Beechwood Park School, Markyate

Desk-Based Assessment

Client: Beechwood Park School

OA East Report No: 1609
OASIS No: oxfordar3-176406
NGR: TL 0449 1454
Beechwood Park School, Markyate, Hertfordshire

Desk-Based Assessment and Heritage Impact Assessment

By Chris Thatcher BA

With contributions by Pete Masters BA (Hons), HND, PIfA, MEAGE

Editor: Stephen Macaulay BA, MPhil, MIfA

Illustrator: Severine Bezie MA, Frances Chaloner

Report Date: April 2014
Report Number: 1609
Site Name: Beechwood Park School, Markyate
HER Event No: n/a
Date of Works: April 2014
Client Name: Beechwood Park School
Client Ref: 16164
Planning Ref: Pre-planning
Grid Ref: TL 0449 1454
Site Code: XHTBWP14
Finance Code: XHTBWP14
Receiving Body:

Accession No:

Prepared by: Chris Thatcher
Position: Project Officer
Date: 03/04/14

Checked by: Stephen Macaulay
Position: Senior Project Manager
Date: 03/04/14
Signed: [Signature]

Disclaimer
This document has been prepared for the titled project or named part thereof and should not be relied upon or used for any other project without an independent check being carried out as to its suitability and prior written authority of Oxford Archaeology being obtained. Oxford Archaeology accepts no responsibility or liability for the consequences of this document being used for a purpose other than the purposes for which it was commissioned. Any person/party using or relying on the document for such other purposes agrees and will by such use or reliance be taken to confirm their agreement to indemnify Oxford Archaeology for all loss or damage resulting therefrom. Oxford Archaeology accepts no responsibility or liability for this document to any party other than the person/party by whom it was commissioned.

Oxford Archaeology East,
15 Trafalgar Way,
Bar Hill,
Cambridge,
CB23 8SQ

t: 01223 850500
f: 01223 850599
e: oaeast@thehumanjourney.net
w: http://thehumanjourney.net/oaeast

© Oxford Archaeology East 2011
Oxford Archaeology Limited is a Registered Charity No: 285627
Table of Contents

Summary..................................................................................................................................................5

1 Introduction............................................................................................................................................7
  1.1 Planning Background....................................................................................................................7
  1.2 Aims...............................................................................................................................................7
  1.3 Methodology..............................................................................................................................7
  1.4 Location, Geology and Topography............................................................................................9
  1.5 Acknowledgements....................................................................................................................9

2 Archaeological and Historical Sources............................................................................................10
  2.1 Historical Sources.....................................................................................................................10
  2.2 The Historic Environment Record (HER)................................................................................11
  2.3 Cartographic Evidence...............................................................................................................11
  2.4 Geophysical Survey..................................................................................................................12
  2.5 Earthworks................................................................................................................................13
  2.6 Walkover Survey.......................................................................................................................13
  2.7 Archaeological Excavations and Surveys................................................................................13

3 Deposit Mapping..................................................................................................................................15
  3.1 Introduction................................................................................................................................15
  3.2 Prehistoric..................................................................................................................................15
  3.3 Roman.......................................................................................................................................15
  3.4 Late Saxon and medieval..........................................................................................................15
  3.5 Post-medieval............................................................................................................................15

4 Degree of Survival.................................................................................................................................16
  4.1 Assessment...............................................................................................................................16
  4.2 Rating.......................................................................................................................................16

5 Impact Assessment On Designated Heritage Assets And Historic Landscape..........................17
  5.1 Discussion of the Heritage Assets.............................................................................................17
  5.2 Potential Impacts on Heritage Assets......................................................................................17
  5.3 Historic Landscape..................................................................................................................17

6 Conclusions.........................................................................................................................................20

Appendix A. Geophysical Survey..........................................................................................................21
Appendix B. HER Entries.......................................................................................................................23
Appendix C. Bibliography.....................................................................................................................29
Appendix D. OASIS Report Form...........................................................................................................30
List of Figures

Fig. 1 Location map with proposed development sites 1 & 2 highlighted (red)
Fig. 2 HER plot
Fig. 3 The 1753 Capability Brown Survey
Fig. 4 The 1754 Capability Brown Plan with Gothic Folly and Ice House Sketches
Fig. 5 The Dury and Andrews Survey (1766)
Fig. 6 The Bryant Map (1822)
Fig. 7 1838 Tithe Map
Fig. 8 1:2,500 1878 OS Map
Fig. 9 1:10,560 1884 OS Map
Fig. 10 1:2,500 1898 OS Map
Fig. 11 1:2,500 1924 OS Map
Fig. 12 1:2,500 1976 OS Map
Fig. 13 Site plan showing plate locations
Fig. 14 Area 1 – Grey scale and trace plots of raw and enhanced data, scale – 1:1000
Fig. 15 Area 2 – Grey scale and trace plots of raw and enhanced data, scale – 1:1000
Fig. 16 Interpretation of Results, scale – 1:1250

List of Plates

Plate 1 View from the entrance to Beechwood Park School
Plate 2 View of Beechwood School from Row End
Plate 3 View of Proposed Development Site 2, from north
Plate 4 View of Proposed Development Site 2, the ice house
Plate 5 View of Proposed Development Site 2, from south-east
Plate 6 View of Proposed Development Site 2 from south
Plate 7 View of Proposed Development Site 2 from west
Plate 8 View of Proposed Development Site 2 from south-west
Plate 9 View of Proposed Development Site 2 from south
Plate 10 View of Proposed Development Site 1 from approach road
Plate 11 View of Proposed Development Site 1 from east
Plate 12 View of Proposed Development Site 1 from south-east
Plate 13 View of Proposed Development Site 1 from south-east
Plate 14 View of Proposed Development Site 1 from south
Plate 15 View of Proposed Development Site 1 from north-west
Summary

In March and April 2014 Oxford Archaeology East undertook a desk based assessment and Heritage Impact Assessment to examine the available historical and archaeological resources relating to Beechwood Park School, Markyate, Hertfordshire (centred at TL 0449 1454). The work was commissioned by Beechwood Park School as part of a pre-planning application for proposed new buildings associated with the school. The aim of this assessment is to determine the archaeological potential of the site and the possible impact any future work could have on both any archaeological remains and the Historic Landscape and Heritage Assets.

Beechwood Park has a rich and varied history. It is built on the site of a former Benedictine Nunnery, St Giles In The Wood, which dates from the Late Saxon period. After the dissolution of the nunnery in 1537 it eventually passed to Sir Richard Page who built an H-shaped Tudor manor house at Beechwood. This plan still exists, later becoming incorporated into the Queen Anne additions to the house. Subsequently it was acquired by Thomas Saunders, in 1628, whose family undertook building works including the alterations to the façade as seen on a plan of 1670. When the house passed, by marriage, to the Sebright family, a major building programme was instigated to double the size of the house. This included the creation of the striking north-east façade, in 1702 and also landscaping of the grounds in the 1750s by Capability Brown.

In 1961 ownership of the buildings and grounds was transferred to the Stewart family. It was Group Captain Peter Stewart who oversaw the restoration of Beechwood Park. He is regarded by many to be the founder of Beechwood Park School, which opened in 1964.

This piece of work has demonstrated that there is a low probability of pre-Saxon remains surviving in either of the Proposed Development Sites. There is a moderate possibility of encountering Late Saxon and medieval remains. The proximity of the site to the putative Late Saxon nunnery of St Giles In The Wood make the Potential Development Sites of some interest to considerations of our understanding of the development of the site during this period.

The numerous cartographic sources available for the site demonstrate that during the post-medieval and modern periods Beechwood House and to a lesser extent the park and gardens, have been subject to numerous phases of construction and remodelling. Overall it is felt that the preservation of any below ground remains will be good, for all periods.

It is suggested that the impact of any development on the Heritage Assets and the Historic Landscape will be far greater in Proposed Development Site 2 than in Proposed Development Site 1.
1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Planning Background

1.1.1 Oxford Archaeology East (OAE) were commissioned by Beechwood Park School to produce a Desk Based Assessment and Heritage Impact Assessment as part of a pre-planning application for a proposed development at Beechwood Park School, Markyate, St Albans (centred on TL 0449 1454). Two potential development sites have been identified within the grounds of Beechwood Park School. The first (Site 1) lies adjacent to modern buildings in the south-eastern part of the site. The alternative site (Site 2) is located in the north-western part of the site, close to the main school building and extant ice house (Figs. 1 & 2).

1.1.2 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 30) states that where development includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, developers should submit a desk-based assessment and where necessary, a field evaluation. The archaeological advisor to the local planning authority has therefore requested that this desk-based assessment be submitted along with the planning application for the site. The results will enable decisions to be made by Hertfordshire County Council with regards to mitigating the impact of the proposed development upon any heritage assets.

1.2 Aims

1.2.1 The purpose of the archaeological Desk-Based Assessment is to define the character, extent and significance of known heritage assets within and close to the Site, taking into account any past impacts which may have affected the survival of any archaeology present on the Site itself. It identifies any heritage constraints on the proposed development and provides an outline assessment of any potential impacts which may result from the proposal.

1.3 Methodology

Data Capture

1.3.1 The Desk-Based Assessment and Heritage Impact Assessment draw on secondary historical sources, the Hertfordshire Historic Environment Record (HER), cartographic evidence, geophysical survey, aerial photographs, a walkover survey and previous archaeological work.

1.3.2 The Desk-Based Assessment has been carried out according to standards set by the Institute for Archaeologists in their guidance paper Standards and Guidance for Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment (2012). The assessment of setting has been carried with reference to English Heritage's Guidance Document The Setting of Heritage Assets (2010).

Assessment Methodologies

1.3.3 The importance of the cultural heritage resource, identified from the existing baseline knowledge of the search area, has been assessed using the definitions established in Part 5 (5.26-31), of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, Volume 11, Section 3 (HA 208/07), 'Screening, Scoping, Simple and Detailed Assessments'. Sections 5.26 – 31, DMRB HA 208/07, provides separate tables for assessing the potential importance of Archaeological Remains (table 5.1), Historic Buildings (table 6.1) and Historic Landscapes (table 7.1). For ease of reference OA have combined these as Table 1 below.
Importance of resources | Equivalent to:
--- | ---
**Very High** | World Heritage Sites (including nominated sites). Sites, buildings or landscapes of acknowledged international importance.
**High** | Sites of National Importance, Scheduled Monuments, Grade I and II* Listed Buildings and Registered Parks and Gardens, designated historic landscapes or those of outstanding interest or well preserved.
**Medium** | English Heritage Grade II Registered Parks and Gardens, Conservation Areas, Historic or Archaeological sites of Regional or County Importance, Grade II Listed Buildings and locally designated buildings of historical importance, designated special historic landscapes or undesignated landscapes of regional value or of average preservation, areas of Ancient Woodland ( Ancient semi-natural woodland as mapped and designated by Defra) with demonstrated ecological value.
**Low** | Locally Important Historic or Archaeological Sites, Sites with a local value for education or cultural appreciation, Sites that are so badly damaged that too little remains to justify inclusion into a higher grade, robust undesignated historic landscapes.
**Negligible** | Sites or features with no significant value or interest, Sites that are so badly damaged that too little remains to justify inclusion into a higher grade.

**Table 1: Criteria for Evaluating the Importance of the Cultural Heritage resource**

**Criteria for Appraisal of Magnitude of Impact**

1.3.4 The potential impacts of the scheme on the cultural heritage set has been considered using the definitions laid out in HA 208/07, Section 3, 5.32-4 as set out in Table 2 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Magnitude of Impact</th>
<th>Description of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major</strong></td>
<td>Complete destruction or change to the site or feature resulting in fundamental change in our ability to understand and appreciate the resource and its historical context and setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moderate</strong></td>
<td>Change to the site or feature resulting in an appreciable change in our ability to understand and appreciate the resource and its historical context and setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minor</strong></td>
<td>Change to the site or feature resulting in a small change in our ability to understand and appreciate the resource and its historical context and setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negligible</strong></td>
<td>Negligible or no material changes to the site or feature. No real change in our ability to understand and appreciate the resource and its historical context and setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Change</strong></td>
<td>Site or feature remains unchanged by the development. Context of monument remains entirely unchanged.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2: Magnitude of Impact**

**Assessing the Significance of Effects**

1.3.5 The effects of the scheme on the Site have been addressed using the definitions laid out in HA 208/07, Section 3. The significance of the effect may be defined as adverse, beneficial or neutral and is laid out in Table 3. It depends upon:

- The importance of the Cultural Heritage resource
- The magnitude of the impacts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Magnitude of Impact</th>
<th>Importance of Resource</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very High</strong></td>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major</strong></td>
<td>Very Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moderate</strong></td>
<td>Large or Very Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minor</strong></td>
<td>Moderate/Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negligible</strong></td>
<td>Slight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No change</strong></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3: Significance of Environmental Effects**
1.3.6 Effects to be assessed are direct and indirect, temporary and permanent:

- A permanent effect will occur for example as a result of the construction and operation of the scheme including landscaping, land take, excavation of the reservoir and associated drains, culverts and water control structures. A permanent effect is not reversible and will therefore include the below ground impact (upon archaeological deposits) of some temporary elements of the scheme, including soil storage, contractor’s site compounds and access routes and erection of other facilities.

- A temporary effect (primarily upon the setting of archaeological monuments or historic landscape features) may occur during the construction and operation of the scheme. These developments may be removed following the completion of the construction process or the decommissioning of the scheme and their effect upon the historic environment is therefore reversible.

- A direct impact is an impact that will occur to the physical fabric or land of an asset and its curtilage, and will include any impact upon the setting of that asset.

- An indirect impact is an impact that might arise as a consequence of the operation or construction of the scheme. For example it may affect viability of land, leading to changes in the management or land use of archaeological or historic landscape features.

1.4 Location, Geology and Topography

1.4.1 The site is located 1.5 miles to the south-west of Flamstead, 5 miles to the south-east of Dunstable, 4 miles to the south-west of Luton, and 4.5 miles to the north of Hemel Hampstead, Hertfordshire (Fig 1: TL 0449 1454). The school is set in a prominent location in an undulating landscape, approached from the south by a long, partially tree lined avenue.

1.4.2 The underlying geology is comprised of deposits of Lewes and Seaford Nodular Chalk formation overlain by Clay-With-Flints (http://digimap.edina.ac.uk February 2014).

1.5 Acknowledgements

1.5.1 The project was commissioned and funded by Beechwood Park School. It was managed by Stephen Macaulay. The walkover survey was carried out by Chris Thatcher and James Fairbairn of Oxford Archaeology East and Jill Hind of Oxford Archaeology South visited the site and provided help and guidance on the setting issues. The geophysical survey was undertaken by Pete Masters of Cranfield University. Isobel Thompson of Hertfordshire County Council Historic Environment Team supplied the HER data and other useful information. The illustrations were produced by Severine Bezie and Frances Chaloner.
2  ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL SOURCES

2.1  Historical Sources

2.1.1  No primary historical sources relating to Beechwood Park School have been used here. This general summary is taken rather from secondary sources which discuss the immediate surroundings of the site.

2.1.2  Although the site lies just 2.5km to the east of Roman Watling Street no artefacts or evidence of settlement dating to the prehistoric or Roman periods have been recorded within the immediate area.

2.1.3  Beechwood Park School is on the site of a former Benedictine Nunnery, St Giles In The Wood, whose origins can be traced to the Late Saxon period. According to the Tudor historian William Lambarde, the 3rd Abbot of St Albans, Wulfigious, founded a small Nunnery near to St Albans Abbey during the reign of Edward the Confessor. This was subsequently moved to a wooded site known as Woodchurch, in the parish of Flamstead, by Winoth, a later Abbot.

2.1.4  After the accession of William the Conqueror, the manor of Flamstead was given to a knight, Ralph de Tony, for services rendered. This then passed to Ralph's grandson, Roger de Tony, and it is he who is credited with renewing the nunnery, gifting land rights and 'a tenth of the bread made in his house' and granting it independence. He also had the nunnery dedicated to the French hermit St Giles, leading it to become known as St Giles in the Wood. The nunnery was small, it was stipulated that no more than 13 nuns were to be in residence at anyone time. However, despite its comparatively small size, the nunnery became increasingly wealthy, mainly as a result of its high ranking benefactors. The Nunnery was attacked by 50 robbers in 1269, whilst under the supervision of Isabel The Prioress. Later on, it suffered severe hardship and decline and began providing education as a means of bolstering its finances.

2.1.5  It has been suggested that the de Tony manor house was located close to the present building and in the 19th century, under the ownership of Sir Edgar Saunders Sebright, stone coffins were discovered during excavations to the north-east of the school building.

2.1.6  The nunnery was dissolved in 1537 and the proceeds of the sale of the inventory were paid into the Royal Treasury. On June 10th, 1537, a lease on St Giles in the Wood was granted to Sir John Tregonwell, one of the commissioners for the monastic dissolutions. This was revoked soon after by Henry VIII, when it was realised that the wealth attributed to the lands owned by the nunnery was too great to be given to Tregonwell. It was instead passed to Sir Richard Page, in exchange for his property in West Molesey, Walton on Thames and Horsham. Richard Page had become a gentleman of the Privy Chamber in 1527 and served the King on a daily basis. He was Lord of the Manor from 1539 until his death in 1548. During his tenure he built an H-shaped in plan, Tudor manor house at Beechwood and this plan still exists, later becoming incorporated into the Queen Anne additions to the house.

2.1.7  The Tregonwell family retained ownership of the property until 1573; Sir Richard Page had died without male heir and as a result the estate passed through the marriage of his daughter to a Sir William Skipworth of Kent. It was then held in trust by Paul Pope and later by Richard and Thomas Smith, until being acquired by Thomas Saunders of Long Marston in 1628. By this point the estate had become known as Beechwood on account of the Beech Avenue planted at the entrance to the site.
2.1.8 Under the ownership of the Saunders family, a series of building works were undertaken and it is suggested that a Thomas Saunders was responsible for the alterations to the façade as seen on a plan of 1670. Upon the death of her father in 1693, Anne Saunders inherited the house. Anne Saunders married Sir Edward Sebright, and the estate remained with the Sebrights for the next 250 years. It was during this time that a major building programme was instigated to double the size of the house. This included the creation of the striking north-east façade, in 1702, which is still visible on approaching the house to this day (Pevsner 1953, 55).

2.1.9 In the 1750s, Capability Brown was employed by the family to landscape the grounds. He also provided architectural features for the house, in particular plans for two pavilions on either side of the main building.

2.1.10 In 1961, an agreement was signed between Sir Hugo Sebright and Group Captain Peter Stewart to transfer the ownership of the buildings and grounds to the Stewart family. Group Captain Peter Stewart retired from his career as a London Insurance Broker and devoted his time to overseeing the restoration of Beechwood Park. He is regarded by many to be the founder of Beechwood Park School, which opened in 1964.

2.2 The Historic Environment Record (HER)

2.2.1 The Hertfordshire Historic Environment Record (HER) is a computerised database of all listed and other historic buildings and all known archaeological sites, historic parks and gardens and other historic landscape features in the county, plotted onto linked digital mapping and often supplemented by photographs, drawings and substantial written accounts. The search was carried out by a Hertfordshire County Council Historic Environment Officer and all records falling within the requested 500m radius around the proposed development site were provided in descriptive form with corresponding datasets supplied as shapefiles to provide the exact geographic location of each record (Fig. 2).

2.2.2 A summary of the results of the search are provided below. Figure 2 shows the location of all Event Records as follows: HER events (prefixed DHT) and Listed Building records (prefixed MHT). Full listings of the search results can be found in Appendix B.

2.3 Cartographic Evidence

2.3.1 The earliest cartographic sources for the proposed development site date to the 18th century and include those produced for Capability Brown’s landscaping of Beechwood Park and the Dury and Andrews Survey (Figs. 3-5). Later, 19th century, maps include the Bryant, Tithe and the Ordnance Survey Maps; the earliest of the latter is the 1st Edition OS Map dating from 1878 (Figs. 6-10).

2.3.2 The later editions OS Maps were consulted at www.oldmaps.co.uk. Barring the extension of the school buildings, from the 1960s onwards, there has been little change to the layout of the site and as a result it is not felt that the inclusion of these sources would contribute to this assessment. Examples of the later maps have been included where changes have been noted, although these are unlikely to have had any impact on either of the Proposed Development Sites. The sources are described individually below.

The 1753 Capability Brown Survey (Fig. 3)

2.3.3 This map shows Beechwood House and its grounds prior to the landscaping work undertaken by Capability Brown. There appear to be ponds close to the area of Site 1 on this map. The area within Site 2 appears to be given over to gardens, in a rectilinear
layout, aligned with the house. Adjacent to the area encompassed by Site 2 are buildings labelled 'The Yards'.

**The 1754 Capability Brown Plan (Fig. 4)**

2.3.4 The next available source shows the alterations as a result of the landscaping. There is some evidence for a 'softening' of the garden area within Site 2, which now have a more sweeping aspect, curving away to the west where once they were apparently broadly rectangular. It would appear that the afore mentioned structures are still extant. There does not appear to have been any significant change within the bounds of Site 1.

**The Dury and Andrews Survey, 1766 (Fig. 5)**

2.3.5 The scale of this map precludes any detailed interpretation with relation to either of the Proposed Development Sites.

**Bryant Map, 1822 (Fig. 6)**

2.3.6 The scale of this map precludes any detailed interpretation with relation to either of the Proposed Development Sites.

**The 1838 Tithe Map (Fig. 7)**

2.3.7 There are no structures recorded within either of the Proposed Development Sites on this map, although it is not a particularly detailed source.

**1:2,500 1878 OS Map (Fig. 8)**

2.3.8 The First Edition OS map shows the site in far more detail. Site 1 appears to lie to the east of a number of what appear to be ancillary structures, along with a feature labelled 'Pumps Gasometer'. Site 2 also lay beyond the bounds of any extant buildings. In the south-western and northern part of Site 2 are what appear to be pathways associated with the gardens.

**1:10,560 1884 OS Map (Fig. 9)**

2.3.9 Although at a much smaller scale, there appears to be little change within the Study Area from the previous map.

**1:2,500 1898 OS Map (Fig. 10)**

2.3.10 Once again, there is little apparent change within either of the Proposed Development Sites. The pathways visible in Site 2 on the First Edition OS map are still extant.

**1:2,500 1924 OS Map (Fig. 11)**

2.3.11 The only visible addition to the fabric of the estate on this map is a small building constructed close to the western limit of Site 1.

**1:2,500 1976 OS Map (Fig. 12)**

2.3.12 By the time of the 1976 edition it would appear that the pathways noted on the earlier maps in Site 2 have disappeared, there have also been a number of buildings constructed to the south of Site 2, including what appear to be the swimming pools within the bounds of the walled garden.

**2.4 Geophysical Survey**

2.4.1 A gradiometer survey was carried out at Sites 1 and 2 on the 20th February 2014. This produced few significant archaeological anomalies. The full report is presented in Appendix A and Figures 14-16.
2.4.2 At Site 1 (Fig. 14), three anomalies were identified that may indicate the presence of burnt remains or possibly kiln type features. The survey also recorded linear and sub oval anomalies that are likely to represent underlying variations in the soils and geology or perhaps features associated with the sports field. The remaining magnetic anomalies evident were attributed to modern disturbances including services and modern ferrous debris.

2.4.3 To the north-west, at Site 2 (Fig. 15), the features identified included a former gravel path and other weakly magnetic curvilinear anomalies possibly associated with the formal garden layout.

2.5 Earthworks
2.5.1 There are no earthworks visible within the Study Area.

2.6 Walkover Survey
2.6.1 A walkover survey was carried out on 20th February 2014. Weather conditions were mixed with persistent rain giving way to bright and dry conditions. The object of the walkover survey was to view on the ground the recorded heritage assets and to assess the likely impact upon them of the proposed development sites. The walkover survey also aimed to find any areas of modern disturbance that might have destroyed heritage assets. The whole of the Site was accessible. A full photographic record of the potential development sites and their relationship to the existing heritage assets was made (Plates 1-14, Fig. 13).

2.6.2 No unrecorded heritage assets were visible during the walkover survey. No new features or previously unknown modern disturbance were visible during the walkover survey.

2.7 Archaeological Excavations and Surveys
2.7.1 To date Oxford Archaeology East have conducted three phases of archaeological test pitting at Beechwood Park school. This work was undertaken as an Education and Outreach project, in conjunction with Mr Tim Rowe and the Beechwood Park School Archaeology Group, aided by parents and teachers from the school.

2.7.2 A first phase of geophysical survey was carried out by Peter Masters of Cranfield University on the lawn to the south-east of the school entrance in 2010. This revealed possible walls, surfaces and garden features that were initially thought to be associated with the 13th century Benedictine Nunnery of St Giles In The Wood that once stood on ground now occupied by the school, but whose exact position has never been verified. It had been thought that it occupied a piece of land in the field to the east of the school frontage but the geophysical survey, and latterly archaeological investigation, have now suggested otherwise.

2.7.3 As a result, six test pits were excavated within this area that revealed a series of garden features and walls along with compressed chalk surfaces. The latter was thought to relate to pathways and areas of garden that have long since disappeared. Nothing however, could be attributed to the nunnery itself, although medieval pottery found gave an indication that occupation lay close by.

2.7.4 The second phase of excavation, in 2011, sought to find further evidence for the location of the Nunnery. A further six test pits were opened on the lawn to the north of the school entrance. These uncovered substantial flint walls; several phases of construction were also apparent. Cobbled surfaces were also recorded. The structural remains included the putative base of a pillar or plinth. Medieval pottery was found
along with a small crystal thought to be from a ring and the base of a candle holder. Furthermore, copper alloy pins and a double eyed needle were discovered, which indicate needlework and particularly veil and net making; crafts typical within a nunnery. These features are believed to be related to the Nunnery of St Giles In The Wood.

2.7.5 Another geophysical survey was undertaken prior to the third phase of investigation, in 2012; this time with the aim of tracing the walls and features running away from those excavated during 2011. Subsequently, a series of larger trenches were opened near to the previous test pits. These revealed more walls, some of which were almost 1m in width and constructed from dressed flint. At least two phases of construction were observed, which indicate continued occupation and alteration of the site in the medieval period. Local building materials were also in evidence in the form of clunch or Totternhoe stone which was quarried in the village of Totternhoe near Dunstable. Medieval pottery and copper alloy pins were also recovered.
3 Deposit Mapping

3.1 Introduction
3.1.1 In this section, an attempt has been made to map all known monuments and events and, based on this mapping, to predict the existence of further remains within the study area. These predictions should not be used to produce ‘constraint maps’.

3.2 Prehistoric
3.2.1 There are no known prehistoric remains within either of the Proposed Development Sites or even within the Study Area as a whole. Although absence of evidence cannot be assumed to represent evidence of absence, at this stage it is considered appropriate to summarise the probability of encountering prehistoric remains within the development area as low.

3.3 Roman
3.3.1 As with the preceding period no known Roman remains are recorded within either of the Proposed Development Sites or even within the Study Area as a whole. It should be noted that the line of Roman Watling Street lies only 2.5km to the east. Despite this, and with the same caveat as attached to the prehistoric remains, it is suggested that there is a low probability that Roman remains extended within the development area.

3.4 Late Saxon and medieval
3.4.1 Based upon the available evidence, Proposed Development Sites 1 and 2 appear to lie outside of the known limit of the putative Late Saxon nunnery of St. Giles In The Wood (MHT2855). It should, however, be borne in mind that the full extent of the nunnery and its associated grounds have not been confidently defined. The location of the de Tony manor house is also a matter of conjecture, with some suggestions that it was located close to the present building. The discovery of stone coffins to the north-east of the school building in the 19th century may be significant in this regard but does not further elucidate the location of any structural remains.

3.4.2 Within, the Proposed Development Sites, the geophysical survey (Appendix A) identified possible archaeological remains in the eastern part of Site 1 (Fig. 16). These took the form of three areas of possible burning, identified tentatively as hearths/kilns, and linear anomalies forming two sides of a rectangle. These may have been associated with the modern use of Site 1 as a playing field and they certainly cannot be directly attributed to buildings appearing on the post medieval cartographic sources. It does, however, remain a possibility that they represent remains pre-dating the post medieval period.

3.4.3 As a result, Site 1 in particular may have some potential for the survival of archaeological remains from this period. Furthermore, the locations of both Potential Development Sites are of interest for the purposes of enhancing our understanding of the extent of Late Saxon activity with the Study Area, even if only to rule them out as areas of settlement.

3.4.4 In summary there is a moderate probability that Late Saxon and medieval remains extended within the development area.

3.5 Post-medieval
3.5.1 The cartographic evidence (detailed in Section 2.3) suggests that there has been little change within the Proposed Development Sites since the mid 16th century; both of
which lay in the wider grounds (Site 1) or gardens (Site 2) of the estate and were not built on. Much of the data relating to the post medieval period within the vicinity of the Proposed Development Sites relates to Listed Buildings associated with Beechwood Park.

3.5.2 In summary there is a high probability of encountering post medieval remains within the Potential Development Sites. However, the wealth and detail of sources make it unlikely that any major post-medieval remains, which are not already documented, will be encountered.

4 DEGREE OF SURVIVAL

4.1 Assessment

4.1.1 This section broadly assesses the degree of survival of archaeological remains in the areas defined by deposit mapping. The assessment takes the form of a prediction model based on probability and not certainty. It is intended as a guide only.

4.1.2 Based upon the available evidence, it is suggested that neither of the Potential Development Sites are likely to have been subject to much truncation until at least the post medieval period. The survival of structural remains attributed to the nunnery of St Giles In The Wood, to the east of Beechwood House, may be taken as a reliable indicator that any archaeological remains surviving within the Proposed Development Sites will be well preserved.

4.1.3 There are however, two factors to consider pertaining to the likely degree of survival. Firstly, the Capability Brown Survey and Plan indicates that there was some re-alignment of the garden features to the front of the house, and alterations to the course of the avenue approaching the house, in the vicinity of Site 1. It is possible that some landscaping may have been undertaken as part of these works. While this should be borne in mind when considering the degree of survival of earlier remains, the absence of more detailed plans mean that at this stage the extent of any resulting truncations or disturbance, and whether or not they extended into Site 1, are impossible to ascertain.

4.1.4 Secondly, the geophysical survey identified modern ferrous disturbance at both Sites 1 and 2, although the extent of vertical truncation implied by this is not clear. The line of a sewer pipe, which is likely to have caused major truncation along its line was recorded in the northern part of Site 1. The remaining anomalies in this area are likely to have been relatively ephemeral and perhaps associated with the more recent use of Site 1 as a playing field. At Site 2, a former gravel path and other weakly magnetic curvilinear anomalies may have been associated with the formal garden layout (Appendix A). This is corroborated by the later cartographic evidence, which suggests there may have been minor landscaping associated with the gardens. Again, this is unlikely to have severely impacted any underlying archaeological deposits.

4.2 Rating

4.2.1 Based on the distribution of known finds and their degree of survival in the Study Area, as defined in the previous sections, rating can be summarised as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Distribution</th>
<th>Survival</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prehistoric Roman</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Saxon and medieval</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5 IMPACT ASSESSMENT ON DESIGNATED HERITAGE ASSETS AND HISTORIC LANDSCAPE

5.1 Discussion of the Heritage Assets

5.1.1 The 1km radius search area around the Potential Development Sites contains HER records including monuments and historic buildings. Study of historic maps has clarified the historic land use of the Potential Development Sites and the wider area.

5.1.2 There are eight Listed Buildings within the Study Area. Beechwood Park School and the walls of the adjoining walled garden (MHT10236) are Grade 1 listed. The remaining entries comprise Grade II listings and include the Ice House (MHT6098), sun dial (DHT2475), four garden urns (DHTs 2268, 2684, 2269 & 2685) and gate piers and steps associated with the walled garden (DHTs 2267 & 2473). Of these listings the Ice House, one of the garden urns (DHT2684) and the sun dial (DHT2475) appear to fall within the bounds of Site 2.

5.1.3 The other Heritage Assets within the Study Area are Beechwood Park itself (MHT15712), the probable site of St Giles’ Priory (MHT2855), Dean Lane (common) (MHT12522) which is located between Dean Wood and Babies Wood. Of these, the most significant potential archaeological resource is the site of St Giles' Priory.

5.1.4 Using the criteria in Table 1 the rating of the importance of the potential archaeological resource within the 1km search area is considered low/medium.

5.2 Potential Impacts on Heritage Assets

5.2.1 This report forms part of a pre-planning application for additional school buildings at Beechwood Park School. Two Potential Development Sites have been identified but as yet, no detailed plans for the construction of new buildings have been submitted. The potential impact to the below ground remains outlined below is therefore based on impacts typically associated with construction and associated works.

5.2.2 The proposed development has the potential to have a direct permanent impact upon any archaeological remains. The excavation of foundation and service trenches will undoubtedly lead to the truncation of any underlying archaeological remains.

5.2.3 Furthermore, any temporary works compounds set up for the construction phase, and permanent or temporary vehicle access ways into and within the site, can involve considerable ground disturbance to a significant depth, which is also likely to have an impact on any archaeological remains.

5.2.4 Based on current knowledge the magnitude of impact as per Table 2 is considered to be of moderate/major severity to below ground remains. The significance of environmental effects on below ground remains as set out in Table 3 is considered to be moderate large.

5.3 Historic Landscape

5.3.1 Beechwood Park itself is listed (MHT15712) and there are elements of the landscaping undertaken in the 1750s, by Capability Brown, surviving within the estate. Although some of the land has reverted to arable farming and there have been numerous alterations to Beechwood House in the intervening years, areas of planting and a ha-ha are undoubtedly the result of Brown's work. However, its full scope, and the extent to which his plans were implemented, is not clear. Nonetheless, the site is undoubtedly an important 18th century designed landscape and a fine example of one of Capability Brown's earliest works.
5.3.2 Many of the designated Heritage Assets within the Study Area relate to features integral to the historic landscape. These include Beechwood House (MHT10236) and the polygonal walled kitchen gardens, whose walls are of 17th and 18th century red brick construction (DHTs 2267 & 2473), both of which are Grade 1 Listed. An early 19th century sundial, and four garden urns, made c.1860, are Grade II Listed and comprise surviving elements of the High Victorian gardens. The Ice House (MHT6098) is also Grade II Listed.

5.3.3 The coherence and integrity of the historic landscape has been affected over the years by re-modelling of the buildings and parkland and a return to arable farming in parts of the wider landscape. Perhaps the most significant impact has been alterations and additions to the School buildings since the 1960s.

5.3.4 The Landscape is a well established designated landscape and as such, using the criteria in Table 1, the importance of the historic landscape is considered to be medium to high.

5.3.5 Any further construction with in the grounds of the school will undoubtedly modify the historic landscape, however, based upon the walkover survey (Fig. 13, Plates 1-14) it is felt that the two Proposed Development Sites are likely to have differing impacts upon the setting and as such they are discussed separately below.

Site 1

5.3.6 Site 1 lies approximately 80m to the south-east of Beechwood House, immediately adjacent to the south of the avenue approaching the house. To the west are a number of modern buildings and the area is currently given over to sports fields. It is situated at the base of an undulation in the land, which rises to the south, west and east, resulting in the site being relatively unintrusive within the context of the landscape. Upon approaching the house (Plate 10), the area is shielded from view by the line of trees on the western side of the avenue and at no point on the approach would it obscure the views of Beechwood house itself. Viewed from this direction (Plates 10 & 11), its setting in front of modern buildings would be of little further detriment to the existing landscape.

5.3.7 Viewed from the south-east, the site is also quite well sheltered by the rise in ground level (Plates12-13). It is felt that a low lying structure would have little impact on the views of the House or parkland from this angle. The same is true of Site 1 when viewed from the south (Plate 14), although it should be noted that from this angle the views of the parkland might be obstructed, depending upon the height of any new build.

5.3.8 When viewed from the forecourt of Beechwood House, Site 1 would certainly have an impact on what is currently an unbroken view across the parkland and sports fields to the south-east.

5.3.9 Using the criteria in Table 2 the magnitude of impact to the historic landscape is minor/moderate. The overall significance of environmental effects to the historic landscape is considered to be moderate to slight.

Site 2

5.3.10 Site 2 lies immediately to the west and north of Beechwood House, in the area previously given over to yards and gardens. It is situated on level ground that stretches westwards almost to the line of the ha-ha and encompasses the area of the Ice House (MHT6098), one of the garden urns (DHT2684) and the sun dial (DHT2475).

5.3.11 In general, the development of this site would have a far greater impact upon the Historic Landscape. Viewed from the trackway leading north-westwards away from the
school Site 2 is sheltered from view by trees (Plate 3). However, once to the west of the line of the main buildings the situation of this development would have a number of quite detrimental impacts. Firstly, it is felt that any development in this area would remove the Ice House from its context in relation to the main buildings by completely obscuring the view of one from the other (Plates 4 & 5). The same would be true of the sundial, which is situated near to the Ice House.

5.3.12 Secondly, as noted above, the western edge of the Proposed Development Site extends right up to an extant portion of the ha ha and ornamental steps leading northwards (Plates 5, 6 & 9). The suggested extent of the development would also encompass one of the garden urns (DHT2684) (Plate 9). The effect of any development within the suggested footprint of Site 2 will be twofold. Specifically, there is very likely to be a direct physical impact on these features and there will also be an adverse impact on their setting and the cohesion and integrity of the surviving post medieval landscaping.

5.3.13 Viewed from further to the west and south-west (Plates 7 & 8) Site 2 is likely to result in the partial obscuring of the western aspect of Beechwood House.

5.3.14 Using the criteria in Table 2 the magnitude of impact to the historic landscape is major. The overall significance of environmental effects to the historic landscape is considered to be large/very large.
6 CONCLUSIONS

6.1.1 The aim of this assessment was to determine the archaeological potential of two Proposed Development Sites within the grounds of Beechwood Park School. Also to conduct a Heritage Impact Assessment to determine the likely impact that development of the sites in question would have on the existing Heritage Assets. It is important to state that a lack of excavation and survey within the site itself does not mean a low potential.

6.1.2 Historical sources and archaeological investigations near to the school have shown there is overall a low probability of pre-Saxon remains surviving in either of the Proposed Development Sites.

6.1.3 These sources have also shown that there is a moderate possibility of encountering Late Saxon and medieval remains. The proximity of the site to the putative Late Saxon nunnery of St Giles In The Wood make the Potential Development Sites of some interest to considerations of our understanding of the development of the ecclesiastical, and possibly manorial estate, during the Late Saxon and medieval period.

6.1.4 During the post-medieval and modern periods, the numerous cartographic sources demonstrate that the Beechwood House and to a lesser extent the park and gardens, have been subject to numerous phases of construction and re-modelling by its various owners and, in the later 20th century, by the School itself.

6.1.5 Overall it is felt that the preservation of any below ground remains will be good, for all periods. However, the geophysical survey does indicate some truncation by modern activity and did not identify with any certainty the presence of significant archaeological deposits.

6.1.6 With regards the impact that either of the development sites will have on the Heritage Assets and Historic Landscape, it is suggested that of the two sites Site 1 would, overall, be less detrimental to the cohesion and integrity of the Historic Landscape and would have little direct impact on the Heritage Assets identified by this study. Conversely, the location of Site 2 would have a major impact on both the landscape and Heritage Assets.
APPENDIX A. GEOPHYSICAL SURVEY

By Pete Masters

Introduction

A.1.1 A gradiometer survey was carried out at Beechwood Park School, St Albans, Hertfordshire on behalf of OA East in February 2014. This work formed part of the pre-planning process to construct a new school building and associated car parking area on the existing site. Two areas (Sites 1 & 2) were surveyed: one to the south of the main front and the other to the rear of the existing building.

A.1.2 Three strong dipolar anomalies were revealed in Site 1 that may reflect the presence of burning or the remains of a kiln/hearth. It is possible that these may also indicate the presence of metal posts. A series of linear and rectilinear ephemeral anomalies probably denote variations in the underlying geology or may relate to the sports playing fields.

A.1.3 The remains of a gravel path that runs parallel to the Ha-ha and leading to a series of steps at the northern end were revealed in Site 2. Other anomalies depict the presence of either garden features or modern ferrous disturbances. No other anomalies of an archaeological nature were recorded. The purpose of the survey was to attempt to define and characterise any surviving archaeological remains in the proposed areas for development. The survey methodology described in this report was based upon guidelines set out in the English Heritage document ‘Geophysical Survey in Archaeological Field Evaluation’ (EH 2008).

Methodology

Gradiometry

A.1.4 Gradiometry is a non-intrusive scientific prospecting technique used to determine the presence/absence of some classes of sub-surface archaeological features (e.g. pits, ditches, kilns, and occasionally stone walls). By scanning the soil surface, geophysicists identify areas of varying magnetic susceptibility and can interpret such variation by presenting data in various graphical formats and identifying images that share morphological affinities with diagnostic archaeological as well as other detectable remains (Clark 1990).

A.1.5 The use of gradiometry is used to establish the presence/absence of buried magnetic anomalies, which may reflect sub-surface archaeological features. The area survey was conducted using a Bartington Grad 601 dual fluxgate gradiometer with DL601 data logger set to take 4 readings per metre (a sample interval of 0.25m). The zigzag traverse method of survey was used, with 1m wide traverses across 20m x 20m grids. The sensitivity of the machine was set to detect magnetic variation in the order of 0.1 nanoTesla. The data was processed using Archeosurveyor v.2. The results are plotted as greyscale and trace plot images (Figs. 3-5).

A.1.6 The enhanced data was processed by using zero-mean functions to correct the unevenness of the image in order to produce a smoother graphical appearance. It was also processed using an algorithm to remove magnetic spikes, thereby reducing extreme readings caused by stray iron fragments and spurious effects due to the inherent magnetism of soils. The data was also clipped to reduce the distorting effect of extremely high or low readings caused by discrete pieces of ferrous metal.
Interpretation and analysis of results (figs 3-5)

A.1.7 Two areas were surveyed by gradiometer: one to the south-east of the present school buildings and the other to the north-west in the garden surrounding the ice house. Generally, a series of isolated individual anomalies were detected in both areas (Fig. 5, examples circled in pink) that reflect zones of modern ferrous litter, which lie just below or on the surface of the ground.

Site 1

A.1.8 Three large amorphous zones of magnetic variation (Figs 3 and 5, pink outline) denote the presence of modern ferrous disturbance. A strong magnetic linear anomaly (Figs 3 and 5, blue line) aligned south-west – north-east indicates the presence of a sewer pipe. A series of modern drain covers are located close by. To the north of the sewer pipe, two positive linear anomalies were recorded (Figs 3 and 5, blue lines) and these probably reflect the presence of pipes connected to the drains from the main sewer pipe. An ephemeral sub-oval shaped anomaly (Figs 3 and 5, 1) possibly denotes variation in the natural deposits or is more likely to be associated with the sports field.

A.1.9 Three dipolar anomalies (Figs 3 and 5, 2) were detected indicating the presence of kiln-like remains or areas of burning. Alternatively, these may reflect the presence of metal posts buried in the ground considering that the area is used as a sports field. A linear and rectilinear weakly magnetic anomalies (Figs 3 and 5, 3) were recorded probably associated with the sports field as former marked lines. No other anomalies of archaeological significance were detected.

Site 2

A.1.10 A linear strong magnetic anomaly (Figs 4 and 5, 4) running parallel to the ha-ha denotes the presence of a former garden path. The path leads to a steps inside the ha-ha and once formed part of the formal Victorian garden.

A.1.11 Other ephemeral curvilinear anomalies (Figs 4 and 5, 5) may be related to the buried remains of the formal Victorian garden. Other anomalies recorded in the resultant plots reflect modern magnetic noise. No other anomalies of archaeological significance were detected.

Conclusions

A.1.12 Site 1 produced three individual dipolar anomalies that may indicate the presence of burnt remains or possibly kiln type features. Two ephemeral linear and curvilinear anomalies were detected that may reflect the presence of former line markings for the sports field. An ephemeral sub-oval shaped anomaly was also detected which may reflect a feature associated with the sports field. However, it is more likely that these may resolve as underlying variations in the soils and geology given the nature of the area of investigation. Other magnetic anomalies present in the resultant image reflect modern disturbances that include services and modern ferrous debris.

A.1.13 Site 2 revealed the presence of a former gravel path and other weakly magnetic curvilinear anomalies that may have been associated with the formal garden layout. It can be concluded that the gradiometer survey has produced few significant archaeological anomalies.
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APPENDIX B. HER ENTRIES

Record Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2855</td>
<td>Probable site of St Giles' Priory, Beechwood House, Flamstead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6098</td>
<td>Ice-house, Beechwood Park, Flamstead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10236</td>
<td>Beechwood House, Flamstead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12522</td>
<td>Dean Lane (common), between Dean Wood and Babies Wood, Flamstead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15712</td>
<td>Beechwood Park, Markyate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Record Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15712</td>
<td>Beechwood Park, Markyate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Map Sheet: Tl01sw

Grid Reference: TL 0457 1450 (point)

Summary: Park worked on by Capability Brown, but now largely farmland; elements of the Victorian gardens survive

Description: The park at Beechwood [10236] is supposed to have been landscaped by Lancelot Brown in the 1750s; but 'Brown's task apparently was to thin out rather than to plant on any extensive scale'. There is an undated but apparently 19th century plan of the park in the Herts record office, but the house has been a school for many years and much of the park has reverted to arable. Some trees survive, and a ha-ha. This is 'an important 18th century designed landscape with remnants of one of Capability Brown's earliest works, incorporating the dower house at Cheverells [15270] and the eyecatcher at Hill Farm' [10247]. In the 19th century the gardens were laid out in high Victorian style; some details survive. The polygonal walled kitchen garden has walls of 17th and 18th century red brick. For details, and for Brown's work. The listed structures include an early 19th century sundial, and four garden urns made c.1860 but re-using 18th century Portland stone pedestals. The enormous bowls, about 1m across, are in buff terracotta. Those on the east front 'were probably installed when the line of the drive was set back from immediately outside the entrance door in 1860'. For the ice-house, see [6098]. The c.1838 tithe map shows a stableyard in the area of the ice-house, at an angle to the house itself and sheltered by trees. The 1878 os map shows the trees and a remodelled or rebuilt stableyard in line with the house, the sundial on a lawn west of the main block and a path from the kitchen garden stretching for 330m in a straight line to a structure at the nw end. This layout may be part of the alterations in high Victorian style c.1860. It is not in fact clear which parts, if any, of Brown's 1754
proposals for the park were carried out and when, ‘he intended to modify the existing layout by curving the straight edges of the blocks of woodland, to vary and define their planting, and to introduce meandering walks. The kitchen gardens were to be screened; small ponds and the existing avenues would be retained, and additions would include a ha-ha, a temple, and other decorative structures. The 1766 map shows little change, but parts of the scheme may have been carried out later. ‘views of the early 19th century park show the house still surrounded by large trees in undulating parkland and a pond remaining on the entrance front’.

Monument/Component Types

- Landscape park (post medieval – 1501 ad to 1900 ad)
- Walled garden (post medieval – 1501 ad to 1900 ad)

Designations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Type/grade</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Reference/title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DHT2266</td>
<td>Listed building (i)</td>
<td>157786</td>
<td>Beechwood Park School and walls of walled garden adjoining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHT2268</td>
<td>Listed building (ii)</td>
<td>157792</td>
<td>garden urn at Beechwood Park School (40 metres to north of main entrance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHT2684</td>
<td>Listed building (ii)</td>
<td>157791</td>
<td>sundial at Beechwood Park School (30 metres to west south west of library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHT2475</td>
<td>Listed building (ii)</td>
<td>157795</td>
<td>garden urn at Beechwood Park School (25 metres to west of library)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHT2269</td>
<td>Listed building (ii)</td>
<td>157794</td>
<td>garden urn at Beechwood Park School (55 metres west south west of dining room bay window)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHT2685</td>
<td>Listed building (ii)</td>
<td>157793</td>
<td>garden urn at Beechwood Park School (40 metres to south east of main entrance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHT2267</td>
<td>Listed building (ii)</td>
<td>157789</td>
<td>gate, piers and steps at west gate to walled garden at Beechwood Park School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHT2473</td>
<td>Listed building (ii)</td>
<td>157788</td>
<td>gate, piers, and steps at south gate to walled garden at Beechwood Park School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Record details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>2855</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Probable site of St Giles' Priory, Beechwood House, Flamstead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map sheet:</td>
<td>TL01sw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grid reference:</td>
<td>TL 0456 1447 (point)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary:</td>
<td>12th century nunnery, succeeded by the post-medieval country house</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description:
St Giles in the Wood Priory for Benedictine nuns was founded at Flamstead c.1150 by Roger De Tode (or Tony). It became impoverished after the black death, and was dissolved in 1537. The site is marked on os 6" 1960 at TL 0794 1478 (at Flamstead) though no corroborative evidence is apparent. The more probable site is at TL045 144, according to a former headmaster of Beechwood Park School, on the grounds of documentary evidence which suggests that Beechwood House [10236] was built at or close to the nunnery; the flint-walled cellars of the extant house may be its remains. A late 19th century 'history of Flamstead' (?the Same 'documentary source') reported that 'nunnery graves' were discovered when altering the forecourt immediately NE of Beechwood House. By 1700 Chauncy remarks that there were no remains of the monastic buildings still standing. However, notes that in 1754 Capability Brown prepared plans for an ice-house [6098] to be built in 'the cellar of old farm house'; the ice-house survives c.30 yds west of the north wing of the house. In 1998, observation of the groundworks for a new classroom block did not reveal any medieval structural evidence, and only two sherds of medieval grey ware pottery were recovered. Test pits dug by the school on the lawn in front of the house in 2012 revealed masonry foundations.

Monument/component types

- Monastery (medieval – 1066 ad to 1500 ad)
- Nunnery (medieval – 1066 ad to 1500 ad)
**Record details**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Id</th>
<th>6098</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Ice-house, Beechwood Park, Flamstead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map sheet</td>
<td>TI01sw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grid reference</td>
<td>TL 0446 1451 (point)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>18th century country house amenity, possibly designed by Capability Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Ice-house, c.30 yds (27 m) west of the north wing of the present Beechwood Park. The plans were prepared in 1754 by 'capability' brown, who designed 'an ice house to be built ... in the cellar of old farm house'. Brown also designed a Gothic folly in the form of the west end of a church, said to have been a bath-house. The plan is inscribed 'this front to stand obliquely in order to show its side in perspective to the windows of the house', but it is not known whether it was built. For the house, see [10236]; for the park, see [15712]. The ice-house is within an earthen mound, and built of red and purple brick. How this relates to the 1754 plans is uncertain.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Monument/component types**
- Folly (post medieval – 1501 ad to 1900 ad)
- Ice-house (post medieval – 1501 ad to 1900 ad)

**Designations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Type/grade</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Reference/title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DHT2778</td>
<td>Listed building (ii)</td>
<td>157790</td>
<td>Ice house at Beechwood Park School (30 metres to west of north stables)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Record details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>10236</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Beechwood House, Flamstead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map sheet:</td>
<td>TI01sw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grid reference:</td>
<td>TL 04540 14485 (point)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary:</td>
<td>Large 17th and 18th century country house in its own park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>Beechwood Park is a large country house, on or near the site of a Benedictine nunnery [2855] which passed into private hands at the dissolution, and is now a school. It was built in three main phases in the 17th and 18th centuries, the first probably in the 1660s. The then owner was Thomas Saunders, who probably erected the 'fair brick house, of the figure of a Roman h' recorded by chauncy in 1700. This house, a main range flanked by two wings, is incorporated in the present building. His successor, sir Edward Sebright, added another block in front of Saunders' house, to form a closed courtyard, and in the early 18th century a 'great room', now the library, was added. This was the only element built of an undated design for rebuilding the west front attributed to roger morris. In 1754 'capability' brown prepared plans for adding two matching wings to the n and s of Saunders' house, similar to the present wings. Brown's plans also included an ice-house [6098]. In 1759 a rebuilding involving demolition of the library was proposed but not executed, and at about this time a covered passage was perhaps built to link the front block to Saunders' house. Further projects were carried out between 1760 and the end of the 1800s, including the remodelling of the library in 1804, roofing in the courtyard, extensions to offices on the south side, a new saloon, and a new billiard room and stables grouped round a court to the north. Early in the 20th century the billiard room became a coach-house and the chapel a 'motor house'. Much of the estate was sold in 1935; the Sebrights moved to Cheverells, and beechwood was rented. By 1961 it had been sold, to become Beechwood Park School. In 1998 wall foundation trenches and service trenches for a new classroom at the rear of the house uncovered several post-medieval wall footings. One was for a wall of the kitchen garden, and one possibly a garden boundary wall (pre-dating the ha-ha). The remainder are not attributable to known structures, but they are likely to be late since this area once formed part of the gardens. The finds, as well as two medieval sherds, included clay pipe stems, oyster, broken 18th century wine bottles, and 19th century pottery. For the park, see [15712].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Monument/component types

- Country house (post medieval – 1501 ad to 1900 ad)

Designations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type/grade</th>
<th>Reference/title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shrine</td>
<td>Probable site of St Giles' Priory; Beechwood House, Flamstead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listed building (i)</td>
<td>157786 Beechwood Park School and walls of walled garden adjoining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listed building (ii)</td>
<td>157792 garden urn at Beechwood Park School (40 metres to north of main entrance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listed building (ii)</td>
<td>157791 sundial at Beechwood Park School (30 metres to west south west of library)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listed building (ii)</td>
<td>157795 garden urn at Beechwood Park School (25 metres to west of library)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listed building (ii)</td>
<td>157794 garden urn at Beechwood Park School (55 metres to west south west of dining room bay window)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listed building (ii)</td>
<td>157793 garden urn at Beechwood Park School (40 metres to south east of main entrance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listed building (ii)</td>
<td>157789 gate, piers and steps at west gate to walled garden at Beechwood Park School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listed building (ii)</td>
<td>157788 gate, piers, and steps at south gate to walled garden at Beechwood Park School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Record details**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Id</th>
<th>12522</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Dean Lane (common), between Dean Wood and Babies Wood, Flamstead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map sheet:</td>
<td>Tl01sw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grid reference:</td>
<td>TL 0466 1404 (point)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>Registered common land. Ngr = approximate centre.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Monument/component types**

- Common land (historic: period uncertain – 410 ad to 1900 ad)
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---
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Figure 1: Site location showing proposed development sites 1 and 2 outlined (red)
Figure 2: HER plot
Figure 3: The 1753 Capability Brown Survey
Figure 4: The 1754 Capability Brown Plan with Gothic Folly and Ice House Sketches

Re-produced by kind permission of Beechwood Park School
Figure 6: Bryant Map (1822)
Figure 7: The 1838 Tithe Map
Figure 8: 1:2,500 1878 OS Map
Figure 11: 1:2,500 1924 OS Map
Figure 12: 1:2,500 1976 OS Map
Figure 13: Site plan showing plate locations
Figure 14: Area 1 – Grey scale and trace plots of raw and enhanced data, scale – 1:1000
Figure 15: Area 2 – Grey scale and trace plots of raw and enhanced data, scale – 1:1000
Plate 1: View from the entrance to Beechwood Park School

Plate 2: View of Beechwood School from Row End
Plate 3: View of Proposed Development Site 2, from north

Plate 4: View of Proposed Development Site 2, the ice house
Plate 5: View of Proposed Development Site 2, from south-east

Plate 6: View of Proposed Development Site 2, from south
Plate 7: View of Proposed Development Site 2 from west

Plate 8: View of Proposed Development Site 2 from south-west
Plate 9: View of Proposed Development Site 2 from south

Plate 10: View of Proposed Development Site 1 from approach road
Plate 11: View of Proposed Development Site 1 from east

Plate 12: View of Proposed Development Site 1 from south-east
Plate 13: View of Proposed Development Site 1 from south-east

Plate 14: View of Proposed Development Site 1 from south
Plate 15: View of Proposed Development Site 1 from north-west