe map shows the house in its plot at the SW end of East End Green [30272], with a large outbuilding north of the house. By 1880 this had been demolished and the house extended to the SE. The 1898 and 1923 OS maps imply other alterations and possibly the replacement of the earlier extension. By 1923 the garden had been enlarged.

3.2 This is a tiny rural settlement of a moderately large farm that includes a farm manager's cottage, the old dairy, three barn residential units and the farmhouse and 6 dwellings along the Green;- a total of 11 dwellings. This is not large enough to support either a pub or a church. The local pub was at Pipers End – The Black House/The Red House - now demolished. This also served as the milk station for East End Green Farm until just after the war. The Chapel at Letty Green and, for high days and holy days, St. Mary's at Hertingfordbury were a brisk walk away.

3.3 Prehistoric, (before 600BC), Iron Age (600BC -43AD), Roman (AD43 - c450), Saxon (c450 - 1066), Norman and Medieval (1066-1500).

As a post Medieval settlement and with little archaeological evidence from the immediate area available, little can be said with confidence about these periods as they relate to the area. Nevertheless, evidence of human settlement along the Lea Valley can be traced to the Mesolithic period (circa 6,500 BC) and, of course, Hertford from the Late Iron Age and Hertingfordbury from the 12th c. were well-established long before East End Green was settled. It is one of five Greens (or 'Ends') associated with the main village of Hertingfordbury and part of its Parish, being Birch Green, Cole Green, East End Green, Letty Green and Staines Green. It is a rural hamlet set on the northern glacial drift valley crest overlooking the River Lea along which, by 700 BC, there were a scattering of small settlements. The SW/NE linear orientation of the hamlet aligns with both the ridge and that of the River some 38 metres below. It is the southernmost of the five Greens.

East End Green's origins were agricultural, East End Green Farm retains this use today, and would have related commercially primarily to Hertford, then Hertingfordbury and the Roxford Estate, Panshanger to the north and, just to the east, the directly adjoining Woolmers Park.

3.4 Norman and Medieval (1066-1500)

The publication, *Place Names of Hertfordshire, English Place-Name Society Vol. XV 1938, Cambridge University Press, 1970* advises several names for East End Green.

1420 – le Estendgrene

1611 – Easten Greene

1938 – Eastend Green

Modern – East End Green

The 1420 date is the earliest known reference to East End Green. It does not feature in The Domesday Book, the census commissioned by William I in 1086. This does record Hertingfordbury, Panshanger and the Roxford Estate, but none of the five Greens are recorded, from which it is surmised that they were as yet unsettled.

3.5 16th – 17th Century

Regrettably there are no records known that might help us understand the early history of East End Green. East End Farmhouse is circa 1800 but is assumed to have replaced an earlier and probably timber-framed vernacular building. The Cottage is the earliest surviving building at late 15th C or early 16th C. followed by Keepers Cottage of late 16th C. or early 17th C.

3.6 18th Century

The 1732 Griffin map depiction of East End Green is topographically remarkable accurate and can readily be compared to current OS mapping, aerial/Google earth photographs.

The extent of common land shown contained by a perimeter fence line closely matches the Village Green Conveyance Deed to the Hertingfordbury Parish Council in 1975. The most imposing building illustrated is on the current site of East End Green Farm, however the plan of an apparent farmstead is depicted opposite south of the public byway where only a shallow excavation now exists and is ascribed to Mr Brace.

Following along the southern common land boundary were five buildings shown facing the Green of which just Keepers Cottage and Orchard Cottage survive. However, whilst of earlier age, just east of the 'triangle' and site of the communal well, the still existing 'The Cottage' is not shown.

The opposite northern common land boundary depicts a tree-dotted hedgerow which survived until the arrival of Dutch Elm disease in 1980 when, regrettably, they had to be felled and replanted with other native trees. Fields adjoining are ascribed to Mr Grub and Mr Grace.

The Griffin map shows further buildings within the oval paddock to the east, ascribed to Lord Cowper and set within orchard trees. A further dwelling is shown as Ormoroids Orchard opposite what is now the public byway. These are now lost (as are the orchards) evidence, perhaps, of the decline of rural areas during the 19th century.

The Andrews and Drury map of 1776 is of little help as the hamlet is not featured.

3.7 19th Century

The 1822 Bryant map clearly identifies the area of common land, the current East End Green Farmhouse, two buildings on the oval field, one in Ormoroids Orchard, Keepers Cottage and one further building and, perhaps, The Cottage to the east. Eastwards a further four buildings are depicted along the road to Staines Green, one of which is assumed to be Hazeldene.

East End Green Farm was increasingly focussed on rearing pedigree Hereford and Aberdeen Angus beef cattle at this time, with one half of the farm producing corn as cattle feed, with the other set to pasture.

Probably the most significant change within the area came with the arrival of the Hertford North – Welwyn Junction railway line in 1858. This passed just to the north of East End Green, as it ran along the Lea valley from Hertford, through Hertingfordbury, Letty Green, Cole Green and on to Welwyn and what was to become from the 1920s Welwyn Garden City. Ambitions to go on to Luton and Dunstable were thwarted by lack of investors and inter-company rivalries. Never a busy line, it closed in 1951 (13 years before Beeching), the tracks lifted in 1967. It is now the Cole Green Way used by recreational ramblers and cyclists. For a brief moment, however, it must have seemed to residents of East End Green that they

were nearly connected to the outside world. That connection, of course, was later restored through the motor car.

3.8 20th Century and beyond

Excepting the two most recent additional houses (Keepers Wood and The Poplars), early and 20th C. OS maps indicate few significant changes over the century, apart from some recent provision of detached garages of traditional construction within gardens.

While the farm carries on, and does now include three rental flats and three residential units, the houses along the Green are now largely owned by residents who earned their living in non-agricultural, more lucrative, pursuits. A number have been extended, often in a sympathetic manner applying conservation principles. Nevertheless, they are now substantial houses and any earlier cottage character has, to a significant degree, been subsumed. As large and attractive houses in a fine rural setting, local house prices make them beyond the pockets of the rural workers for whom they were originally built. Similarly, the area's status in the Green Belt protects it from development yet militates against the building of more affordable housing; a not untypical tale in the District.

Conservation Area status brings with it protection measures that prevent the unwarranted demolition of non-listed buildings (with the exception of some agricultural buildings on the Farm) and ensures that any future development – be it extensions or new houses – do not harm the special interest, character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

This Character Appraisal seeks to identify that special architectural interest, character and appearance so that it can be better preserved and enhanced. The derived and approved Management Proposals, local action, the influencing of individual owners, directing the various authorities with rights over the public realm, better design and more informed decision-making by the Council's own planning system can help prevent or mitigate any such identified harm. It cannot stem the above social changes, which are for others to contemplate and address.

3.9 Historic and contemporary maps.

These show the development of the area since the early 18th century. Allowing for the relative inaccuracies of early surveys, of interest are the lost buildings on the paddock and to its north and east demolished in the mid-19th century and the absence of 'Mr Brace's' farm to the east before 1822. Since then, the maps show how little the area has changed. The sequence begins with the 1732 Griffin map followed by the Dury and Andrews map (1776), the Bryant map (1822) and then into the OS maps, starting with the initial survey of 1833 then on to the present day.

The impact of the railways shown on the 1863 map is quite startling and sheds light, perhaps, on why so many artists, romantics and intellectuals of the day were so opposed to them. Today, of course, we laud our railway heritage and many readers, no doubt, feel a wistful regret at the loss of the line. Yet, proposed modern infrastructure projects face similar resistance to that faced by the railway pioneers of the 19th century. *Plus ça change...*



Fig. 1. Griffin Map of 1732. This is the earliest known map of the area - an estate map of some degree of accuracy. East End Green and the farm are clearly shown as are buildings on the paddock and 'Mr Brace's' farm now lost. The map is inverted to show north at the top to allow easy comparison with the following historic maps).



Fig. 2. Dury and Andrews map of 1776. East End Green not shown (this survey focussed on the larger estates). The building and compound under the large letter 'O' may be of relevance but, regrettably, are unannotated.



Fig. 3. Bryant Map of 1822. This survey was at 1" = 1 Mile so not particularly detailed. The Farm and cottages are clearly visible including buildings on the paddock and to its north since lost.



Fig. 4. OS First series map of 1833 (from a spread of 1805-1869) from initial sketches of circa 1805. The survey was at 1" = 1 Mile so not particularly detailed. Note East End Green was annotated as Eason Green. The Farm and cottages are shown including buildings on the paddock and to its north since lost.




Fig 5. Hertingfordbury Tithe map (extract) 1838




Fig. 6. OS First series map of 1863 (from a spread of 1805-1869). By far the biggest change shown was the new railway. Little else had changed over the intervening years. The map is at 1" = 1 Mile so not particularly detailed. Note East End Green was still annotated as Eason Green. The Farm and cottages are shown including buildings on the paddock and to its north since lost.




Fig. 7. OS map of 1880 (from a spread of 1874-1894). Buildings on the paddock and to its north and east shown on the 1863 map are no longer shown.

(The relative inaccuracies between different OS sheets from individual years and the difficulties in aligning these with modern GIS standards of mapping (e.g. the new Conservation Area boundary) are apparent. Due allowance on this and other historic maps in this series should be made).




Fig. 8. OS map of 1898 (from a spread of 1897-1898).




Fig. 9. OS map of 1923 (from a spread of 1920-1924).




Fig. 10. OS map of 1972 (from a spread of 1963-1979).




Fig. 11. OS map of 2017

4. HERITAGE AND ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGNATIONS AND THE CRITERIA USED TO IDENTIFY OTHER IMPORTANT FEATURES

4.1. Scheduled Ancient Monuments (a National designation).

There are no SAMs within the Conservation Area.

4.2. Areas of Archaeological Significance

These are designated locally by East Herts District Council on advice from Hertfordshire County Council. There are no AAS within the Conservation Area.

4.3. Listed buildings (a National designation).

There are three grades of listed buildings; in descending order of special interest, Grade I (approximately 2.5% of the national total), Grade II* (approx. 5.5%) and Grade II making up the rest. Listed buildings are protected from unauthorised demolition, alteration or extension. They are protected both internally and externally. Structures, including railings and walls, within the curtilage of listed buildings, if they are pre-1948, are also subject to the same controls as listed buildings. Individually listed buildings within the Conservation Area have been identified, plotted and briefly described, such abbreviated descriptions being based on the national list, occasionally with additional comments in italics by the fieldworker. Full descriptions can be obtained on line at Historic England's website

List.HistoricEngland.org.uk

4.4. Non-listed buildings of quality and worthy of protection.

A number of other non-listed buildings and structures make an important positive contribution to the architectural or historic special interest of the Conservation Area and are identified by this Character Appraisal. The basic questions asked in assessing such buildings/structures are:

- (a) Is the non-listed building/structure of sufficient architectural or historic interest whose general external form and appearance remains largely unaltered?
- (b) Does the building contain a sufficient level of external original features and materials?
- (c) Has the building retained its original scale without large inappropriate modern extensions that destroy the visual appearance particularly in respect of the front elevation?
- (d) Is the building visually important in the street scene?

Historic England, in its Advice Note 1 'Conservation Area Designation, Appraisal and Management' (2016) provides a useful checklist to identify elements in a conservation area which may contribute to the special interest. The checklist is reproduced in Appendix 1.

4.5. Important trees and Hedgerows.

These are identified by this Appraisal and shown on the Character Analysis Map on p. 28. The basic criteria for identifying important trees and hedgerows are:-

- (a) They are in good condition.
- (b) They are visible at least in part from public view points.

- (c) They make a significant contribution to the street scene or other publicly accessible areas.

4.6. Open spaces or important gaps.

Those that contribute to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and where development would be inappropriate are identified by this Character Appraisal and on the Character Analysis Map on p. 28. The basic question asked in identifying such areas is does the open space or gap form an important landscape feature contributing to the general spatial quality and visual importance of the Conservation Area? Private open spaces forming an important setting for an historic asset and unkempt spaces that have the potential to be enhanced are candidates for selection subject to complying with the principle question.

4.7. Other distinctive features.

Those that make an important architectural or historic contribution are identified in this Character Appraisal and on the Character Analysis Map on p. 28. In relation to walls and railings, those at and above prescribed heights in a conservation area, being 1m abutting a highway (including a public footpath or bridleway, waterway or open space) or 2m elsewhere, are protected and require permission for their demolition.

4.8. Enhanced controls.

Reference has previously been made to the potential of introducing Article 4 Directions to control minor development in conservation areas in justified circumstances. The character appraisals undertaken to date for other conservation areas have identified that while many important historic architectural features remain unaltered on some non-listed buildings, the exercise of Permitted Development Rights on other buildings has eroded their quality and harmed the special interest of the conservation areas. Should Members decide to proceed with such an initiative, such important historic detailing including features as identified below could justifiably be retained and inappropriate alterations to them controlled. In time some of the lost architectural detailing could then be restored.

- Chimneys, in good condition, contemporary with the age of the property and prominent in the street scene.
- Windows and doors visible from the street/s, where they make a positive contribution to the special interest and character and appearance of the Conservation Area. An Article 4 Direction made through a s.71 Conservation Area Management Proposal can be a useful tool in controlling the loss of such features and, where already lost and replaced with inauthentic modern replacements, their restoration.
- Other features might include good quality architectural materials and detailing constructed of wood, metal or other materials.
- Walls or railings which make a positive architectural or historic contribution to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

- Hardstandings and measures to prevent the loss of front gardens for off-street parking.
- Measures to prevent the installation of PV and solar panels on prominent roofslopes.
- It may also be appropriate to introduce Article 4 Directions to retain quality buildings below the prescribed Permitted Development threshold.

4.9. Negative features.

Buildings and features that are out of character with the Conservation Area and detract from or harm its special interest or are in poor repair are identified in the Character Appraisal and on the Character Analysis Map on p. 28.

4.10. Important views.

These are identified on the Character Analysis Map on p. 28.

4.11. Conservation Area boundaries.


In suggesting any revisions to the Conservation Area boundaries, principal consideration has been given as to whether or not the land or buildings in question form part of the area of 'special architectural or historic interest the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance'. Too often modern development lacks the necessary architectural interest to merit retention. Similarly, large tracts of open space or farmland around a village should not now be included. The boundary should describe a clear change in character or appearance if it is to be both logical and defensible in law.

Boundaries will normally, but not always, follow existing features on the ground and property boundaries. Where appropriate, it will also follow the crown of the road. In addition, where conservation area legislation protects features such as wall/railings or trees that would otherwise form part of a conservation area boundary the latter is extended a small but obvious distance beyond the protected feature in question to avoid any ambiguity in interpretation as to whether or not it lies within the conservation area.

5. CHARACTER ANALYSIS.

East End Green Conservation Area Character Appraisal Map 2. Character Analysis Map

© Crown Copyright and database right 2017.
Ordnance Survey 100019528



5.1. General Landscape setting.

In terms of its wider setting, the Landscape Character Assessment produced in 2007 as a Supplementary Planning Document, describes the wider area ('Area 66, Cole Green and Hertingfordbury Settled Farmland') as, '*A mainly pastoral area of small hamlets, with parkland and mineral extraction along its southern edge and urban influence at its eastern extent*'. It describes its Key Characteristics as, '*small double gravel ridge between two rivers, with a small valley between, most of this area is remote and tranquil, small variable villages and hamlets, long established and with 20th-century additions, clustered around village greens and influence of rivers not apparent, even at confluence*'. Its Distinctive Features include, '*use of disused railway for Lea Valley Walk. Possibly the best signed and accessed footpath in the county, but dull and gloomy*'.

The SPD informs us that '*The long-settled character of this area is very evident within the various settlements*'. It adds, '*There has been some loss of field boundaries to arable production, and a change to medium-sized fields, but there is still a strong small-scale pattern of hedges and fences and a considerable number of mature hedgerow oaks*'. In terms of transport patterns it notes, '*The parkland influence is apparent in the number of no through roads. Most of the villages are accessed from Birchall Lane but have no exit to the south. The lanes vary between deep and level, but all are winding and generally well vegetated. Cole Green Way/Lea Valley Walk/Chain Walk is a combined footpath, bridleway and cycle route*'.

5.2 General overview.

East End Green is a small rural hamlet approximately two miles to the west of Hertingfordbury and one of five Greens between Birchall Lane/ the Old Coach Road on the high ground and the River Lea below. The valley was cut through in 1858 by the Hertford to Welwyn Junction Railway which passed just to the north of East End Green. To the south east are the Roxford Estate and Grotto Wood.

The hamlet is surrounded by open countryside and the setting is consequently somewhat remote, away from both traffic noise and street lighting. The approaches are two single-track rural lanes, four footpath routes and the Cole Green Way all in use by walkers, ramblers, horse riders and cyclists crossing the Green.

The hamlet is tiny, featuring the one farm with associated flats and dwellings and 6 further dwellings, these latter arrayed along the south side of the road. Originally small cottages, the dwellings have been substantially extended in recent years.

The majority of the Green feels quite enclosed by a hedgerow and tall tree screen marking the long northern boundary and, south of the gravel track, continuous maintained hedgerows that line and partially obscure the five residential property boundaries. Both these lineal edges to the Green meander and by widening and narrowing, create a distinctive changing perspective when crossing the Green.

Halfway across the Green the land drops two or more metres toward the Farm but the ridge level continues south around an old clay pit 'dell' to reach the RUPP and the two footpaths before reaching a final small triangle of Green at its return to the lane towards Staines Green. Whilst the principal area of the Green is mown regularly, this eastern section is entirely abandoned and impenetrable with no visual

attributes and does not contribute towards the special interest of the Conservation Area.

A principal feature is the unadopted track which crosses the Green between the single-track lanes westwards to Pipers End and northwards beyond 'Hazeldene' and the Cole Green Way on to Staines Green. The track divides at each end of the Green to access footpaths FP1 to Water Hall and RU19/FP3 and 3a towards Roxford and Hertingfordbury. It has survived earlier proposals for Tarmac and streetlights but, as a soft gravel finish, while picturesque, it was prone to deep potholes and mud which in winter months encouraged drivers to cross onto the grass rather than risk vehicle damage (or having to clean the car). Happily, it was recently relaid with a fresh track base and attractive gravel topping but will continue to require regular pothole filling and maintenance to retain the current visual and practical enhancement.

A further enhancement since designation involved British Telecom who were persuaded to replace the line of telegraph poles then crossing the length of the Green with underground cables – once the residents had dug the trenches for them.

As noted, Dutch Elm disease killed of the northern tree screen which was replaced in 1980 with 109 native saplings. This was a partnership project between residents, the Parish Council and East Herts DC. The saplings are now good trees. However, since then invasive blackthorn, blackberry and nettles have been allowed to take hold in front of the intended tree line and have rather reduced the visually apparent area of the Green.

Nevertheless, the strong tree and hedge lines give the area an enclosed feel while the topography has led to the rolling and curving road. Together these characteristics make for a picturesque and intimate grouping with few external views to the country side beyond.

Its remote location and the lack of any nearby public transport means that today's residents are almost entirely dependent on the car to get around or visit other villages or towns. It is too small a hamlet to sustain its own facilities such as a church or chapel-at-ease (the nearest was at Letty Green, but it has now gone) or even a pub (at Pipers End but now demolished). It is consequently, rather isolated.

5.3 Scheduled Ancient Monuments.

None. (Grotto Wood, part of the Roxford estate, half a mile to the south east is a SAM).

5.4 Areas of Archaeological Significance.

None. (A rectangular area partially covering the gravel ponds to the south east is an Area of Archaeological Significance).

5.5 Individually Listed Buildings.

There are 3 entries on the national list within East End Green Conservation Area. All are Grade II. Summaries of the listings are reproduced below. Full details of the listings can be found on the Historic England website at:-

<http://list.historicengland.org.uk/results.aspx?index=1>

East End Green Farmhouse and Attached Barn to North East.



HE Ref: 1341426

Listed 24 November 1966. Amended 11 June 1986.

House. c.1800, but closely following an earlier type. Extended and altered C20. Stock brick with white brick dressings. Tiled roof. 3 bays with original lean-to outshuts on ends and stair wing to rear. 2 storeys and attic. Central entrance: 6 panelled door in reveal, hooded architrave, flanking and first floor 2 light small pane casements, recessed with stone sills and gauged brick flat arched white brick heads. Three 2 light small pane hipped dormers. Slightly extruded end stacks with offsets. Original lean-to outshuts are slightly set back with 2 light casements to front. To rear is central full height stair wing, first and second floor segmental heads to 2 light casements, hipped roof. To rear left catslide roof over a lean-to bay, part rebuilt with 2 light casements. Both lean-to outshuts are extended to rear with hipped roofs. Interior: upper part of original stair with plain stick balusters, moulded handrail, original fireplaces. Extending to right is early C20 1 storey and attic weatherboarded range with a door, a 2 light casement and three 2 light hipped dormers, to rear a door and three 2 light casements. This range forms a link to the barn: C17 or C18, timber frame on brick base, weatherboarded, tiled roof. 4 bays. Double doors in both sides in 2nd bay from house. Interior: braces, some arched, from jowled posts to tie beams, some cambered, collars clasp purlins, angled queen struts to principals, braces in walling.

Keeper's Cottage.



*Previously two cottages.
Good hedge boundary.*

HE Ref: 1367479
Listed 11 June 1986

House, once 2 dwellings. Late C16 or early C17, extended C20. Timber frame, extended in brick, all rendered. Steeply pitched tiled roof. Originally 3 bay lobby entry. 2 storeys. Original central entrance blocked, flanking bays have flush frame small pane casements. Central on ridge is original red brick multiform stack. An entrance porch added on right end which has an attic casement. Catslide roof over continuous lean-to outshut to rear. Projecting slightly with an entrance in re-entrant wall and extending to left is C20 1 storey and attic 2 bay addition with a gable to left front. Interior: exposed framing, ground floor stop chamfered axial binding beams.

Additional information: Keepers Cottage is shown on the 1833 OS map and through the series to 1972 as two cottages and presumably related to the large Keepers Field behind. It was converted to a single dwelling and extensions added in the 1970s.

The Cottage.



The earliest surviving building in the CA.

HE Ref: 1089137
Listed 2 November 1982

House. Late C15 or early C16, stack inserted and floored late C16 to mid C17. Altered and extended C20. Timber frame with brick plinth. Rendered. Tiled roof, machine tiles to rear. Originally a 2 bay open hall altered to become a lobby entry, 1 bay added to right in C20. 1 storey and attic. Gabled porch, entrance now to left of centre. C20 flush frame 3 light casements, 1 gabled dormer. Multiform early brick ridge stack. C20 addition to rear. Interior: chamfered bearers on ground floor, cambered tie beams.

Additional information: The Cottage was owned by a Mr Woods and was renowned for its tea room history when it was known as Wicket Cottage. It featured a hanging sign 'Teas with Hovis' now lost but potentially still retained nearby. A chimney insertion and matching side extension retain the original cottage scale and appearance, whilst since being listed, further rear extensions and outbuildings have been approved. It features an attractive garden visible from the track, thankfully now without the two caravans that once provided further homes thereon.

5.6 Important buildings within the curtilages of Listed Buildings.

It should be noted that s.1 (5) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 extends the protection of the listing given to the main building to include curtilage structures, buildings and boundaries. These have, therefore, enhanced protection above that provided by being within a conservation area.

5.7 Non-listed buildings that make an important architectural or historic contribution.

This Character Appraisal identifies other buildings of high quality that are not listed but that should be retained. These are an important element in the built form and historical evolution of the Conservation Area and make a positive contribution to its special interest, character and appearance. They are normally shown in two categories on the Character Analysis Map.

Category 1 buildings are shown cerise on the Character Analysis Map and are well-preserved and retain most important architectural features, for example good quality windows, chimneys and other architectural features that are considered worthy of additional protection through an Article 4 direction.

Category 2 buildings are shown in orange on Character Appraisal Maps and are good buildings, clearly worthy of retention but which have lost some key architectural features or have suffered modern replacements out-of-keeping with the building. These buildings are considered worthy of restoration which additional planning controls through an Article 4 direction would help deliver (and then, subsequently, retain). There are no Category 2 buildings within the East End Green Conservation Area.

East End Green: South side (W–E).

Category 1.

Orchard Cottage



The stepped excrescences rather subsume the original cottage character.

Orchard Cottage is unlisted but its timber framed original structure closely matches that of the adjacent The Cottage, which is listed. Both are of similar size and orientation and it is thought they may be of similar age to Keepers Cottage, also listed. Only these three dwellings and the Farm remain of the ten buildings recorded on the 1732 Griffin map. The modest original structure of Orchard Cottage has been rather subsumed by large-scale incremental stepped extensions shown initially on the 1923 OS map and then, with addition upon addition, in 1972 to the present day.

White Cottage



Polite frontage behind notable tall hedging.

The White Cottage is the only Victorian dwelling, now with various 20th C outbuildings. The large range of stable buildings attached to its east elevation shown on the 1898 OS map were removed by 1923 and replaced in the rear east corner of the site. The current stabling and matching double-pile rear extension are late 20th C additions. A second wellhead is reported in the western garden.

Keepers Wood



*Mostly early
21st C.
Striking gable
window.*

Keepers Wood is a substantial new dwelling that occupies the site of two earlier buildings that originated as a group of loose boxes operating as a livery stable – known as Keepers Stables. Latterly it became a large animal veterinary centre with live-in supervision and thence, after 2001, into a residential dwelling.

The Poplars



*A modern
interpretation of
traditional
vernacular cottage
design. Note the
steep clay plain
tiled roof.*

The Poplars is a late 20th C. dwelling that replaced the previous single storey, one room flint brick 'Hermit's Cottage' shown on the 1972 OS map and itself on the site of an earlier building. It is reported that the 'hermit, a Mr Richmond, was dragged from the fire that destroyed his home. A mature Lombardy poplar on the site was a landing landmark for Panshangar pilots, until felled.

East End Green: North side.

Category 1.

Barns and out buildings at East End Green Farm forming the immediate farmyard



*A handsome grouping.
Note the rough-hewn arris fencing*



Good quality surfacing unites the composition.

5.8 Other distinctive features that make an important architectural or historic contribution.

Mention has been made above of the Wellhead gear and brickwork and its potential for restoration. See Part C – Management Proposals.

Front boundaries are either hedging and trees or rough-hewn arris rail fencing c/w typical 5-bar gates.

An interesting characteristic is the notable absence of street column lighting or other street furniture in the Conservation Area – this helps underline its strong rural character.

5.9 Important Open Spaces.

This is, of course, the main Green. Much of the Green to the east is unkempt as scrubland and is not included in the Conservation Area. The small sward to the east of The Poplars is a notable exception.

5.10 Any others e.g. Wildlife sites/ Historic Parks and Gardens

The area to the north east of the Conservation Area centred on junction with the Cole Green Way is designated in the Local Plan as a Wildlife Site.

5.11 Particularly important trees and hedgerows.

The array of trees in front of the entrance to Keepers Cottage and heading east to the 'dell' are covered by a TPO.



TPO trees at the entrance to Keepers Cottage.

In addition a large number of other trees and hedging are important to the Conservation Area and are shown diagrammatically on the accompanying Character Analysis Map on p. 28. These include those others that array the northern front boundary of the dwellings along the south and a number within the Farm complex. These serve to underline the rural origins and character of East End Green and are central to its special interest.



Fine willow trees at the entrance to East End Farm.

5.12 Important views.



A delightful garden seen from the public track.

A selection is shown on the accompanying Character Analysis Map on p. 28. Long meandering views are evident from both ends of the central track together with attractive views south through the garden of The Cottage. Prior to the gravel workings, many of the dwellings enjoyed panoramic views across the river valley and reportedly the view included the spires of five churches. However, as these are views from private land, not available to the public, they have not been surveyed or annotated on the Character Analysis Map.

5.13 Elements harmful to the Conservation Area.

As noted, the Conservation Area has changed little since designation and, with the exception of one or two typical large post-war agricultural structures on the Farm, no adverse development has taken place in that time.



*Typically
utilitarian and
rather bleak
farmyard c/w
neutral buildings.*

The demolition of neutral buildings would not normally be a concern, subject to the details of the replacement being known and the opportunity to secure development that makes a positive contribution to the Conservation Area being taken.

A perpetual threat to the character and appearance of this, as any other, Conservation Area is the unfettered exercise of permitted development rights. The quality of an area can quickly be eroded by the incremental loss of original features and architectural detailing. Modern replacement doors and windows, cheap roofing and cladding materials and poorly located solar or PV panelling may, superficially, appear a saving but will, in the long run, harm the special interest and significance of an area and its economic value. Historic England and the RICS have repeatedly demonstrated that historic areas and buildings that retain such features and detailing enjoy an up to 13% increase in value. As such, these cheap materials are a false economy, as well as harming the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. As such, an Article 4 Direction, which would bring such matters within the Planning system, should be considered.

The loss of the elm trees is regrettable but the replacements are, in the main, restoring the tree cover and sense of enclosure. The replacement of the telegraph poles with underground cabling was a major enhancement.

Notwithstanding the above, the preservation of conservation areas allows for no complacency and enhancements should always be pursued. As with the tree replacement and the underground cabling, success often requires partnership and cooperation between residents, the authorities and other stakeholders.

To that end the Management Proposals tabled in Part C of this document are commended.

The positioning of satellite dishes always requires care and, in a Conservation Area, often planning permission.



Often such satellite dishes can be located on rear elevations or on a low pole behind a bush in the garden.

5.14 Threats and opportunities

A hamlet as attractive and desirable as East End Green will inevitably encourage high property prices which will make housing increasingly unaffordable for many local people. It is difficult to maintain strong community ties in such a situation, as the young and local workers are priced out of the area. The increasing and associated trend of incoming residents following a suburban rather than a rural lifestyle is also a factor in the decline of rural life. Such hamlets and villages can quickly become commuter villages or retirement settlements and the vitality can be sucked out of them.

The same high property prices have and will, no doubt, continue to attract developers keen to build new houses and carry out more intensive redevelopment of existing built sites. It is vital to the protection of the character and appearance of the Conservation Area that any new development is of excellent 'Urban design' and architectural standards with a grain, density, siting, form, size, height and bulk that fits within its historic context and are executed in local vernacular crafts and materials such that they make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

A growing trend within East Herts is an increasing demand for excessive extensions to historic and listed buildings. These are often 'life-style' driven in order to facilitate single-function rooms and their various digital distractions and, following the hotel model, an en-suite bathroom for each bedroom, all reflective of the increasing fragmentation of family life. This demand needs to be monitored and, where harmful to heritage assets, contained if historic buildings are not to lose their intrinsic character and special interest and the Conservation Area is not to become increasingly built-up and urbanised.

The quality of existing boundaries is largely good save some metal 5-bar gates. Effort must be made in this regard to protect hedging and typical rural boundary treatments to ensure that the rural quality of the area is maintained. The latter will require the making of an Article 4 direction.

5.15 Suggested boundary changes.

Paragraph 4.11 above details the policy requirements in this regard under the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and associated Planning Practice Guidance (2014) and the current Historic England Advice Note 1 'Conservation Area Designation, Appraisal and Management' (2016). Paragraph 127 of the NPPF is particularly pertinent.

Councils have a responsibility to ensure that conservation areas justify their continued designation and that their status is not devalued through the designation of areas that lack special architectural or historic interest. There can be no question as to the appropriateness of the designation of an East End Green Conservation Area which is remarkably intact and of a particularly high quality. However, it is evident that the boundaries of the Conservation Area have not been reviewed since designation in 1981 and that they reflect guidance at that time to 'cast a wide net initially which can then be tightened up later'. That latter and important task never occurred. Consequently, the existing boundaries do not define, as current Historic England guidance requires they should, where there is a clear change of character and a defensible boundary, making the Conservation Area vulnerable in planning law. This review is the opportunity to put this right.

The survey for this Character Appraisal revealed that while the majority of the boundary is appropriately located and sensibly defines where character changes from settlement to the surrounding countryside, a substantial area of field, paddock and scrubland to the east were erroneously included. While this land was part of the Green as conveyed to the Parish Council, they have been assessed and found to lack the necessary special interest or significance, being indiscernible from the surrounding countryside. Removing them and thereby designating a Conservation Area within logical and policy-compliant boundaries will strengthen it and make it more robust in planning law. Consequently, it was decided to remove them and to relocate the boundary to locations that correctly define the relevant change of character from settlement to countryside. Other very minor changes were also proposed. These boundary changes, therefore, are included in the Conservation Management Proposals.

6. SUMMARY OF SPECIAL INTEREST OF THE EAST END GREEN CONSERVATION AREA

The overall characteristics of the East End Green Conservation Area can be summarised as follows:-

1/ A historic hamlet within the River Lea valley, one of five 'Greens' within the Hertingfordbury Parish, of a farm and 6 dwellings lining a simple track road. Good hedging and groups of trees along the north boundary and along the front boundaries of properties facing onto the Green form a high quality picturesque

environment. The surrounding landscape is largely farmland underlining the village's rural past,

2/ The public realm is notably simple in design and materials, with a good quality gravelled track road with soft verges, no street lighting, telegraph poles or street furniture, all serving to underline the rural character and appearance of the area,

3/ Trees and hedging form a strong sense of enclosure and intimate scale,

4/ Good views along the track and peeked transverse across into some private land with picturesque gardens,

5/ Buildings along the track are well set back behind hedged, treed or simple traditional rural boundaries thereby defining public and private space. Those on the south side follow a traditional informal building line, are two storeys high and of traditional construction.

6/ Two good quality recent buildings are of an appropriate bulk, height and scale and are of traditional design and materials such that they sit comfortably alongside the important historic and listed other dwellings and do not harm their setting,

7/ Any future development should, similarly, not harm the rural character and appearance of the Conservation Area,

8/ Attractive main Farm building, barns and yard, but with more ugly utilitarian structure on the working north east yard.

7. SUMMARY OF ISSUES

Issues facing the Conservation Area at present can be summarised as follows:-

1/ The Conservation Area has changed little in the last 100 years and certainly not since designation. Local residents have already been commendably pro-active and the removal of telegraph poles, the replanting of trees and the gravel surfacing have done much to reinforce its rural character and enhance its special interest.

2/ A number of ugly modern utilitarian structures, albethey typical, mar the north east farm yard and, should the opportunity allow, could beneficially be replaced by better designed, more traditional and less harmful barns and buildings.

3/ Some modern metal gates jar the eye and could be replaced by less harmful timber 5-bar gates.

4/ The ever-present threat to good quality historic houses by poor quality alterations and the use of modern materials should be forestalled. Increasing public interest in PV and solar panels has much potential to cause harm. Such matters readily contribute to the declining quality and run-down appearance of conservation areas. While East End Green is relatively unscathed at present (certainly when compared to some other conservation areas) consideration should be given to introducing an Article 4 direction to control minor development and prevent any decline of the area,

5/ The loss of timber windows and doors and other architectural joinery and their replacement with PVCu, aluminium or other inappropriate modern materials is a particular blight affecting many conservation areas. Listed buildings must retain their original fabric and remain single-glazed (but can have secondary glazing). The use of double-glazed units in non-listed buildings is generally acceptable with, in many instances, the casements and sashes capable of adjustment to accommodate slimline units. If not, new double-glazed timber frames may be acceptable provided that the original window design and materials are replicated.

6/ The demand for excessive extensions to historic and listed buildings needs to be contained if the buildings are not to lose their intrinsic character and special interest and the Conservation Area is not to become increasingly built-up and urbanised,

7/ It must be assumed that development pressure within the District will continue to escalate and that, as an attractive and picturesque hamlet, East End Green will from time to time be subject to such pressures. The designation as a Conservation Area is not to prevent any future development but to manage change so as to ensure that it does not harm the character or appearance of the area. However, it must be said that whereas the two most recent houses are of such scale, siting, design and materials as to fit in well, and similar single discreet additions of high architectural quality may be possible, groups of buildings, e.g. cul-de-sac development, or other larger scale proposals are, by their very scale and nature, unlikely to be able to avoid causing substantial harm in this tiny hamlet. High quality design and materials that reinforces local character should be demanded of any future development within the Conservation Area,

8/ There are extensive private gardens behind many of the houses. These contribute greatly to the grain and, in some instances, views from and between the houses and are important for wildlife. Their loss to piecemeal development would have an adverse effect on the character of the area.

Issues 2/-8/ are under planning control, or can be brought under planning control with an up-to-date and rigorously applied Article 4 direction. Steps to seek the restoration of lost vernacular features may also be sought through local policy, grants, persuasion and appropriate Conservation Area Management Proposals designed to both preserve and enhance.

PART C – CONSERVATION AREA MANAGEMENT PROPOSALS.

8. MANAGEMENT PROPOSALS.



The rural idyll preserved.

8.1. Revised Conservation Area Boundaries.

The revised boundary alignments are shown on the accompanying Character Analysis Map on p. 28 and include the following amendments -

- (a) Dedesignate. Land to the east of the Conservation Area being: the field to the north east of East End Green Farm, the adjacent paddock and the scrubland to its south east.

To rationalise the boundary and remove farmland and scrubland of no special interest.

- (b) Designate. Strips of land at the rear (south east) boundaries to Keeper's Wood, Keeper's Cottage and White Cottage including the adjacent return boundary with Orchard Cottage to ensure the inclusion of trees and hedging.

To rationalise the boundary.

- (c) Designate. Strip of land to the rear (south west) of The Cottage to ensure inclusion of trees and hedging.

To rationalise the boundary.

- (d) Designate. Strip of land to the north boundary along the track to ensure inclusion of trees and hedging.

To rationalise the boundary.

- (e) Designate. Pocket of land at the south west boundary of the farmyard near The Old Dairy to ensure inclusion of trees and hedging.

To rationalise the boundary.

- (f) Designate. Strip of land at the west corner of East End Farm Land to ensure inclusion of trees and hedging.

To rationalise the boundary.

8.2. *General Planning Control and Good Practice within the Conservation Area.*

All 'saved' planning policies are contained in the East Herts. Local Plan Second Review adopted in April 2007. It is currently against this document and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) that the District Council will determine applications. The NPPF is supplemented by Planning Practice Guidance. One such guidance note of particular relevance is 'Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment'. In due course the 2007 Local Plan will be replaced by the District Plan whose policies will then have full weight.

8.3. *Contact and advice*

Applicants considering submitting an application should carefully consider the relevant policies and if necessary contact Officers to seek pre-application advice.

Telephone 01279 655261 (For development proposals ask for Development Management).

E-mail planning@eastherts.gov.uk

Website: www.eastherts.gov.uk

Or write to Development Management, East Herts District Council, Wallfields, Pegs Lane, Hertford SG13 8EQ

8.4. *Guidance Notes*

Applicants should refer to the relevant Guidance Notes previously referred available on the Council's website at :- <http://www.eastherts.gov.uk/index.jsp?articleid=15387>

8.5. *Development Management - Potential need to undertake an Archaeological Evaluation.*

Within sites designated as being a Scheduled Ancient Monument or within an Area of Archaeological Significance (as shown on either the adopted Local Plan or emerging District Plan), the contents of policies BH1, BH2 and BH3 are particularly relevant.

8.6. *Listed Building Control and Good Practice.*

Those buildings that are individually listed are identified on the Character Analysis Map on p. 28 and within the text of this document. Other pre-1948 buildings, structures or walls within the curtilage of a Listed Building may be similarly protected in law. Please seek pre-application advice on this point. Listed Buildings are a significant asset in contributing to the quality of the Conservation Area. It is essential

that their special interest and architectural detailing is not eroded nor their other qualities and settings compromised.

8.7. Development Management – Unlisted Buildings that make an Important Architectural or Historic Contribution. The Character Appraisal above has identified at 5.7 a number of unlisted buildings that make an important architectural or historic contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

Any proposal involving the demolition of these buildings is unlikely to be approved.

8.8. Planning Control – Other unlisted distinctive features that make an Important Architectural or Historic Contribution.

This Appraisal has identified a number of features that make a particular contribution to the character of the Conservation Area. Some boundary treatments are protected from demolition by virtue of exceeding the specified heights relevant to Conservation Area legislation or by Listed Building legislation. Any proposal involving the demolition of these is unlikely to be approved. Removal of other Permitted Development rights involving the alteration of non-listed boundaries will be considered.

8.9. There are other distinctive features that are integral to some of the important unlisted buildings identified above that make an important architectural or historic contribution, including chimneys, windows and other architectural detailing. In some situations protection already exists through existing planning controls but in other cases protection could only be provided by removing Permitted Development Rights via an Article 4 Direction. Should the Council consider such a course of action appropriate there would be a process of notifying the affected owners separately at a later date. The Council would then consider any comments made before deciding whether to confirm or amend the Direction.

8.10. Planning control - Wildlife Sites.

Any development that adversely affects wildlife species occupying such sites will not normally be permitted and would need clear justification. Proposals will be considered against Policies ENV 14 and ENV 16 of the Local Plan.

8.11. Planning Control – Important open land, open spaces and gaps.

This Character Appraisal has identified the open Green and the dell as being particularly important open spaces whose openness and the defining treed and hedged boundaries must be protected.

8.12. Planning Control – Particularly important trees and hedgerows.

The TPO group and the most significant trees and clumps or trees are shown diagrammatically on the Character Analysis map. It has not been possible to plot trees on inaccessible land. Subject to certain exceptions all trees in a conservation area are afforded protection and a person wanting to carry out works has to notify the Council. Trees that have not been identified may still be considered suitable for protection by Tree Preservation Orders. Owners are advised to make regular inspections to check the health of trees in the interests of amenity and health and safety. Lines of hedges along house front boundaries are particularly important to the

rural character of the conservation area. All stakeholders have a role to play in protecting these hedges.

8.13. *Planning Control - Important views.* A selection of notable views is diagrammatically shown on the Character Analysis Map on p. 28. Policy BH6 is particularly relevant.

8.14. *Enhancement Proposals.*

Section 7 of the Character Appraisal, 'Summary of Issues', identifies a number of elements that detract or have the potential to detract which are summarised in the Table below together with a proposed course of action; other actions are also identified.

Within the staff and financial resources available, Council Officers will be pro-active and provide assistance. It must be recognized that such improvements will generally be achieved only by the owner's co-operation.

8.15. *Schedule of Enhancement Proposals*

Detracting element	Location	Proposed Action.
Invasive Blackthorn (Prunus Spinosa) suckers, nettles, blackberry and densely tangled thicket areas.	Encroachment onto the Green from the northern western boundary.	Remove all dead/dying self-sown elms, other trees and fallen timber. Retain good healthy trees and lift crowns as necessary.
Closed off central field gateway behind invasive thickets	North boundary of the Green	Seek its opening up to reinstate field views northwards.
Unmanaged walnut tree.	South side of Green	Raise crown and cut out dead wood.
Missing Wellhead presently stored at Orchard Cottage.	Marked 'W' on OS maps on north side of Green	Confirm original well location and restore the Wellhead. Potential partnership project with the Parish Council.
Orchard Cottage	West end of the Green	Apparently contemporaneous with The Cottage and Keeper's Cottage. Investigate of HE why it was not also listed.
Potential for poor quality alterations and materials implemented under permitted development rights.	Scattering.	Seek to implement an Article 4 direction. Protect and preserve surviving features and seek to restore previously lost features through future planning applications.
PVCu and other inappropriate replacement window and doors and thick double glazing.	Scattered.	Seek to implement an Article 4 direction. Retain historic originals and Improve quality through future planning applications.
Excessive extensions to	Scattered.	Seek to implement an Article 4

historic and listed buildings.		direction limiting sizes. Contain extensions of listed buildings through the consent regime.
Neutral buildings diluting or harming the character and appearance of the CA.	East End Green Farm.	Where possible and as the opportunity arises seek better architectural quality that reinforces local styles and materials for future developments through the planning system.
Field maple trees planted in the 1980s	Around the dell in front of The Poplars	Remove the field maples and replace with the previous hawthorn trees.
Other Actions.		
For discussion with Parish Council and community.		
Scrubland at the east of the Green making for a poor setting and views of the CA	Between the RUPP and Keeper's Field	Improve the setting of the CA. Clear out the shallow winter pond and edges of fallen trees to open up this area.

Bibliography

The Buildings of England, Hertfordshire. Nikolaus Pevsner, second edition revised by Bridget Cherry. Penguin Books 1977.

The Place-Names of Hertfordshire, Gower, Mawer and Stenton, English Place-Name Society Vol. XV Cambridge UP 1938 and 1970.

East End Green, Information, notes and observations on the history and development of the area provided by Mr Peter Newson 2017.

Association of Commons Registration Authorities website (www.acraew.org.uk)
Commons Commissioner decision notice of 28 April 1972.

Appendix 1

Historic England, in its Advice Note 1 'Conservation Area Designation, Appraisal and Management' (2016) provides a useful checklist to identify elements in a conservation area which may contribute to the special interest (Cf 4.4 above). The checklist is reproduced below:-

- Is it the work of a particular architect or designer of regional or local note?
- Does it have landmark quality?
- Does it reflect a substantial number of other elements in the conservation area in age, style, materials, form or other characteristics?
- Does it relate to adjacent designated heritage assets in age, materials or in

any other historically significant way?

- Does it contribute positively to the setting of adjacent designated heritage assets?
- Does it contribute to the quality of recognisable spaces including exteriors or open spaces with a complex of public buildings?
- Is it associated with a designed landscape e.g. a significant wall, terracing or a garden building?
- Does it individually, or as part of a group, illustrate the development of the settlement in which it stands?
- Does it have significant historic association with features such as the historic road layout, burgage plots, a town park or a landscape feature?
- Does it have historic associations with local people or past events?
- Does it reflect the traditional functional character or former uses in the area?
- Does its use contribute to the character or appearance of the area?

A positive response to one or more of the above may indicate that a particular element within a conservation area makes a positive contribution provided that its historic form and values have not been eroded.