

Heritage Asset	Comments on assessment in Heritage Statement		Assessment of impact	Recommendations to reduce harm
Dunton Hills Farmhouse (Grade II, List Entry Number: 1208245)	<p>Assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The assessment of significance is generally agreed. As well as the contribution of the Site to the significance, which has a positive contribution.</li> <li>- Minimal detail is provided as to the wind turbine and pylons being detractive features. It is considered these are slight detracting features as the agrarian landscape can still be appreciated despite their presence</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The harmful effects are agreed. This is considered to result in medium to high levels of less than substantial harm (Para 202).</li> </ul>	<p>The proposed development will result in <b>medium to high levels of less than substantial harm</b> through the change in the character of Site, as well as the visual impact.</p> <p>The LVIA Photoviewpoint 4 of the photomontages demonstrates the impact that the development will have and the change in character to the setting.</p>	<p>Removal of the development that lies on the farmstead boundary (part of Dunton Woods development)</p> <p>Reduction of Dunton Waters, in line with the SPD</p>
<p>Harmful Effects:</p> <p>Beneficial Effects:</p> <p>Mitigation:</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The creation of public space by the farmhouse is not agreed as a heritage benefit as this is out of character / not in keeping with the farmhouse.</li> <li>- Small levels of beneficial effects are provided by the removal of the wind turbines and pylons</li> <li>- The deviation from the SPD has resulted in built development next to the farmstead, the separation distance of c.113m is not agreed as an adequate mitigation method.</li> <li>- The retention of open space has limited weight due to the amount of proposed development in close proximity.</li> <li>- The retention of the historic drive and orchard has been noted under three points. This has limited weight as part of the historic drive is proposed as a primarily mobility route,</li> </ul>	<p>The deviation from the SPD has resulted in the encroachment of built development being proposed to the north, south and south west. At three to five storeys, this has an increased level of impact to the farmhouse.</p> <p>The small benefit of the removal of the wind turbine and pylons does little to outweigh this harm.</p> <p>The cited mitigation has done little to reduce the harm caused</p>	<p>Reduction of building heights</p>

<p>Church of All Saints (Grade II*, List Entry Number: 1197184)</p>	<p>continuing along the northern boundary of the farmstead. This will fundamentally change the character of the approach, as well as increased traffic experience for the farmstead</p>	<p>Assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The assessment of significance is generally agreed.</li> <li>- The contribution made by the Site is not agreed.</li> <li>- It is considered the contribution of the Site to the significance, has a small positive contribution as an open landscape setting and illustrating the significance of the building as a rural parish church.</li> <li>- The assessment identifies no harm.</li> <li>- The harmful effects are largely agreed.</li> <li>- Also include Increased movement; Noise; and Light spill (included for others)</li> </ul> <p>Harmful Effects:</p>	<p>The proposed development will result in <b>low levels of less than substantial harm</b> through the change in the character of Site, as well as the visual impact.</p> <p>The LVIA Photoviewpoint 1 of the photomontages demonstrates the impact that the development will have and the change in character to the setting.</p> <p>The SPD identified views from the church across to the farmstead. The deviation from the SPD has resulted in the encroachment of built development being proposed to the north of the farmstead. At three to four storeys, this will effect these .</p> <p>The small benefit of the removal of the wind turbine and pylons does little to outweigh this harm.</p> <p>The cited mitigation has done little to reduce the harm caused</p>	<p>Removal of the development that lies on the farmstead boundary (part of Dunton Woods development)</p> <p>Reduction of proposed building heights</p>
<p>Assessment:</p>	<p>Harmful Effects:</p>	<p>Beneficial Effects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The beneficial effects are not agreed.</li> <li>- The removal of the wind turbine is not agreed as a benefit, and has not been identified as a detracting feature.</li> <li>- The provision of a new congregation for the church is neither recognised as a heritage benefit nor a public benefit.</li> <li>- Landscaping as a mitigation method holds little weight due to seasonal effects and long term management considerations</li> </ul> <p>Mitigation:</p>		

Church of St Mary (Grade II, List Entry Number: 1122253)	Assessment:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The assessment of significance is generally agreed.</li> <li>- The assessment does not outline the contribution made by the Site, it is considered the contribution of the Site to the significance, has a small positive contribution as an open landscape setting and illustrating the significance of the building as a former rural parish church.</li> <li>- The assessment identifies no harm.</li> </ul> <p>The harmful effects are agreed.</p>	<p>The proposed development will result in <b>low levels of less than substantial harm</b> through the change in the character of Site, as well as the visual impact.</p> <p>The SPD identified views from the church across to the farmstead and further south. No views have been included to demonstrate that there will be no harm to the asset (as identified by the Heritage Statement). The vista views that were previously identified to the west of Dunton Woods may no longer be accessible as the areas of built form in Dunton Waters has been altered from the SPD and the previous version (July 2019 Version 4)</p>	Subject to the proposed views, likely to be the reduction of proposed building heights/ realignment of Dunton Waters
	Harmful Effects:			
	Mitigation:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Generally agreed. Proposed views should demonstrate that views of the spire within the Site will be retained.</li> </ul>		
Dunton Hall (Grade II, List Entry Number: 1338380)	Assessment:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The assessment of significance is generally agreed. As well as the contribution of the Site to the significance, which has a positive contribution.</li> <li>- The assessment identifies no harm.</li> <li>- The harmful effects are agreed.</li> </ul>	<p>The proposed development has the potential to result in <b>low levels of less than substantial harm</b> through the change in the character of the Site and erosion of the historic associations between the Site, farmhouse and heritage asset. As well as the visual impact.</p>	Subject to the submission of proposed views, likely to be the reduction of proposed building heights.
	Harmful Effects:			
	Mitigation:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Generally agreed.</li> </ul>		

				Subject to the submission of proposed views, likely to be the reduction of proposed building heights.
<p>East Horndon Hall (Grade II, List Entry Number: 1197257)</p>	<p>Assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The assessment of significance is generally agreed.</li> <li>- The contribution made by the Site is not agreed. Whilst there has been alterations to the building's setting which has effected the way the building is experienced, beyond the road, the Site forms part of the agrarian landscape that informs the understanding of the building, as well as there being historic associations.</li> <li>- It is considered the contribution of the Site to the significance, has a small positive contribution as an open landscape setting and illustrating the significance of the building.</li> <li>- The assessment identifies no harm.</li> </ul> <p>Harmful Effects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The harmful effects are largely agreed. Also include Increased movement; Noise; and Light spill (included for others)</li> </ul> <p>Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mitigation methods are not agreed.</li> <li>- Further clarification on 'No visual or physical connections with the Site' – the development of three to four storey buildings along Tilbury Road will likely result in visual impacts.</li> <li>- The parameter plan shows built development along Tilbury Road – therefore not set back from the road.</li> </ul>	<p>No views have been included to demonstrate that there will be no harm to the asset (as identified by the Heritage Statement).</p> <p>The proposed development has the potential to result in <b>low levels of less than substantial harm</b> through the change in the character of the Site and erosion of the historic associations between the Site and heritage asset. As well as the visual impact.</p> <p>It is considered likely the development of three to four storeys will have an increased visual impact. No views have been included to demonstrate that there will be no harm to the asset (as identified by the Heritage Statement).</p>		

Lower Dunton Hall (Grade II, List Entry Number: 1111583)	Assessment:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Landscaping as a mitigation method holds little weight due to seasonal effects and long term management considerations.</li> <li>- The assessment of significance is generally agreed. As well as the contribution of the Site to the significance.</li> <li>- The harmful effects are agreed though this is considered to be at some distance.</li> <li>- There is no benefit of the removal of the wind turbine due to the distance between the asset and the Site.</li> <li>- The distance of the Site and development located between the asset and the Site is not a mitigation method.</li> </ul>	The proposed development is likely to result in <b>no harm</b> to the significance of the heritage asset, due to the distance of the Site and there being no known historical or functional associations.	
Garlesters (Grade II, List Entry Number: 1111648)	Assessment:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The assessment of significance is generally agreed. As well as the contribution of the Site to the significance.</li> <li>- The harmful effects are agreed though this is considered to be at some distance.</li> <li>- There is no benefit of the removal of the wind turbine due to the distance between the asset and the Site.</li> </ul>	The residual effect has been identified as an enhancement, this is not agreed as the removal of the wind turbine is not agreed as a detracting element.	
	Harmful Effects:			
	Beneficial Effects:			
	Mitigation:			
	Assessment:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The assessment of significance is generally agreed. As well as the contribution of the Site to the significance.</li> <li>- The harmful effects are agreed though this is considered to be at some distance.</li> <li>- There is no benefit of the removal of the wind turbine due to the distance between the asset and the Site.</li> </ul>	The proposed development is likely to result in <b>no harm</b> to the significance of the heritage asset, due to the distance of the Site and	
	Harmful Effects:			
	Beneficial Effects:			

<p>Thorndon Park (Grade II* RPG, List Entry Number: 1000314)</p> <p>Thorndon Hall (List Entry Number: 120824517)</p>	<p>Mitigation:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The distance of the Site and development/vegetation located between the asset and the Site is not a mitigation method.</li> <li>- The assessment of significance is generally agreed.</li> <li>- The contribution made by the Site is not agreed.</li> <li>- It is considered the contribution of the Site to the significance, has a small positive contribution as an open landscape setting and illustrating the significance of the assets, as well as the historic associations between them.</li> <li>- The assessment identifies no harm.</li> <li>- The harmful effects are largely agreed.</li> <li>- Also include Increased movement; Noise; and Light spill (included for others)</li> </ul>	<p>there being no known historical or functional associations.</p>	
<p>Thornden Hall (Conservation Area)</p>	<p>Assessment:</p> <p>Harmful Effects:</p> <p>Beneficial Effects:</p> <p>Mitigation:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The assessment of significance is generally agreed. As well as the contribution of the Site to the significance.</li> <li>- The harmful effects are agreed though this is considered to be at some distance.</li> </ul>	<p>The proposed development will result in <b>low levels of less than substantial harm</b> through the change in the character of Site, as well as the visual impact.</p> <p>No views have been included to demonstrate that there will be no harm to the asset (as identified by the Heritage Statement).</p>	<p>Subject to the submission of proposed views, reduction of proposed building heights</p>
<p>Old Plough House (Grade II*, List Entry Number: )</p>	<p>Assessment:</p> <p>Harmful Effects:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The assessment of significance is generally agreed. As well as the contribution of the Site to the significance.</li> <li>- The harmful effects are agreed though this is considered to be at some distance.</li> </ul>	<p>The residual effect has been identified as an enhancement, this is not agreed as the removal of the wind turbine is not agreed as a detracting element.</p>	

1337059)	Beneficial Effects:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is no benefit of the removal of the wind turbine due to the distance between the asset and the Site.</li> </ul>	The proposed development is likely to result in <b>no harm</b> to the significance of the heritage asset, due to the distance of the Site and there being no known historical or functional associations.	
	Mitigation:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The distance of the Site and development/vegetation located between the asset and the Site is not a mitigation method.</li> </ul>		
South Barn and North Barn, Dunton Hills	Assessment:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Historic England have identified these buildings as curtilage listed buildings and therefore, should be assessed as designated heritage assets and not non-designated heritage assets.</li> <li>- The Barns should be assessed as part of a group with the Grade II listed Dunton Hills Farmhouse.</li> <li>- The assessment of the Site making a positive contribution to the significance of these buildings is agreed</li> <li>- Minimal detail is provided as to the wind turbine and pylons being detractive features. It is considered these are slight detracting features as the agrarian landscape can still be appreciated despite their presence</li> </ul>	<p>As part of the Dunton Hills Farm Group, the proposed development will result in <b>medium to high levels of less than substantial harm</b> through the change in the character of Site, as well as the visual impact.</p> <p>The LVIA Photoviewpoint 4 of the photomontages demonstrates the impact that the development will have and the change in character to the setting.</p> <p>The deviation from the SPD has resulted in the encroachment of built development being proposed to the north, south and south west. At three to five storeys, this has an increased level of impact to the farmstead.</p> <p>The small benefit of the removal of the wind turbine and pylons does little to outweigh this harm.</p>	<p>Removal of the development that lies on the farmstead boundary (part of Dunton Woods development)</p> <p>Reduction of Dunton Waters, in line with the SPD</p> <p>Reduction of building heights</p>
	Harmful Effects:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The harmful effects are agreed. This is considered to result in medium to high levels of less than substantial harm (Para 202).</li> </ul>		
	Beneficial Effects:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The creation of public space by the farmstead is not agreed as a heritage benefit as this is out of character / not in keeping with the farmhouse.</li> <li>- Small levels of beneficial effects are provided by the removal of the wind turbines and pylons</li> </ul>		

	Mitigation:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The deviation from the SPD has resulted in built development next to the farmstead, the separation distance is not agreed as an adequate mitigation method.</li> <li>- The retention of open space has limited weight due to the amount of proposed development in close proximity.</li> <li>- The retention of the historic drive and orchard has been noted under three points. This has limited weight as part of the historic drive is proposed as a primarily mobility route, continuing along the northern boundary of the farmstead. This will fundamentally change the character of the approach, as well as increased traffic experience for the farmstead</li> </ul>	The cited mitigation has done little to reduce the harm caused	
Old Mill Cottages (Non-designated heritage asset)	Assessment:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The assessment of significance is generally agreed. As well as the contribution of the Site to the significance.</li> </ul>	<p>Low to medium levels of harm to the significance of the non-designated heritage asset, due to the substantial change in character being surrounded by four storey buildings.</p> <p>The deviation from the SPD has resulted in the increase in building heights surrounding the non-designated heritage asset, this has an increased level of impact to the dwelling.</p>	Reduction of building heights
	Harmful Effects:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The harmful effects are agreed.</li> </ul>		
	Beneficial Effects:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The increased public access/ appreciation from surrounding paths is not agreed as the increased movement and activity has been identified as a harmful effect.</li> <li>- There is no benefit of the removal of the wind turbine pylons due to the distance from the asset.</li> </ul>		
	Mitigation:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Built form at 30m distance is not an adequate mitigation method .</li> </ul>		



The Old Rectory (Non-designated heritage asset)	Assessment:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The assessment of significance is generally agreed. As well as the contribution of the Site to the significance.</li> <li>-</li> <li>- The harmful effects are agreed.</li> </ul>	No views have been provided to demonstrate no harm.  Likely to be <b>no harm to negligible levels of harm</b> to the significance of the non-designated heritage asset.	Subject to the submission of proposed views, reduction of proposed building heights
	Harmful Effects:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is no benefit of the removal of the wind turbine due to the distance.</li> </ul>		
	Beneficial Effects:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Landscaping as a mitigation method holds little weight due to seasonal effects and long term management considerations.</li> <li>- Noted that it is at a further distance</li> </ul>		
	Mitigation:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The assessment of significance is generally agreed. As well as the contribution of the Site to the significance.</li> <li>- The harmful effects are agreed though this is considered to be at some distance.</li> <li>- There is no benefit of the removal of the wind turbine due to the distance between the asset and the Site.</li> <li>- The distance of the Site and development/vegetation located between the asset and the Site is not a mitigation method.</li> </ul>		
Friern Manor (Non-designated heritage asset)	Assessment:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The assessment of significance is generally agreed. As well as the contribution of the Site to the significance.</li> </ul>	Likely to be <b>no harm to negligible levels of harm</b> to the significance of the non-designated heritage asset.	
	Harmful Effects:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is no benefit of the removal of the wind turbine due to the distance between the asset and the Site.</li> </ul>		
	Beneficial Effects:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The distance of the Site and development/vegetation located between the asset and the Site is not a mitigation method.</li> </ul>		
	Mitigation:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The assessment of significance is generally agreed. As well as the contribution of the Site to the significance.</li> </ul>		
Historic Landscape Features	Assessment:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The assessment of significance is generally agreed. As well as the contribution of the Site to the significance, which has a positive contribution.</li> </ul>	The proposed development will result in <b>medium to high levels of harm</b> through the change in the	Removal of the development that lies on the farmstead boundary

(Non-designated heritage asset)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Minimal detail is provided as to the wind turbine and pylons being detractive features. It is considered these are slight detracting features as the agrarian landscape can still be appreciated despite their presence</li> <li>- The harmful effects are agreed.</li> </ul>	<p>character of Site, as well as the visual impact.</p> <p>The LVIA photomontages demonstrates the impact that the development will have and the change in character to the setting.</p> <p>The deviation from the SPD has resulted in the encroachment of built development being proposed. At three to five storeys, this has an increased level of impact to the farmhouse.</p> <p>The cited mitigation has done little to reduce the harm caused</p>	(part of Dunton Woods development) Reduction of development, in line with the SPD
	Harmful Effects:			
	Beneficial Effects:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No beneficial effects are provided by the removal of the wind turbines and pylons</li> <li>- Beneficial effect is Historic hedgerows, enhanced or relaid is a beneficial effect not a mitigation method</li> </ul>		
	Mitigation:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The deviation from the SPD has resulted in built development next to the historic landscape features in some areas</li> <li>- The retention of open space has limited weight due to the amount of proposed development in close proximity.</li> <li>- The retention of the historic drive and orchard has been noted under three points. This has limited weight as part of the historic drive is proposed as a primarily mobility route, continuing along the northern boundary of the farmstead and through the historic features.. This will fundamentally change the character of the approach</li> <li>- Historic hedgerows, enhanced or relaid is a beneficial effect not a mitigation method</li> </ul>		