

Heritage at Risk Register (HARR) Report 2022

City of London Corporation's heritage assets listed in the 2022 HARR London and South East

Detailed Description and Plans of Action

SITE NAME:	Wanstead Park E12
DESIGNATION:	<i>Registered Park and Garden grade II*, 7 LBs, 2 CAs</i>
CONDITION:	<i>Extensive significant problems</i>
VULNERABILITY:	<i>High</i>
TREND:	<i>Stable</i>
NEW ENTRY:	<i>No</i>
OWNER TYPE:	<i>Local Authority, multiple owners</i>
LIST ENTRY NUMBER:	<i>1000194</i>

Remains of an important landscape dating from the late C17 to the early C19 and associated with George London and Humphry Repton, further developed in the late C19 by the City of London as a public park. The central area was converted to a private golf course in the early C20. Features of the historic designed landscape survive but are in poor condition. A Parkland Plan has been prepared to inform decision making and forward planning. Possible sources of funding for implementation are being explored.

Note: This information was extracted from HARR 2022.

City Surveyor / Director of Environment observations:

Trend:

In comparison to the previous HARR, the Trend has now improved from 'Declining' to 'Stable'.

Ownership/Responsibility:

Parts of Wanstead Park held in trust by the CoL; Wanstead Park Sport Ground Ltd.; Parish of Wanstead (Church of England); London Borough of Redbridge.

Wanstead Park faces major challenges around heritage protection, integrity of water supply, nature conservation and flood protection. Parts of the Park's five lake cascade have also been designated under the Reservoirs Act as 'High Risk' by the Environment Agency.

Historic England recognises that a multi-phase approach will be needed to address the complexity of issues to remove the Park from the Register. The "Conceptual Options Plan and Cost Planning Study - Rev G" from 2019 recommends actions to enable the improvement and eventual removal of the Park from the HARR including the production of the costed Conceptual Option Plan and the implementation of the Priority Projects. The Priority Projects include works to the water bodies, which is the single largest issue; improvement of the boundaries and views; improved management of the landscape; works to determine a sustainable long-term solution to the condition of the Grotto; and provision of assurances of on-going management of the landscape and structures.

The Wanstead Park Ponds Project was set up in 2019 by the CoL, to fulfil its statutory duties in relation to the Environment Agency rated 'High-Risk' reservoirs. Two flood studies were done, one into the lake system and another into the relationship between the Ornamental Water and the River Roding. Subsequent recommendations were to strength and improve the dam structures of each lake. In addition, it was recommended to address the water balance within the lakes to avoid periods of prolonged drying out. Current proposals also include reinstating and extending the up cascade pumping system to enable greater flexibility in how water is moved around the site. The Project is currently tendering for design, with

the intention to begin enabling works in Autumn 2023 with works completing in 2024. The ponds project is funded from City Cash (subject to drawdown approval of RASC and other relevant committees). The overall project is estimated to be £950 000 to £1.15 million, which is earmarked for this project. Of this £241 000 is approved in full and drawdown, another £333 500 is now subject to RASC approval at the next opportunity, and the remainder will be sought at Gateway 5.

The Project Board have also been co-ordinating with other projects looking to improve the sustainable water management within the park. This includes the reinstatement of the Roding pumphouse to enable a winter supply to the Ornamental Water and land drainage works to the Long Walk to more efficiently capture and convey water in the park. In addition, a Mayor of London support Sustainable Drainage (SuDS) Feasibility Study has recently been completed which recommends other works to improve water supply and quality, reduce losses and improve habitats and amenity facilities. The Epping Forest team are exploring how these proposals can be taken forward.

The SuDS Project funding is dependent on successfully bidding for external funds, such as the Mayor of London’s Green and Resilient Spaces Fund or other relevant funds.

SITE NAME:	<i>Wanstead Park E11</i>
DESIGNATION:	<i>Conservation Area, 8 LBs, part in RPG grade II*</i>
CONDITION:	<i>Very bad</i>
VULNERABILITY:	<i>Low</i>
NEW ENTRY:	<i>No</i>
TREND:	<i>Deteriorating</i>

Note: This information was extracted from HARR 2022.

City Surveyor / Director of Environment observations:

Ownership/Responsibility:

Wanstead Park Conservation Area also has multiple owners, including the CoL.

The action/activities developed in the previous listing will help to address this Conservation Area at Risk designation. See item above. However, while the condition of the Park is a key factor, HE also cites problems with detrimental changes to the Edwardian residential stock surrounding the Park.

SITE NAME:	<i>The Grotto, Wanstead Park E11</i>
DESIGNATION:	<i>Listed Building grade II, RPG grade II*, CA</i>
CONDITION:	<i>Poor</i>
OCCUPANCY:	<i>N/A</i>
PRIORITY CATEGORY:	<i>C (C)</i>
OWNER TYPE:	<i>Local Authority</i>
LIST ENTRY NUMBER:	<i>1183624</i>

Ruined grotto boathouse of circa 1762. It consists of a honeycomb rockwork facade of segmental plan with several arches at lake level, and window openings above. The area is fenced off from public access. The grotto has been managed as a ruin, but its stability is threatened by mortar failure, loss of rockwork, and self-sown vegetation. The owner, the City of London, has carried out repairs and clearance, and commissioned a Conservation Management Plan to identify the most appropriate approach to securing the structure's long-term future. Further discussions are required to take this forward.

Note: This information was extracted from HARR 2022.

City Surveyor / Director of Environment observations:

Ownership/Responsibility:

CoL's ownership and responsibility.

Since the Grotto's addition to the HARR in 2018, Cyclical Works Programme (CWP) funding has been allocated to this asset to allow officers to undertake urgent works and to commission a Conservation Management Plan (CMP), implemented in 2019, to help the CoL to remove the Grotto from the HARR and to help determine a successful and sustainable future for the Grotto. The CMP provides a framework for making decisions about the Grotto's future.

Various options for the future of the Grotto have been discussed at the two stakeholder consultation workshops. The outcome of this consultation was a consensus that the most realistic path for removing the Grotto from the HARR in the longer-term would be to restore the façade to its eighteenth-century appearance, as far as possible. The policies set out on the CMP seek to help the CoL achieve this ambition to remove the Grotto from the HARR and secure its successful, long-term future.

To remove this asset from the HARR, Historic England advised that the building should be structurally sound, the fabric repaired satisfactorily and as fully as possible and a maintenance plan should be in place. Packages of preliminary works are being implemented in the first half of 2023, including structural investigations and retrieval of archaeological materials from the lakebed. A Restoration and Maintenance Plan and the completion of the landing stage will be commissioned and carried out in 2023. CWP funding is available for the above activities. Further funding will be required for the construction works.

The current programme anticipates completion of all work required to allow removal from HARR by 2025.

Subsequent feasibility studies will inform the level of intervention required for the remaining restoration of the Grotto and assess the operational and financial viability of different potential uses for the Grotto – (which can only take place once the future use of Wanstead Park as a whole, and the Grotto's role in it, is more clearly defined than it is in the Parkland Plan for the park).

The Grotto is held in trust by the CoL but given its important relationship with the lake, the restoration of the façade should be coordinated with the Ponds Project.

SITE NAME:	<i>Bunhill Fields, Finsbury Square EC2</i>
DESIGNATION:	<i>Conservation Area, 95 LBs, RPG grade I</i>
CONDITION:	<i>Fair</i>
VULNERABILITY:	<i>Medium</i>
NEW ENTRY:	<i>No</i>
TREND:	<i>Deteriorating</i>

Note: This information was extracted from HARR 2022.

City Surveyor observations:

Ownership/Responsibility:

Bunhill Fields Conservation Area has multiple owners, including the CoL.

This Conservation Area was added to the HARR because of inappropriate developments in the wider area beyond Bunhill Fields Burial Ground, making removal from the HARR beyond the CoL's control. However,

officers are continuing to assist Islington Council addressing the Heritage At Risk status, by making formal objections to large scale developments within the Conservation Area.

Bunhill Fields Burial Ground, owned by the CoL, itself is not an entry in the HARR. To ensure that the Burial Ground will not be added back to future editions of the HARR, a cyclical programme of conservation works is in place and a Conservation Management Plan (CMP) was implemented in 2020 to help determine a successful and sustainable future for this site.

SITE NAME:	<i>Ashtead Park, Ashtead</i>
DESIGNATION:	<i>Registered Park and Garden grade II, 20 LBs, part in SM, part in CA</i>
CONDITION:	<i>Generally satisfactory but with significant localised problems</i>
VULNERABILITY:	<i>Medium</i>
TREND:	<i>Improving</i>
NEW ENTRY:	<i>No</i>
OWNER TYPE:	<i>Mixed, multiple owners</i>
LIST ENTRY NUMBER:	<i>1001490</i>

A C17 park, developed with successive owners throughout the C18 and C19 the well wooded open parkland estate was broken up and sold in the 1920s with the historic landscape split into two principal ownerships, the house, gardens and southern park a school, and the northern park with ponds managed as open access land now a nature reserve. The school has improved its management of the landscape amongst proposals for further facilities following a Conservation Management Plan since 2010. A joint heritage-led approach should support the park's historic character and balance its cultural services.

Note: This information was extracted from HARR 2022.

City Surveyor observations:

Ownership/Responsibility:

Ashtead Park has multiple owners. The CoL owns the southern part, with the northern part being owned by Mole Valley District Council and managed by the Surrey Wildlife Trust.

Historic England notes that the main vulnerabilities of the park are associated with development and fragmentation of the site, resulting in the northern and southern parts becoming distinct.

Officers are currently working with HE to understand required actions to remove the asset from the HARR.

Key to the entries as extracted from HARR 2022:

<p>LISTING The principal listing type includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Listed Building (LB) grade I, II* or II • Listed Place of Worship grade I, II* or II • Scheduled Monument (SM) • Registered Park and Garden (RPG) grade I, II* or II • Registered Battlefield (RB) • Protected Wreck Site (PWS) • Conservation Area (CA) <p>CONDITION For buildings condition is graded as: 'very bad', 'poor', 'fair' and 'good'. For sites that cover areas (scheduled monuments – archaeology assessments, parks and gardens, battlefields and wreck sites) one overall condition category is recorded. The category may relate only to the part of the site or monument that is at risk and not the whole site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • extensive significant problems • generally unsatisfactory with major localised problems • generally satisfactory but with significant localised problems • generally satisfactory but with minor localised problems • optimal • unknown (noted for a number of scheduled monuments that are below ground and where their condition cannot be established) <p>For conservation areas, condition is categorised as: 'very bad', 'poor', 'fair' and 'optimal'.</p> <p>OCCUPANCY/USE For buildings (excluding places of worship) that can be occupied or have a use, the main vulnerability is vacancy or underuse. Occupancy (or use) is noted as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • vacant (or not in use) • part occupied (part in use) • occupied (in use) • unknown • not applicable (for structural scheduled monuments) <p>VULNERABILITY Principal vulnerability is noted for archaeology assessments and may relate only to the part of the site that is at risk, and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • animal burrowing • arable ploughing • coastal erosion • collapse • deterioration – in need of management • scrub/tree growth • visitor erosion <p>For parks and gardens, battlefields, wreck sites and conservation areas, vulnerability is noted as 'high', 'medium' or 'low'.</p>	<p>PRIORITY CATEGORY Priority for action is assessed on a scale of A to F, where 'A' is the highest priority for a site which is deteriorating rapidly with no solution to secure its future, and 'F' is the lowest priority. For buildings and structures and places of worship the following priority categories are used as an indication of trend and as a means of prioritising action:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Immediate risk of further rapid deterioration or loss of fabric; no solution agreed Immediate risk of further rapid deterioration or loss of fabric; solution agreed but not yet implemented Slow decay; no solution agreed Slow decay; solution agreed but not yet implemented Under repair or in fair to good repair, but no user identified; or under threat of vacancy with no obvious new user (applicable only to buildings capable of beneficial use) Repair scheme in progress and (where applicable) end use or user identified; or functionally redundant buildings with new use agreed but not yet implemented <p>Previous year priority categories are given in brackets, otherwise 'New entry' is noted. 'New entry – re-assessed' indicates an existing site on the Register that has been re-assessed using a different risk assessment methodology and is included on this year's Register under the new assessment type.</p> <p>TREND Trend for archaeology entries, parks and gardens, battlefields and wreck sites may relate only to the part of the site that is at risk and is categorised as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • declining • stable • improving • unknown <p>For conservation areas trend is categorised as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • deteriorating • deteriorating significantly • no significant change • improving • improving significantly • unknown <p>OWNERSHIP A principal ownership category is given for each entry, and if sites are in divided ownership, a 'multiple' ownership category is noted.</p> <p>ABBREVIATIONS</p> <p>CA Conservation Area HE Historic England HLF Heritage Lottery Fund LB Listed Building LPA Local Planning Authority NP National Park PWS Protected Wreck Site RB Registered Battlefield RPG Registered Park and Garden SM Scheduled Monument UA Unitary Authority WHS World Heritage Site</p>
---	---