



HERITAGE STATEMENT Northaw Riding School

THA Ref: 2015/5067 (b)
July 2015

Contents

1.0	Introduction	p. 4
2.0	Regulatory Framework	p. 7
3.0	Historic Background	p. 10
4.0	The Listed Building	p. 13
5.0	Assessment of Proposals	p. 19
6.0	Summary	p. 24
7.0	Sources	p. 26

Cover: Listed Barn, from the east

Figures

Figure 1: Location, Northaw Riding School (Google)

Figure 2: The Grade II Listed Barn, from the east

Figure 3: Distribution of Listed Buildings in the Locale (Historic England), showing Northaw Riding School

Figure 4: The Barn, from the northeast

Figure 5: The Barn, from the southeast

Figure 6: Barn to East of the Listed Building, Exterior

Figure 7: Barn to East of the Listed Building, Interior

Figure 8: Interior, Looking East

Figure 9: Interior, Looking South

Figure 10: Replacement Farmhouse

Figure 11: The Application Site, Aerial View

Figure 12: Submitted Layout

Figure 13: Proposed Elevations

Figure 14: Revised Layout

Appendices

Appendix 1: List Summary

Introduction

1.0

- 1.1 The Heronslea Group has commissioned the Heritage Advisory to undertake this Heritage Statement. The document first considers Northaw Riding School (**Figure 1**) and, in particular, the site's Grade II listed barn (designated 1974, **Figure 2**, **Appendix 1**), before going on to consider proposals for the redevelopment of the application site. The statement therefore addresses potential impacts arising from the proposed works upon the significance of the aforementioned heritage asset and its setting.



Figure 1: Location, Northaw Riding School (Google)

- 1.2 The Riding School is a former farm complex comprising a principal dwelling along with a number of formerly agricultural outbuildings. This is located around 1km to the east of Northaw village. The barn is noted by the relevant list description to

comprise a C17 structure, albeit most other fabric across the site is subsequent and of a generally much later phase of development (see *Historic Environment Desk Based Assessment, Archaeology South East, May 2015*). The barn itself can also be seen to have undergone not inconsiderable alteration and development.



Figure 2: The Grade II Listed Barn, from the east

- 1.3 The application site therefore exhibits fabric from a variety of periods dating from at least the C17 to the present day (again, see *Historic Environment Desk Based Assessment, Archaeology South East, May 2015*). An extensive planning history is illustrative of the extent and nature of change to be found at the application site more recently (see *Planning Statement, Heronslea Group, May 2015*). Representing the earliest instance of fabric is the listed building, although appreciation of this and overall legibility of its setting has been compromised by subsequent change. The relevant list description reads as follows:

'Barn. C17. Weatherboarded. Slate roof. 5 bays, mostly intact. Complete floor plate resting on red brick base. Cart entrance on S with replacement hipped roof. C18 and C19 red and yellow stock brick 1-storey addition on SE with 3 arched openings.'

- 1.4 In brief, proposals for the redevelopment of the application site comprise *'Residential development including the conversion of the listed barn to residential unit, parking and amenity space'*. Submitted proposals benefited from extensive pre-application discussion with the local planning authority (LPA) begun in April 2015. They are therefore understood to comprise a deeply considered approach to redevelopment and one that is also based upon common ground arising from discussions, and therefore a considerable degree of agreement (again, see *Planning Statement, Heronslea Group, May 2015*). Proposals have nevertheless been developed over the course of determining the application, and this statement therefore reflects subsequent, further changes made in accordance with the views of the LPA and a considerably amended scheme.
- 1.5 In accordance with Paragraph 128 of the *National Planning Policy Framework* (March 2012), this statement describes the significance of the heritage asset to be affected (the listed barn) in a manner proportionate to the both the asset's importance, and an understanding of the potential impact of proposals upon that significance.

Regulatory Framework

2.0

- 2.1 Legislation relating to the historic environment is contained in the *Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990* (the Act). Of particular relevance are sections 16 and 66, summarised as follows:

Concerning a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

National Guidance

- 2.2 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, March 2012) emphasises a '*presumption in favour*' of sustainable development i.e. defined by the document as '*development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs*'.
- 2.3 This '*presumption in favour*' has been implemented to speed up decision making and encourage more development. As regards heritage assets, it is emphasised that their conservation under such circumstances is to be achieved '*in a manner appropriate to their significance*'. Key paragraphs from the document are summarised below.
- 2.4 Paragraph 131 states that in determining planning applications local authorities should take account of:
- The desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
 - The positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
 - The desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

Local Policy

- 2.5 Although the LDF is presently being progressed, the *Welwyn Hatfield District Plan* (2005) remains the relevant development plan for the site and also contains relevant policy, summarised as follows:

Policy R25 – Works to Listed Buildings

Permission will be refused for any proposal which would adversely affect the historic character or architectural quality of a Listed Building or its setting. Listed Buildings Consent will not be granted for any extensions or external or internal alterations to buildings of special architectural or historic importance unless all of the following criteria are satisfied:

- i. New works respect the character, appearance, and setting of the building in terms of design, scale and materials;*
- ii. Architectural or historic features which are important to the character and appearance of the building (including internal features) are retained unaltered;*
- iii. The historic form and structural integrity of the building are retained; and*
- iv. Full detailed drawings of the proposed works are submitted with the application.*

Policy R26 – Alternative Uses for Listed Buildings

Applications for the change of use of Listed Buildings will only be permitted when all of the following criteria are met:

- i. The proposal would not harm the character or setting of the building;*
- ii. The change of use could be successfully implemented without the essential need for other development which would harm the building's character or setting, and;*
- iii. The change of use results in the continued preservation of the building's fabric or its restoration*

Other Relevant Guidance

2.6 Of equal relevance is English Heritage's 2008 document *Conservation Principles: Policy and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment, 2008*. At paragraph 140, p.59, this states that "*The greater the range and strength of heritage values attached to a place, the less opportunity there may be for change, but few places are so sensitive that they, or their settings present no opportunities for change*".

2.7 On the subject of listing, English Heritage's website further reiterates that:

'Listing is not a preservation order, preventing change . . . Listing does not freeze a building in time, it simply means that listed building consent must be applied for in order to make any changes to that building which might affect its special interest. Listed buildings can be altered, extended and sometimes even demolished within government planning guidance'.

Historic Background

3.0

- 3.1 The relevant *Victoria County History* entry (1908) identifies Northaw as a '*charming parish of hill, vale and woodland, on the Middlesex border of Hertfordshire*'. The general slope of the ground is further noted as being from west to east, albeit a run of high ground is noted to run into the parish from the west, with land subsequently dipping to the north and about 100ft to the south and east. Several small streams are also noted to rise on the hills, whilst the Cuffley Brook forms part of the eastern boundary.
- 3.2 The parish is recorded as well-wooded and that the south was once open common, which in turn formed part of Enfield Chase, a medieval deer/hunting park. The church and village stand on the high ridge to the west and surround a triangular village green located near the church. The soil is clay mixed with gravel and the subsoil London clay and Woolwich and Reading Beds. The locale also hosts chalk-pits, gravel-pits and quarries (now disused). Traditionally, the area was agricultural producing crops of wheat, beans, roots and, more latterly, milk for London.
- 3.3 No mention is made of Northaw (or nearby Cuffley) in the Domesday survey. The earliest references to Northaw (*North Haga* i.e. north enclosure) date to the C11 and woodland disputed by St Alban's Abbey and Robert de Valogne. Ultimately, the abbey assumed rights and maintained these up until the Dissolution. In 1556, this wood had a circumference of seven miles. Northaw was also known as the 'desert' frequented by the C12 hermit Sigar – described as '*strenuous in his subjection of the flesh, and a mighty foe of demons*' – who walked nightly to St. Albans and is reputed to have banished the nightingales from the area, which disturbed his devotions. In 1540, the probably C12 or C13 church and associated vicarage were granted to William Cavendish.
- 3.4 The village is thought to have assumed the name '*Northaw*' in c.1750. The application site lies to the east of the settlement, toward Cuffley, and is shown by 1766 mapping (see *Figure 3, Historic Environment Desk Based Assessment, May 2015, ASE*) to lie to the south of a mineral spring (latterly choked upon enclosure), brick fields and a road probably originating as a

droveaway across 'North Hall Common'. It is unclear when the complex which would become known as Park Farm was first established however, but no buildings or otherwise are shown in this location by 1766 mapping. This is despite an ostensibly C17 date for the barn (see **Appendix 1**) and that the former farmhouse - no longer extant - is reputed to have been C18 in origin. A 'Park Corner' and its large pond to the east is identified by 1806 enclosure mapping and may represent an approximate dating for the first establishment of the complex.

3.5 The earliest map to show 'Park Farm' is the Bryant Map of 1822 (see *Figure 4, Historic Environment Desk Based Assessment, May 2015, ASE*), albeit little detail is given. This shows three buildings configured at the south, east and north of a yard, and an additional structure to the east. By the late 1830s the complex can be seen to comprise both farmhouse and a number of other outbuildings, one of which would - by this time - clearly and definitively include the barn (see *Figure 5, Historic Environment Desk Based Assessment, May 2015, ASE*). This Tithe map also shows agricultural buildings defining a farmyard, with the listed barn at the south, other buildings to the east and north, and the farmhouse itself on the west.

3.6 By the late C19 the farm can be seen to have expanded again with further outbuildings on the north of the complex, stockyards and/or buildings on the south, and a pond to the southwest of the barn. The farmhouse is surrounded by orchards (see *Figure 6, Historic Environment Desk Based Assessment, May 2015, ASE*). This scenario was to remain until the mid to late C20 with little discernible change. Over this period, the village was also to develop slowly, retaining its rural nature. Between 1870-2, in his *Imperial Gazetteer of England and Wales*, John Marius Wilson described wider Northaw as:

'Northaw, or Northal, a village and a parish in Hatfield district, Herts. The village stands on a hill adjacent to the boundary with Middlesex, 2 1/4 miles E by N of Potters-Bar r. station, and 4 1/2 NE by N of Barnet; is a neat place; and has a post office under Barnett. The parish contains also the hamlet of Cuffley. Acres, 3, 180. Real property, £5, 104. Pop., 551. Houses, 114. The property is divided among a few. The manor is held by the trustees of the late Rev. J. A. Trenchard, ...'

3.7 Whilst little change was to occur between the late C19 and 1970s (see *Figures 7-8, Historic Environment Desk Based Assessment, May 2015, ASE*), latterly, a covered area is shown to the south of the listed barn, this likely to have been an open

sided cattle shelter set within a yard. The pond to the southwest has been infilled by this time and the associated field system regularised and simplified. 'New Park Farm' was established to the east of the application site by the 1970s. By 1989 (see *Figure 9, Historic Environment Desk Based Assessment, May 2015, ASE*), the C18 farmhouse was demolished and other structures cleared to leave only barns on the south and east, and the cattle shelter and yard.

- 3.8 Aerial photographs show a new 'farmhouse' to have been constructed by 2000, along with a replacement barn/shelter on the north of the farmyard and a new barn to the southwest of the cattle yard. The southern ménage had also been established by this date. By 2007 hedging can be seen to have been replaced with the existing brick walling at the front of the site. The access track from the west gate to the ménage was also established. Between 2007 and 2011 the southern ménage was enlarged. Other ancillary buildings were also established by 2011.
- 3.9 The extensive planning history associated with what may only be termed significant change over the last fifty years is set out in full at *p-p. 8-9* of the application's accompanying *Planning Statement (Heronslea Group, May 2015)*. Given such a history it can be seen that the listed barn is in fact one of the few constants at the site, yet one that is not without significant change itself. This renders legibility of the site as a whole, and its history and fabric, difficult to appreciate. This can also be seen to render the character and appearance of the listed building and its setting, much compromised, as will be demonstrated further below.

The Listed Building

4.0

- 4.1 Whilst an intensively historic locale generally, given the intervening distance and the nature of topography lying between Northaw Riding School and Northaw itself - and/or any other identifiable heritage assets there (including the Northaw Historic Core Conservation Area) - it is considered that the only asset to be directly affected by proposals is that represented by the listed barn, located on the application site itself (Figure 3).



Figure 3: Distribution of Listed Buildings in the Locale (Historic England), showing Northaw Riding School

- 4.2 As noted, the listed building (**Figures 4 & 5**) represents the earliest instance of fabric at the site, however appreciation of this and overall legibility has been compromised by subsequent change more generally as this is described above. The relevant list description reads as follows:

'Barn. C17. Weatherboarded. Slate roof. 5 bays, mostly intact. Complete floor plate resting on red brick base. Cart entrance on S with replacement hipped roof. C18 and C19 red and yellow stock brick 1-storey addition on SE with 3 arched openings.'



Figure 4: The Barn, from the northeast



Figure 5: The Barn, from the southeast

- 4.3 There is little to contest in such a description, although as indicated, there may perhaps be some doubt as to the C17 date of original construction. As with many timber-framed structures, given the building's straightforwardly agricultural, functional nature, little or no stylistic detailing exists to assist on this point. Dendrochronological sampling may be the only way in

which to definitively date the structure, although a further note of caution must be sounded on the potential for reused timbers; a late C19/early C20 example of which can be seen to the direct east of the listed building (see *para. 7.6, Historic Environment Desk Based Assessment, May 2015, ASE, Figures 6 & 7*).



Figure 6: Barn to East of the Listed Building, Exterior



Figure 7: Barn to East of the Listed Building, Interior

- 4.4 Given the relatively clear indication attributable to mapping, and that the listed barn's southeast extension is indeed likely to be of an C18 and/or C19 date of origin (as was the principal farmhouse historically), it is perhaps safe to assume that the date of the barn is also closer to the late C18 and/or early C19. Although that is not to say it did not precede the farmhouse etc. and was present independently of this, but not noted by mapping, being an agricultural and therefore relatively unimportant building from a point of view of status.

- 4.5 The listed barn assumes a rectilinear footprint set upon a northwest/southeast axis and has a principal elevation facing northeast. The principal pitched roof is added to by the smaller pitched roof of the southeast extension and a hipped roof projecting from the south elevation, which is again a later addition surmounting a former cart entrance. The principal entrance on the north comprises a large two-leaf, full-height sliding door at centre. This leads to the former threshing floor. A number of *ad hoc* internal subdivisions – principally at lower levels, maintaining appreciation of the larger space – enable its present use as stabling.



Figure 8: Interior, Looking East



Figure 9: Interior, Looking South

- 4.6 In contrast to its eastern neighbor, internally, the single-volume space of the principal cell is visually and physically striking; a quality not least of which is attributable to the single phase (**Figure 8**) and relative integrity (but for the southern extension, **Figure 9**) of its supporting structure, particularly in contrast to its more *ad hoc* eastern neighbor. British barns are known to be fairly uniform in plan and form etc. and the listed barn at Northaw is no exception, where it can be seen to assume that of the simplest and most common type of barn.



Figure 10: Replacement Farmhouse



Figure 11: The Application Site, Aerial View

- 4.7 It is therefore three bays long, with two storage bays flanking a central bay in which a threshing floor lies between large entrances on either side. One door is often larger than the other, allowing a heavily loaded harvest wagon to enter. The south and east accretions are later and the only departures from such a type. Both have in turn undergone change

themselves and are visibly altered in that the former has a later replacement hipped roof and the latter has lost its three arched openings sometime since designation in 1974.

- 4.8 Whilst patently altered, the listed barn nevertheless retains its significance as a relatively complete structure of its type; generally common across the UK in terms of plan, form and feature from the medieval period up until at least the C19. Irrespective of its actual date of origin, the structure is also of some quality both visually and physically. The only departures from its original integrity have had little impact upon these qualities, and merely illustrate the early evolution of the structure (and structures of its type i.e. adapted strictly according to requirement etc.), yet without detracting from this in any way. In contrast, the wider setting of the building can be seen to be much compromised by recent, poor quality development of a permanent nature (specifically, the replacement farmhouse (**Figure 10**) and front boundary wall).
- 4.9 More temporary agricultural structures have had less of a negative impact being of a similar function, materials etc. Although a number of earlier agricultural buildings survive, the complex as a whole comprises buildings and fabric of an untidy number of phases, appearance and quality (**Figure 11**), and therefore lacks cohesion more generally. Added to the current trend toward combined storage and dereliction to be found at the application site (which would include the listed building), the setting of the listed building offers considerable scope for enhancement (particularly physical, environmental enhancement), although given wider planning and/or economic contexts, this is unlikely to comprise a return to agricultural use.

Assessment of Proposals

5.0

- 5.1 The submitted application sought full planning consent for seventeen residential dwellings comprising sixteen new builds and conversion of the Grade II listed building to residential use. Individual dwellings would comprise a mix of three and four bedroomed properties, rising from one and a half to two storeys. All dwellings would be complemented by garage, drive and garden, in addition to further amenity space located at the southeast corner. Houses one to four deliberately represented an active frontage to the development. But for the listed building all existing buildings would be demolished and present accesses reduced from three to two (one vehicle and one pedestrian).
- 5.2 Whilst an acknowledged departure from either a singularly agricultural and/or equestrian emphasis, the submitted scheme would nevertheless enhance the setting of the listed building. More recent history has made clear that such uses have in the past proved demonstrably lacking in terms of the adequate upkeep of the site and its amenity, which importantly, can be seen to have affected the security and therefore integrity of the listed building, which can be seen to be in clear decline. Although residential, a legible, cohesive layout would be imposed upon the currently confused, untidy and physically/visually unattractive site, whilst specific regard has been had for the configuration of this in relation to the listed building (**Figure 12**). Forms and features would also be of a traditional emphasis in order to assimilate old and new elements better.
- 5.3 As such, clear sight-lines to and from the front and rear of the listed building were enabled via i) reduced storey heights at the front of the site (one and a half storeys); and ii) an open, undeveloped amenity space to the rear of the site. This endowed the converted barn with a cleared and therefore significantly improved and appropriate setting on its south. In views from the road and public realm, the backdrop to the listed building therefore remained rural - i.e. as this would have appeared historically – whilst ‘framing’ and/or emphasising the structure in a number of other views. Although development at the west of the site would have been higher, the listed building nevertheless sits at the eastern end of an open, central west-east axis and is therefore made prominent in views from this direction/part of the development. New development would have only appeared as a backdrop to the listed barn in views from farmland i.e. from the south and east and not from the public realm.

- 5.4 Although the listed barn was proposed to be converted to residential use – i.e. not the use for which it was originally designed – as a matter of principle, residential use would more successfully arrest its present trend toward decay whilst ensuring ongoing maintenance and therefore the future conservation and survival of the structure far more successfully. If the principle of conversion is accepted for this reason, it is then necessary to ensure that the physical and visual impacts of conversion are minimised as far as practicably possible, and it is considered that the proposed approach achieves this. Externally, fenestration and accesses utilise existing openings; are kept to a minimum; focused to the rear; and generally seek to reduce visual and physical impacts whilst enabling functioning of the building as a dwelling (**Figure 13**).



Figure 12: Submitted Layout



Figure 13: Proposed Elevations



Figure 14: Revised Layout

5.5 As a general concept, the existing structure and its original manner of functioning were referenced as far as practicably

possible. Fundamentally, the rear elevation reinstated the central, high level cart entrance (yet retained the later extension for evidence/legibility), whilst side elevations to the east and west remained entirely intact. Front sliding doors were retained but merely fixed in an open position. Internally, a similar approach to that of the exterior was adopted and one that sought to both enable practical use of the interior as a living space, whilst allowing legibility and appreciation of the present internal volume via the stairwell. Whilst fenestration to the rear of the property ran the length of the building, the overall effect was broken up by the varied massing and many depths of plane on this side of the property.

- 5.6 In short, it is considered that the original proposals would represent not only a clear enhancement of the setting of the listed building but also enable a more intensive yet effective use, and therefore the appropriate future maintenance and conservation of the heritage asset. Principally due to their deference and reference to the listed building, proposals were considered and of a high quality, with any potential impacts being well managed. Although a departure from formerly agricultural use, and therefore the use for which the structure was originally designed, at the present time such a use is demonstrably lacking in its capacity to enable the continued survival of the heritage asset.
- 5.7 As such, submitted proposals are understood to accord with the objectives of the NPPF, but in particular, paragraphs 132, 134 and 137. Great weight was given the asset's conservation, both as a matter of enablement and design. Significance would not have been harmed or lost. Whilst it is not acknowledged that any harm would have accrued, should proposals be interpreted as such, this would be less than substantial and public benefits would be significant from a point of view of both general amenity and ongoing conservation. Furthermore, it is clear that the opportunity was taken to both enhance and better reveal the significance of the heritage asset and should therefore be treated favourably.

Revised Proposals

- 5.8 As noted, as part of the application's determination, further amendments have been requested by the LPA and subsequently implemented as part of revised proposals. Whilst the finer levels of detailing etc. described above remain generally the same, amendments have had a much greater impact on layout, proving a still more beneficial scheme (**Figure 14**). Principally, benefits arise from the reduction of overall densities of development across the application site generally (to fourteen units), which, being less evenly dispersed than formerly, assumes a focus to the east rather than west of the

application site. This achieves a much clearer balance between open green space and built form, with an obvious bias being given the former as regards the overriding Green Belt designation.

- 5.9 In terms of impacts upon the listed building however, these remain a general enhancement of the very poor status quo, with the implementation of more open green space combined with the removal of general clutter and poor development across the site as a whole. Development to the front of the listed building would remain the same as that proposed previously, albeit land to the rear of the structure would now be developed. It is considered that this impact would be offset by the much larger, green amenity space now being implemented to the west however, and resulting benefits arising in terms of the Green Belt. Otherwise, a high degree of separation and definitive spacing would nevertheless be retained between the heritage asset and new development, thus ensuring an appropriately gauged setting.

Summary

6.0

- 6.1 Given the extensive history of change at the site – particularly more recently - it can be seen that the listed barn is in fact one of the few constants there, yet one that is not without significant change itself. This renders legibility of the site as a whole, and its history and fabric, difficult to appreciate. This can also be seen to render the character and appearance of the listed building and its setting, much compromised.
- 6.2 Whilst patently altered, the listed barn nevertheless retains its significance as a relatively complete structure of its type, generally common across the UK in terms of plan, form and feature from the medieval period up until at least the C19. Irrespective of its actual date of origin, the structure is also of some quality both visually and physically. The only departures from its original integrity have had little impact upon these qualities, and merely illustrate the early evolution of the structure, yet without detracting from this in any way.
- 6.3 In contrast, the wider setting of the building can be seen to be much compromised by recent, poor quality development of a permanent nature (specifically, the replacement farmhouse and front boundary wall). More temporary agricultural structures have had less of a negative impact being of a similar function, materials etc. Although a number of earlier agricultural buildings survive, the complex as a whole comprises buildings and fabric of an untidy number of phases, appearance and quality and therefore lacks cohesion more generally.
- 6.4 Added to the current trend toward combined storage and dereliction to be found at the application site (which would include the listed building), the setting of the listed building offers considerable scope for enhancement (particularly physical, environmental enhancement), although given wider planning and/or economic contexts, this is unlikely to comprise a return to agricultural use. It is therefore considered that proposals would represent not only a clear enhancement of the setting of the listed building but also enable a more intensive yet effective use, and therefore the appropriate future maintenance and conservation of the heritage asset itself.
- 6.5 Principally due to their deference and reference to the listed building, proposals are considered and of a high quality, with

any potential impacts being well managed. Although a departure from formerly agricultural use, and therefore the use for which the structure was originally designed, at the present time such a use is demonstrably lacking in its capacity to enable continued survival of the heritage asset. As such, proposals are understood to accord with the objectives of the NPPF, but in particular, paragraphs 132, 134 and 137.

- 6.6 Revised proposals generate added benefit in their increase of open green amenity space, not only contributing to the Green Belt but also adding amenity value to the setting of the listed building, which in contrast to the status quo, represents a clear enhancement.

Sources

7.0

Archaeology South East, May 2015, Historic Environment Desk Based Assessment

Heronslea Group, May 2015, Planning Statement

PAGE, W., 1908, A History of the County of Hertford: Volume 2, Victoria County History, London

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: List Summary

List Entry Summary

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

Name: BARN ON SOUTH SIDE OF FARMYARD AT PARK FARM

List Entry Number: 1173959

Location

BARN ON SOUTH SIDE OF FARMYARD AT PARK FARM, NORTHAW ROAD WEST

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

County: Hertfordshire

District: Welwyn Hatfield

District Type: District Authority

Parish: Northaw and Cuffley

National Park: Not applicable to this List entry.

Grade: II

Date first listed: 02-Apr-1975

Date of most recent amendment: Not applicable to this List entry.

Legacy System Information

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

Legacy System: LBS

UID: 158513

Asset Groupings

This List entry does not comprise part of an Asset Grouping. Asset Groupings are not part of the official record but are added later for information.

List Entry Description

Summary of Building

Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

Reasons for Designation

Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

History

Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

Details

Northaw TL 20 SE NORTHAW AND NORTHAW ROAD WEST CUFFLEY (south side)

12/249 Barn on S side of farmyard at Park Farm 2.4.75

GV II

Barn. C17. Weatherboarded. Slate roof. 5 bays, mostly intact. Complete floor plate resting on red brick base. Cart entrance on S with replacement hipped roof. C18 and C19 red and yellow stock brick 1-storey addition on SE with 3 arched openings.

Listing NGR: TL2849301878

Selected Sources

Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details

Map

National Grid Reference: TL 28493 01878

The below map is for quick reference purposes only and may not be to scale. For a copy of the full scale map, please see the attached PDF - [1173959.pdf](#) - Please be aware that it may take a few minutes for the download to complete.



© Crown Copyright and database right 2014. All rights reserved. Ordnance Survey Licence number 100024900.

© British Crown and SeaZone Solutions Limited 2014. All rights reserved. Licence number 102006.006.

© Mark Sanderson BA (Hons), MA, IHBC / The Heritage Advisory Ltd.
m. 07951 926869 / e. msanderson@theheritageadvisory.co.uk