Heritage Statement
White House Farm, Magpie lane, Little Warley, Brentwood, Essex CM13 3DZ

Site Code: WHF16

NGR: TQ 6061 9042

September 2016

TOUCHSTONE ARCHAEOLOGY
The Ridings, White Elm Road, Danbury, Essex CM3 4LR
Tel: 07976 275180
E: zoeschofield1@gmail.com
www.touchstonearchaeology.co.uk

© Touchstone Archaeology 2016 all rights reserved
Heritage Statement for White House Farm, Magpie Lane, Little Warley, Brentwood, Essex CM13 3DZ

Site Code: WHF16
NGR: TQ 60619 90423
Smart Planning Ref: 16.3565

Report for Smart Planning Ltd

September 2016

TOUCHSTONE ARCHAEOLOGY
The Ridings, White Elm Road, Danbury, Essex CM3 4LR
Tel: 07976 275180
E: zoeschofield1@gmail.com
www.touchstonearchaeology.co.uk

© Touchstone Archaeology 2016 all rights reserved
## CONTENTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION........................................................................................................PAGE 5
  1.1................................................................................................................PAGE 5
  1.2................................................................................................................PAGE 5
  1.3................................................................................................................PAGE 5

2.0 PARAMETERS........................................................................................................PAGE 6
  2.1................................................................................................................PAGE 6
  2.2................................................................................................................PAGE 6

3.0 PROJECT OBJECTIVES.......................................................................................PAGE 6

4.0 METHODOLOGY................................................................................................PAGE 7
  4.0................................................................................................................PAGE 7
  4.1................................................................................................................PAGE 7
  4.2................................................................................................................PAGE 7
  4.3................................................................................................................PAGE 7
  4.4................................................................................................................PAGE 7

5.0 LOCATION........................................................................................................PAGE 8

6.0 TOPOLOGY/GEOLGY........................................................................................PAGE 9

7.0 SHARED INTERVISIBILITY.................................................................................PAGE

8.0 DESCRIPTION....................................................................................................PAGE 11

9.0 CARTOGRAPHIC EVIDENCE..............................................................................PAGE 17

10.0 SITE HISTORY................................................................................................PAGE 18

10.1................................................................................................................PAGE 18

11.0 ESSEX HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT RECORD..................................................PAGE 21

12.0 HISTORICAL/ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND ......................................PAGE 22

13.0 ARCHAEOLOGICAL POTENTIAL...................................................................PAGE 23

14.0 IMPORTANCE..................................................................................................PAGE 23
  14.1 LOCAL IMPORTANCE..................................................................................PAGE 23
  14.2 REGIONAL IMPORTANCE..........................................................................PAGE 24
  14.3 NATIONAL IMPORTANCE..........................................................................PAGE 25

15.0 VALUE...............................................................................................................PAGE 25
  15.1 EVIDENTIAL VALUE....................................................................................PAGE 25
  15.2 HISTORICAL VALUE....................................................................................PAGE 25
  15.3 AESTHETIC VALUE.....................................................................................PAGE 26

16.0 IMPACT ASSESSMENT.....................................................................................PAGE 26
  16.1................................................................................................................PAGE 26
  16.2................................................................................................................PAGE 26

17.0 DISCUSSION & MITIGATION.........................................................................PAGE 27

18.0 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS................................................................................PAGE 28

19.0 ARCHIVE.......................................................................................................PAGE 28

20.0 RELIABILITY/LIMITATIONS OF SOURCES....................................................PAGE 28

21.0 REFERENCES.................................................................................................PAGE 29
I. List of Figures

1. Location map
2. Aerial Photograph
3. Plan of farmyard
4. Chapman and Andres Map 1769
5. OS Map County Series 1:2500 1868-70
6. OS Map County Series 1:2500 1874
7. OS Map County Series 1:2500 1896
8. OS Map County Series 1:2500 1920
11. National Grid Map 1:2500 1993
12. Site Plan

II. List of Plates

1. Photo of White House Farmhouse and yard facing east
2. Photo of Black Barn, facing northwest
3. Photo of Black Barn facing south
4. Photo of Black Barn internal west elevation
5. Photo of Black Barn internal stable
6. Photo of Black Barn internal grain silo
7. Photo of Black Barn internal north-south partition
8. Photo of Black Barn storage/garage area
9. Photo of Black Barn north side of lean-to facing east
10. Photo of Black Barn south side of lean-to facing east
1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 This report was commissioned by Smart Planning Ltd to ascertain the local, regional and national historical importance and the archaeological potential of the Black Barn in advance of a planning application for the conversion of the barn to a residential single dwelling, the demolition of the lean-to and the construction of a cart lodge.

1.2 The Heritage assessment was carried out on 12th September 2016 and was conducted in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 128, the English Heritage publication Conservation Principles Policies and Guidance (2008) and Understanding Historic Buildings: A Guide to Good Recording Practice (2006) and the Institute of Field Archaeologists Standard and Guidance for the Archaeological investigation and recording of standing buildings or structures (2008).

1.3 In summary the work consists of a basic descriptive report accompanied by digital images and annotated plans as appropriate.
2.0 PARAMETERS

2.1 The recording was restricted to the structures on site to be developed; however some consideration was given to historical context.

2.2 The photographic survey was conducted using digital photography.

2.3 This work did not include any investigation of below ground archaeology.

3.0 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

A Heritage Statement has been requested in advance of a planning application by Smart Planning Ltd and in line with Essex County Council recommendations should include:

- A description of the Heritage Asset and its setting
- An assessment of significance
- An explanation of the design concept for the proposed development
- An assessment of the impact of the proposed development
4.0 METHODOLOGY

4.1 Archaeological Databases
The local Historic Environment Record (HER) held at Essex County Council provides an accurate insight into catalogued sites and finds within both the proposed development area (PDA) and the surrounding environs of Little Warley.

The Archaeology Data Service Online Catalogue (ADS) was also used. The search was carried out within a 500m radius of the proposed development site and relevant HER data is included in the report. The Portable Antiquities Scheme Database (PAS) was also searched as an additional source as the information contained within is not always transferred to the local HER.

4.2 Historical Documents
Historical documents, such as charters, registers, wills and deeds etc., were considered relevant to this specific study.

4.3 Cartographic and Pictorial Documents
A cartographic and pictorial document search was undertaken during this assessment. Research was carried out using resources offered by Essex County Council, the Internet and Ordnance Survey Historical mapping (Figs. 4-11).

4.4 Geotechnical Information
To date, no known geotechnical investigations have been carried out at the site.

4.5 Secondary and statutory resources
Secondary and statutory sources, such as regional and periodic archaeological studies, landscape studies, dissertations, research frameworks and websites are considered appropriate to this type of study and have been included within this assessment where necessary.
5.0 LOCATION

White House Farm is situated in the village of Little Warley between Brentwood Park and Thorndon Park Golf Clubs, south of Thorndon Country Park and north of Childerditch Industrial Estate.

The villages of Warley, Great Warley, Ingrave and Herongate surround the village within a 1-mile radius; the town of Brentwood is c.2 miles north, Billericay c.7 miles east.

The civil parish of Little Warley was abolished in 1934 and the property is now within the parish of West Horndon and the Borough of Brentwood. Little Warley lane is to the west and Childerditch Hall Drive is to the east. White House Farm is accessed via an unmade road on the south side of Magpie Lane (TQ 60619 90423) (Fig.1).
6.0 TOPOGRAPHY/GEOLOGY

White House Farm is in a largely rural setting, located on the south side of Magpie Lane, which is the main road through Little Warley village. During the 18th century the village was characterised by small farmsteads and cottages with grazing rights over Little Warley Common served by the Greyhound Public House and the village retains its low-density residential style (Fig.2).

A long unmade road, leads to the farm and screens it from the road frontage. It is bounded to the north by grassland interspersed with trees, to the south by agricultural fields, to the east by Little Bassetts Cottages and to the west by the detached houses of Pottens and Rosedale. The Greyhound Public House and Little Warley Village Hall are just west and Warley Hall east.

The farm is located on bedrock geology of London Clay formation (clay, silt and sand) and superficial deposits of Head (clay, silt, sand and gravel). It sits at an average height of 65m OD.
7.0 SHARED INTERVISIBILITY

The Black Barn shares intervisibility with the associated south and east buildings of the farmyard and with the neighbouring property ‘Pottens’ (Plate 1).

The north elevation of the Barn looks on to a small paddock and to the northeast the farm pond, to the northwest is ‘Pottens’, a neighbouring detached house, although the boundary is densely cultivated with trees.

The east elevation looks on to the old dairy; a series of brick buildings with clay tiled roofs and timber windows, constructed from soft red brick (9”x4”x2”) in header stretcher English bond; the rear buildings in cement/asbestos/metal corrugated cladding and flat corrugated roofing sheets.

The south elevation looks on to the modern mechanised dairy, which is a series of timber or cement/asbestos/metal corrugated clad buildings with corrugated flat roofs, timber doors and roofs.

The west elevation looks into the extension and on to the garden of ‘Pottens’, which is, as previously described, screened with trees and vegetation.
8.0 DESCRIPTION

The 17th century detached Farmhouse is a Grade II Listed Building and the Black Barn is therefore curtilage listed. The farm is no longer functioning but the layout of the farmyard has remained unchanged since the 19th Century (Fig.3).

An unmade access road opens in to the Parallel- type yard and the Black Barn is located on the west side of the entrance track, the dairy to the east of the track and the winter housing for the cattle and modern dairy to the south side of the yard. Access to pasture was southwest. The detached farmhouse is to the east of the yard, west gable facing. The front of the house faces north; the remains of an orchard and kitchen garden are east of the farmhouse and the pigpens were south of the dairy.

The farm once occupied some 170 acres but now stands on c.2 acres.
The Black Barn (9.2m W x 9.6m L x 7m H) is a three bay barn located on the north side of the yard. It has been partitioned internally to provide storage of hay and straw on the ground floor and potatoes and grain on the first floor of the north side (Plate 3) and stabling for the carthorses and a grain silo to the south side (Plate 2). The south extension provided cart and tractor storage and the west extension, caravan storage (Plate 3).
The barn has three bays of 3.15m/10ft each and is a light timber box frame construction with earthen floor (Plate 4).

The timbers are sawn, a mixture of softwood and hardwood and of modern dimensions – 50mm x 100mm. The most common joint is the lap joint. Two timber collars divide the bays, support the purlins in a birdsmouth joint and join with the wall plate with metal straps, screws and bolts. The roof is pitched with a 6” x 1” ridge beam, rafters, purlins and diagonal cross braces, battened and clad in cement/asbestos corrugated roof sheets.

There is a pitching hole (0.8m high) to both the east and west gable at a height of c.2.28m, a later addition cut through the existing studs and both the east and west elevations are weather boarded and painted black.

The north elevation is of heavier construction, the posts spread evenly at 3.15m/10ft. Map evidence shows that is was open fronted but it is now closed with re-used metal and timber panelling; the northwest post has empty mortises probably from re-use as there is no answering mortice on the opposite post.

The south elevation, once closed, has a set of double doors to the east side and is open to the west side.

The plinth to the east and west elevations is of soft red brick (9” x 4” x 2½”) in English bond that deteriorates towards the south and has been disturbed by the later internal brick partitioning.
Internally the barn has been partitioned east to west, to full height, just south of the ridgeline, in timber with close-board cladding. The partitioning provided stabling to the west side (Plate 5) and a silo to the east side (Plate 6). The stable has a collapsed manger to the rear with feeding rack above, close-boarded timber walls and earth floor. To the east a half brick wall (1.25m) and a raised brick podium of modern pink brick (9”x 4”x 2 ½”) has been constructed to support the silo. The floor is black/grey paviours (4”x 8”x 3 ½”). The silo is made of corrugated metal sheeting and is fed from the grain augur above.
A second partition runs north south in corrugated metal sheets and a purpose built, hardwood staircase leads south to a mezzanine floor of random sized timber joists and hardwood floorboards. An opening to the eaves on the first floor accesses the grain augur and silo; the grain was stored on the first floor and decanted into the silo for winter-feed (Plate 7). A door, cut through the metal partition on the ground floor leads to a storage/garage area with double doors to the north elevation (Plate 8).

**Plate 8. Storage/garage area**

It appears from map evidence that the storage area continued through to the south stable in an L-shaped arrangement but the rear of the storage area has been closed with timber cladding and a half brick wall probably when the silo was installed.

The north and south elevation may survive from the late 19th to early 20th century construction. The timbers are larger and the construction less refined.
The extension to the southeast (Plate 10) is constructed with re-used timbers, asbestos/cement roof sheeting, plastic guttering and a set of double doors with six small glazed panels. It is extended further to the south west with timber wall plates propped with metal acro supports, vertical metal corrugated sheets and shallow pitched corrugated asbestos roof sheets and is open-fronted with an earth floor. A door leads into the west extension (Plate 9), which is constructed from telegraph poles set in concrete pad-stones, sawn timber beams, vertical corrugated metal sheets and corrugated asbestos/cement roof sheets with east west pitched roof to the north side and north south pitched roof to the south side. The floor is a mixture of earth and crushed hard-core.
Fig. 1 The 1874 map shows a building on the site of the Black Barn. It is L-shaped with a small south extension.

Fig. 2 By 1920 the barn has either been rebuilt or considerably adapted. The west wing has been removed and only a single rectangular building remains with an open fronted extension to the south (probably a loose box), leading into two enclosures.

Fig. 3 By 1955 the barn has again been heavily adapted. The loose box has been closed and the partitioning installed to form an L-shaped stable with an open-fronted barn area to the north. The enclosure has been covered. The shape of this construction is still visible in the fabric and layout of the building. The barn remains open fronted to the north and both east-west and north-south partitioning remain. However, the L-shaped area was separated for the installation of the silo and part of the south elevation became openfronted to accommodate the later tractor storage.

Fig. 4 By 1989 the implement shed and caravan storage lean-to extensions have been added to the west.
10.0 MAP AND HISTORICAL DOCUMENT EVIDENCE

10.1 18th Century

In 1769 Little Warley is a village that has grown up on the south side of the road that leads from Childerditch to Warley. It is a rural area with woods and common ground to the north and the lands of Thorndon Hall, owned by Lord Petre, are just east. The area of Little Warley is owned by ‘Baron Winn’, Lord Headley, Baron of Warley; White House farm is not named as a farm and is represented as a small property of two buildings opposite Little Warley Common, where it holds common grazing rights. The east building is probably the farmhouse as this dates to the 17th Century and would have been standing at this time. The west building may have been a barn in a similar position to the current Black Barn.

10.2 19th Century

In 1841 John Seabrook (65) is farming the land noted in the census as ‘on Warley Common’. Following his death in 1850, his wife Sarah (67) continues to employ labourers to help farm the 170 acres and their daughter Eliza marries John Parson from a local farming family, who in 1851, are working 120 acres at Warley Hall. By 1861 Sarah (77) is farming 160 acres, employing 5 labourers and a stockman and her son Edward (35) is acting as Farm Bailiff. By 1871 (87) she is farming 155 acres, employing 7 labourers and a groom. This is the first time that the farm is named in the census as White House Farm. By this time her son Edward (45) is farming 16 acres and the reduction in acreage at White House Farm may be due to land that she has given to him over the preceding decades.
The Seabrook family were farming during what is known as ‘The Golden Age’, a period that followed a depression in farming and saw continuity, modest prosperity, independence and a movement towards livestock and ‘high farming’. The Chelmsford to London Railway opened a new London market and it seems that the farm developed considerably under their occupation.

By 1874 the farm consists of the farmhouse and a collection of three areas of buildings around a parallel yard; the barn, the dairy and two buildings on the south side of the yard with an enclosure and small rectangular building beyond, possibly pigs. The Barn is an L-shaped building with a small rectangular extension to the south. The village consists of the neighbouring Little Bassetts pig farm, the Poor House Farm, the Greyhound Public House, the Parochial School for Boys and Girls and a few cottages between.

In 1875 Sarah dies (91) and the farm passes to her son Edward (49). Six years later he is farming the reduced acreage of 55 acres and employing 1 man and 1 boy. Edward dies in 1886 (61) and his sister Emma (63) takes over the farm. Edward and Emma were farming during a difficult period in agriculture. The developments in steam transportation and the import of grain from America, and meat from Australia and New Zealand had driven down prices and this may reflect the lack of change to the farm buildings and reduced acreage that was farmed. It may also suggest a change of direction for the farm from arable to dairy, where only enough land for the growth of fodder and grazing was required.

In 1896, Warley Barracks for the 44th Essex Regiment is to the northwest and the woodlands of Holden’s wood, Ellen’s wood, Barrack wood and Kent’s Wood surround Warley Common. Little Bassetts neighbours the property, Blue House Farm is to the west and Poorhouse Farm and Warley Lodge Farm are northwest. With the exception of the removal of the southern enclosure and associated building the farm remains unchanged.

### 10.3 20th Century

Emma dies in 1906 (79) and in 1908 and for the first time in over 70 years the farm is let outside of the Seabrook family and is leased to Joseph Mclean (29) for seven years at a yearly rent of £70. Joseph is a farmer and contractor from Port Adelaide, south Australia and despite the continued depression in agriculture he is still farming the property in 1911.

In 1915 the landlord, C E Haselfoot, sells the farm to D T & DJ Russell for £1150.
Three years later in 1918, D T Russell, a Seedman of Essex Nurseries, Brentwood sells the farm to W J Hammond (55), a gentleman of Seven Kings for the increased price of £1500.00. Two years later William adds to the estate when he buys land, previously owned by the Waverley Lodge Estate, at an auction, for £400 and £600.00 respectively. Lot 4 of four acres, one rood and three perches is occupied by S J Cronin and has a commuted tithe rent charge of 19s 5d. Lot 9 of fifteen acres, sixteen perches and two cottages and buildings known as Groves is occupied by S Brett and C Newland and has a commuted tithe rent charge £3 3s 5d with brick and timber built and tiled barn with loose-box and open shed.

By 1920 Little Warley Common has become a Golf Course and the farm has changed considerably, probably during Joseph Mclean’s occupation. The west section of the barn has been removed and the barn has become a rectangular building with an open fronted extension and an enclosure divided in two. The dairy is an L-shaped building with an open fronted extension to the southeast and a closed extension southwest creating two internal enclosures. The small rectangular building to the south side of the yard has been removed and a new building, possibly a pigpen has appeared to the south paddock.

William dies in 1923 (60), shortly after buying the farm and within the year his wife has taken a mortgage on the property of £500 from a Mr Dinn at an interest rate of 5% p.a. The mortgage may be to finance the construction in 1924, of No.1 & 2 Wardens bungalows by her son-in-law William Henry Ford (22).

In 1937 Mrs Hammond (75) sells the farm to her son in law, William Henry Ford (48). The sale includes the farmhouse, the lands of some forty acres, and the two parcels of meadowland that her husband bought at auction. By 1939 the farm remains unchanged, William Ford (50) is a dairy farmer and Mrs Hammond is still living at the farm with William, her daughter Lillian and their son William.

By the time of William’s death in 1954 (65), the farm has again been the subject of considerable development. The house has been extended to the east and several buildings have been added to the southern side of the yard. The east elevation of the dairy has been rebuilt into a series of three buildings. The barn has again undergone development. It is now an L-shaped building with an open-fronted extension to the north and south. The neighbouring Little Basset farm has also been greatly extended towards the south.

In 1969 planning permission (PD/89/69) is granted for an implement shed (30ft wide by 18ft deep with a single pitch roof, 18ft at the rear and 14ft at the front, constructed of telegraph poles, 4x2 timbers and corrugated asbestos roof) to the west of the barn and in 1980 permission
(BRW/416/78) is granted for the storage of caravans to the west extension of the barn.

The new extensions can be seen on the 1989 map along with the closure to the north side of the barn. The neighbouring cottages have been demolished and in their place are two detached properties ‘Pottens’ and ‘Rosedale’ and Little Bassetts farm has also undergone modernisation. The farm continues into the next generation but in the 1970’s it ceased to trade and the land was sold off over the next few decades. The property remains under the ownership of the family.

11.0 HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT RECORD

The Historic Environment record provided records within c.1km of the farm. The following records are within c.500m and provide a local representation of the history of the village.

Whitehouse Farmhouse is an early 17th century timber framed, Grade II Listed building (27386/1197234) and the farm buildings and yard are within the curtilage of the house rendering them curtilage listed. Greyhound Public House (27383/1297240) is an early 16th Century Grade II Listed Building just west of the farm. The outbuilding (27384) dates to the early 19th century. Warley Hall (27385/1297241), formerly little Warley Lodge is an early 19th century Grade II Listed building just east of the farm and is now operating as a nursing home. It is thought that the original building dated to the 16th century and fragments of a moat survive to the south and west; it was referred to in historical documents as ‘Castle Warley’.

St Peter’s church dates to the medieval period but shows the style of every century from 1250 to 1940. It has Elizabethan box pews and a pre-reformation 3/4 tonne bell.

To the south of the forest plantation in Thorndon Park are a number of quarrying sites (19617) for sand, gravel and clay. They relate to the construction of the new Thorndon Hall at the end of the 18th century. Ridge and furrow earthworks (19612) survive at Childerditch but are so far unexcavated and undated.

Further afield is the 16th century house Rosebrook (27302) and the 16th century open hall house of Woodlands (27304), the 17th century Blue House farmhouse (27382) and the 17th century Roses farmhouse (27301) with a 19th century dairy and the larger building of Thorndon Hall (27427).
12.0 HISTORICAL/ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

Little Warley was noted in the Domesday Book of 1086 as ‘Werwelie’ meaning ‘a farm settlement in a clearing in a woodland area’. There were 12 inhabitants. The church of St Peters dates to the 15th century and the Hall to the early 16th century. By 1671 there were 23 houses; White House Farmhouse dates to this period and is contemporary with the neighbouring Little Bassetts Farmhouse.

In 1746 the Mayor of Warley kept the only alehouse in the parish ‘The Bull’ on Warley Common but the Greyhound succeeded it in 1769. The population grew to around 200 and by 1750 a doctor was retained. The village lands were owned by Lord Headley, Baron of Little Warley, a title he received in 1776.

In 1805 a Barracks was built at Warley Common supplying accommodation for 10 officers, 306 men and 222 horses of the Horse Artillery. Little Warley had very few poor, the children were apprenticed and the adults sent to Great Warley workhouse. After the closure of the workhouse in 1830 the poorhouse was established at a house belonging to Chappington’s charity and by 1842 there was a day school and a Sunday school. In 1840 the Eastern Counties Railway opened a temporary station at Brentwood some 3 miles southeast of Little Warley.

In the 1841 census a large number of the village inhabitants were farming ‘on Warley Common’. In 1842 Warley Barracks were bought by the East India Company and expanded to house over 1000 men who were trained and posted for service in India. The railway and the Barracks had a significant impact on the population of Little Warley, bringing new trade and investment and the population grew from the families of the soldiers. The War Office bought the barracks in 1861 and by 1881 it had become the home of the Essex Regiment and remained so until 1958. It was during this period that the farm is first named White House Farm.

With the expanding population came the construction of Warley hospital, a National school and Christ Church. The architect Samuel Teulon designed both the Church and parts of the hospital. The village became popular again during the early part of the 20th century when foreign prisoners were housed nearby and were allowed into the village for recreation. The road pattern has remained unchanged for over 200 years, although the name Magpie Lane is quite recent, taking its name from a local public house, now the Headley Arms.
13.0  ARCHAEOLOGICAL POTENTIAL

Despite the entry in the Domesday record, there is no archaeological record prior to the medieval period. Evidence of Medieval pottery (45943) was found during the installation of a sewer pipeline at Warley and several examples of 16th and 17th century houses survive, among them farmhouses, reflecting the historically agricultural nature of the local area. Later additions to these houses are evidence of continued occupation and the larger 18th and 19th century houses of increased prosperity. Therefore the potential for archaeological features or deposits is considered to be low.

14.0  IMPORTANCE

14.1  LOCAL

White House Farm owes its origins to the farming of Warley Common and was one of several farms within the village of Little Warley providing local employment. It diversified in the 19th century into Dairy products and it prospered during the 19th century, probably due to the barracks and the railway. The farm was consistently worked and occupied by two families through several generations and is evidence of two very different types of farmer; the Seabrook family, who began as farmers ‘on the common’, leasing the farm for over 70 years (as far back as documentary evidence can trace) and the Hammond family, who began as landlords and became farmers, owning the farm for almost 100 years. This Heritage Statement has considered the Local Importance of the site and finds it to be moderate.
White House Farm functioned for almost 200 years through the 19th century and 20th centuries. John Seabrook, the first documented farmer would have begun his farming career in the early part of the 19th century, a period when there was an increase in the need for crops to feed the growing population and a change in the type of crop from barley to wheat and rye. He farmed through a period that saw the use of Nitrogen fixing plants to improve yields, new farm machinery, failed harvests and the difficulties of importing grain due to the Napoleonic war. The fluctuations in the price of grain and modern farming methods saw a reduction in labour and by 1850 Britain had the smallest number of people working in agriculture of any country in the world. The Seabrook family only ever employed a handful of labourers, probably farming the land themselves. We know from the records that they were farming 170 acres and had a stockman, suggesting that they weathered the hard times by diversifying into livestock.

Dairy farming was often a sideline for people who had the grazing (Warley Common) and could boost their farming income by the sale of milk. The cows were milked by hand and the milk transported to the local town by wagon. Prior to electricity and refrigeration, 10-gallon containers of milk were placed into a cooling tank or vat of naturally cold well water. Later, ice banks were used successfully in small dairies.

The new economic climate saw the advent of the concept of ‘Victorian High Farming’ when farmers looked to more scientific practices to maximise their yields and this resulted in changes in farm buildings as farmers moved towards mechanization to reduce the cost of labour.

The first confirmation that the farm is in the Dairy business is in the 1939 census, prior to this the occupiers refer to themselves simply as ‘farmer’. Dairy farmers ran small operations and were often exploited by the larger, more powerful, dairy processing companies. Milking machines were introduced in the early 20th century and were an extension of the traditional milking pail. The produce was perishable, heavy and difficult to transport and tankers would arrive daily for collection of the milk and cheques would arrive at the end of the month. Most dairy farms grew their own feed and the hay and straw were stored in the large two-storey section of the barn and the grain on the first floor where it was decanted into the silo below for the winter. The farm is a surviving example of a dairy farm that embraced the new innovations and regulations of the early 20th century regarding the production of Dairy produce.

This Heritage Statement has considered the Regional Importance of the site and finds it to be low.
14.3 NATIONAL

White House Farm is an example of dairy farming in the southeast. This Heritage Statement has considered the National Importance of the site and finds it to be low.

15.0 VALUE

15.1 EVIDENTIAL VALUE

The Black Barn has been rebuilt and adapted several times over the past century and there is little that survives of its early construction. However, its constant position in the farmyard is evidence of its integral place in the workings of the farm as a multi-purpose building, providing storage for fodder, stabling and shelter for the cart/tractor. This Heritage Statement has considered the Evidential Value of the site and finds it to be low.

15.2 HISTORICAL VALUE

Land farmed ‘on Warley Common’ grew over two centuries to become a working farmyard with a specialization in Dairy farming; the hereditary continuation of both the Seabrook family and the Hammond family through several generations; the influence of Joseph Mclean coming to England from Australia to practice farming, with new ideas and different methods; the impact of the rise and fall in the agricultural industry and the effects of social change through two centuries. The women of the 19th century Seabrook family, were involved in the farm and took responsibility after John Seabrook’s death, in juxtaposition with the women of the 20th century Hammond family who had little involvement in the farm and saw the farm pass to the next male relative. The farm remains within the Hammond/Ford family, the owner born and raised at the farm. This Heritage Statement has considered the Historical Value of the site and finds it to be moderate.
15.3 AESTHETIC VALUE
The barn is a late 19th century to early 20th century hay barn that has been rebuilt and adapted during the 20th century to suit purpose. The construction is either uninspired or methodically modern and there are no features of specific architectural merit. However, a barn has consistently held that position on the farm for over c.140 years and is an important and key building within the historic farmyard. This Heritage Statement has considered the Aesthetic Value of the site and finds it to be low.

16.0 IMPACT ASSESSMENT

16.1 Existing Impacts
Cartographic regression, Topographic analysis and Historical research indicate that the site has consistently been the subject of agriculture and the changes wrought have been in the development of the agricultural process. The buildings have been adapted but have retained their place in the farmyard layout. Therefore, previous impacts to the site from construction have been low.

16.2 Proposed Impacts
The proposed development is for the removal of the lean-to extensions, the conversion of the barn to a residential dwelling and the erection of a cart lodge.

The lean-to buildings are late 20th century additions and have no structural connection to the barn, therefore their removal will improve the barns appearance and return the farmyard to its previous historic layout.

The barn conversion will retain the barn as a key feature of the farmyard complex, preventing the eventual decay and collapse of the building.

The erection of the cart lodge is consistent with and sympathetic to the barn’s historic multi-purpose function.

Therefore, the proposed impacts to the site from construction are considered to be low.
17.0 DISCUSSION & MITIGATION

The purpose of this Heritage Statement was to provide an assessment of the local, regional and national importance of the site as well as the evidential, historical and aesthetic value of the site and to determine the impact of the proposed construction works. The assessment has generally shown that the area to be developed has moderate local importance and moderate historical value. This document provides a concise record of the history of the site and the age and construction style of the barn does not seem to warrant further recording.

The layout of the farmyard has remained largely unchanged for a period of c.140 years. The farm ceased to operate in the 1970’s and now has only 2 acres remaining, the agricultural land having been sold off over the past three decades. The buildings, while renovated, extended or rebuilt have retained their position within the yard but are now quite dilapidated and in need of repair and modernisation.

The barn is a 20th century building, built on part of the footprint of a 19th century building and possibly even an 18th century building. While the building has no particular architectural merit its importance lies in its historic position in the yard and conversion of the existing building would retain the farm scape. If this is not structurally possible then the construction of a building of similar size, shape and style on a similar footprint would serve the same purpose.

The later lean-to extensions were added in the second half of the 20th century and have no historical merit or structural connection with the barn and their removal will return the barn to its historical appearance.

The north elevation of the barn has historically been both closed and open fronted. Therefore, the design could incorporate glazing to retain the open-fronted aspect or weatherboarding to create a closed wall. The pitching holes could be retained as windows to retain the visual appearance of the barn. The partitioning, staircase, mezzanine floor, manger and silo are late 19th to early 20th century additions and have no historical or architectural merit, however, they are a reflection of the barns function as a multi-purpose building and the proposed cart lodge would provide a sympathetic comment on the historic use of the building.

Some consideration could be given to the families that worked the farm in terms of a house name - ‘Seabrooks’ ‘Hammonds’ or ‘Fords’ - particularly as the current occupants are descendants of the Hammond/Ford family.
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19.0 ARCHIVE

Subject to any contractual requirements on confidentiality, a copy of this Heritage Statement will be submitted to Essex County Council within six months of completion.

20.0 RELIABILITY/LIMITATIONS OF SOURCES

The sources that were used in this assessment were, in general, of high quality. The majority of the information provided herewith has been gained from either published texts or archaeological ‘grey’ literature held at Essex County Council, and therefore considered as being reliable.

Touchstone Archaeology and the author shall retain full copyright on the commissioned report under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988. All rights are reserved, excepting that it hereby provides exclusive licence to Smart Planning Ltd for the use of this document in all matters directly relating to the project.

Zoe Schofield

Touchstone Archaeology

8th October 2016
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