Heritage Statement

Manor Farm Wall Repair, Netheravon, SP4 9RG
9th January 2024

Site Location
Manor Farm is a grade II listed building, in a rural location, off the A345 in Netheravon. The house has a large garden plot, with a distinctive cob wall boundary treatment complete with pitched tiled capping. It is not within the Netheravon Conservation Area or the North Wessex Downs AONB.

Listing
The listing NGR SU1434748347 description is as follows: *Manor Farmhouse II Farmhouse. Mid C18. Brick, tile roof. Two storeys and attics, 3 x 3 bays. West front has three gables, the centre one wider and slightly set forward, probably with original entrance on ground floor, now replaced with window. Plat band. Small C19 porch in right bay. Gables scrolled at base, with moulded stone copings. Windows stone-mullioned and framed, transomes to rear windows. Windows in gables oval, also stone framed. Side and rear elevations have one central pediment with blind oval windows in side, Diocletian window in rear. Late C18-early C19 bay extension on rear, and late C19 roughcast block added on north. Porch door, oak, C16-C17, brought from house in Imber. Interior: stair on south side with tall stair window. Iron fire plate of Sun Fire Office. The farm had, until c1978, an impressive range of large timber framed thatched barns such as described by Cobbett Rural Rides (1830), demolished by M.O.D. There was also a furze house, demolished earlier. (Wilts Folklife I, No 2 (Sept 1977.))*

The boundary wall is not described, but is considered a curtilage listed wall. It is constructed of cob with a pitched coping in double roman clay tiles.

Heritage Significance of the boundary wall
The house is grade II listed, and the wall falls under the curtilage listing. The wall boundary treatment is of significance as a distinctive feature denoting the boundary of the heritage asset. However, the wall has been extensively repaired over the years, much of it unsympathetically, with modern materials which are not the vernacular materials to match the original. The original wall was mass cob construction, but there is evidence that some portions of the wall, including the extent covered by this application, have been rebuilt or repaired in two leaves. Some of these repairs appear to have been done in blockwork, brickwork, and materials other than cob, though they are hidden from view by the render finish. Their presence is revealed by the behaviour of the wall as it disintegrates, where the inner garden face of the wall is leaning in, whilst the external field face remains vertical.

The heritage significance of the wall has therefore been impacted already by its history of poor repairs. A large proportion of the material is not original or repaired like for like with the original. The heritage significance therefore rests on the form of the wall, rather than the originality of the existing material. This proposal seeks to maintain the existing heritage significance as a minimum, and replace existing modern material repair work which has failed with a repair

constructed in approved cob substitute materials, to return the wall to good condition using vernacular materials.

Schedule of Proposed Work
including assessment of potential impact to the significance of the heritage asset

The table below itemises the work required to undertake the repair of the wall. The wall has been undermined by vermin tunnelling underneath and through gaps, and as a result the garden side of the wall is leaning in significantly. As the base of the wall has been undermined, the necessary work includes construction of a foundation for the stretch of wall effected. The extent of wall requiring repair has been identified as a 10m stretch on the east side of the garden. Only the extent effected by the damage is proposed to be repaired, thus minimising the potential impact on the significance of the heritage asset overall.

Work item ref	Description of work	Assessment of impact on significance of heritage asset
0.1	Remove existing render from identified 10m extent of wall.	Low impact on significance as the render on the wall has been patched and re-rendered on numerous occasions in the history of the wall, so very little of the render is that which was applied more than 50 years ago, for example.
0.2	Insert props to maintain tiled capping structure and coverings in situ for duration of the works.	No impact on significance; these will be temporary, removable and leave no trace once removed.
0.3	Remove cob/wall portion of the wall height on the garden side and dispose of off site.	Some impact on significance as some heritage material may be removed and lost during this process. However, the evidence is for this to be an area of failed later repair, and this portion of the wall is not mass cob, due to behaviour of wall during failure.
0.4	Excavate a 750 wide by 450mm deep trench. Pour a trench foundation in concrete within the trench.	Low impact on significance, and will safeguard longevity of repairs undertaken.
0.5	Build up garden face of wall to reinstate height and support capping structure and finishes, in cob blocks, on NHL 3.5 lime mortar. These will be knit into the remaining external field face of the wall extent.	Minimal impact on significance, maintaining cob material construction. Or if as suspected this inner face is blockwork, this change will

		return this portion to cob-type construction.
0.6	Apply 3 coats NHL 3.5 render to both sides to renew continuous appearance of garden wall, ensuring thorough coverage, so cob blocks are not revealed when the wall is wet. This is the render mix that was used on other portions of the wall that required repair under consent ref E/2011/1623/LBC, as established during the undertaking of that consented work.	Minimal impact on significance, as application is a suitable lime product which matches the existing, and maintains continuous visual appearance of the boundary treatment of the heritage asset.

Conclusion

This proposal is for the repair of a heritage wall, which is in the interests of the continued life of the listed building and the appearance of the local area to have completed using the matching vernacular construction materials proposed. Though some heritage material from the wall may be lost, the wall is not itself identified in the listing, and without repair the wall will gradually dilapidate until it is lost into the adjacent field and verge. It is therefore in the interests of the listed building overall to agree means and materials to maintain the wall in good condition, which this application seeks to propose and have consented.