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USING THIS DOCUMENT

When using this document in an electronic format, click on the section names or page numbers in the main Contents or the section contents to navigate the report.

Within the text, references to other sections can be clicked on to navigate to the relevant section.

Clicking the 'Contents' button will return you to the contents page.

Clicking the 'back' button will return you to the page you were previously viewing.
THE ABBEY OF ST EDMUND

The Abbey of St Edmund was one of the wealthiest and most powerful abbeys in medieval England, cherishing at its heart the shrine of St Edmund, which attracted pilgrims from across Christendom. Although the Dissolution of the Abbey in 1539 plucked the mighty Abbey from its position of control of the town and Liberty of St Edmund and erased many of the Abbey buildings, 500 years later, the Abbey’s precinct remains a clearly discernible unit in the town of Bury St Edmunds.

The Heritage Partnership is formed from many of the owners and interested parties associated with the former Abbey site. Its vision is that the site would be treasured and enjoyed by a range of people who appreciate its heritage significance in the past and the present. The Conservation Plan has been commissioned to understand the heritage significance of the site and to form an approach to its future conservation and enhancement. The Conservation Plan has been prepared following the recently completed Heritage Assessment by Richard Hoggett Heritage, which explores in detail the history and archaeology of the site. This assessment should be read alongside the Conservation Plan.

The Conservation Plan includes a simple summary of the project area, its setting and history based on the Heritage Assessment. It provides an assessment of the heritage significance of the overall project area and each of the 15 sub-areas into which it has been divided. Part I of the Conservation Plan also explores the issues and opportunities associated with the site and articulates a Conservation Framework for its ongoing care and enhancement. Part I is intended for use by anyone who may be involved with planning or undertaking change on the site. Although it may be used to inform proposals, it has no status as a formal planning document and does not form part of the statutory decision-making process which rests with the local planning authority, Historic England and, where relevant the Cathedrals Fabric Commission for England and the local Fabric Advisory Committee. Part II of the Conservation Plan provides a basis for the Heritage Partnership to develop proposals for the project area to realise their vision for the Abbey of St Edmund.

THE SITE

The whole of the Abbey precinct and the areas associated with the Abbey to the north-east (the former Eastgate Nursery and Minden Close) and south-east (the Crankles and No Mans Meadow) form the Abbey of St Edmund project area (see map on page 8).

The site encompasses buildings and landscapes that date from the eleventh century onwards. Below the site there is buried archaeology associated with the Anglo-Saxon and pre-historic periods as well as archaeology associated with the Abbey and post-medieval periods.

An exceptionally rich collection of heritage assets is found within the project area including 21 Grade I listed buildings, three Grade II* listed buildings and over 115 Grade II listed buildings and structures (most of the latter are memorials in the Great Churchyard). Much of the site is designated a scheduled monument, protecting the archaeology below ground as well as above. The Chapel of the Charnel is a separate scheduled monument. The Abbey Gardens is a Grade II registered park and most of the site falls within the Bury St Edmunds Conservation Area.

The Abbey of St Edmund area has retained most of its medieval precinct walls although some of these have been incorporated into houses on Angel Hill and Honey Hill. Two fine gates, the Norman Tower and the fourteenth century Abbey Gate, are located on the west side. Across the river is the twelfth century Abbot’s Bridge. At the centre of the precinct are the exposed ruins of the Abbey Church and some of the claustral buildings. The west end of the ruined Abbey church contains a unique row of houses. The medieval parish church of St Mary is located at the south-west corner of the Great Churchyard, which is no longer used for burials. To the north is the Cathedral, formerly the parish church of St James. Smaller buildings of a variety of periods run along the north, west and south sides of the precinct walls including Abbey House. This formed the main house when the Abbey Gardens were a private estate. Other larger residential properties within the site include the 1830s Alwyne House to the north and the multi-phase 1 and 2 Abbey Precincts to the south together with three small, early nineteenth century cottages. The Deanery is a fine eighteenth century red brick building originally built as almshouses for the poor of the parishes. To the south is the neo-classical former Magistrates’ Court. Many of the buildings in the south-east part of the site and on the east bank are modern and provide a variety of community uses from an NHS clinic and a pre-school to a care home and sheltered housing. The Abbey Gardens, which occupies much of the precinct, includes a large area of formal bedding that was once a Botanic Garden, several smaller gardens of different characters, an aviary and a children’s playground.

The project area is owned by many different organisations and individuals (Section 2.5) and some parts of the site are managed by a different organisation from the one that owns them. The principal owners within the project area are:

- the Cathedral Chapter of St Edmundsbury, which owns the Cathedral (including the Norman Tower), which is under EHT’s guardianship, Abbey House, 31–34 Angel Hill, 3 Crown Street, the Deanery and 1 and 2 Abbey Precincts;
- the Parochial Church Council for St Mary’s Church, which owns the church and land immediately around it;
- Suffolk County Council, which owns the Crankles, Minden Close and the sites of the pre-school and clinic; and
- the Diocesan Board of Finance, which owns St James’ Middle School.

Whilst the site has many uses and meanings, the Conservation Plan focuses on the site’s heritage and evaluates the site in relation to its heritage significance.
SUMMARY HISTORY

By the reign of Æthelstan (924–939) the body of St Edmund had been transferred to a religious institution that had been founded possibly in the seventh century at Beodricsworth. St Edmund became England’s first patron saint. One of the first English kings, also Edmund, endowed the Abbey with lands and rights across most of West Suffolk. The Abbey grew in wealth and power and the eleventh century abbot, Baldwin, began a campaign of building that created one of the largest churches in medieval Europe. Under Abbot Anselm in the early twelfth century, the Abbey precinct was expanded with two impressive gates in its high stone walls. He also rebuilt the two parish churches in their current locations, which were subsequently rebuilt again in the later medieval period.

In 1214, a group of barons, under the guise of making a pilgrimage, met at the Abbey to lay the foundations of the Magna Carta, which would be presented to King John at Runnymede.

Although the relationship was symbiotic, tensions had long simmered between the Abbey and the town of Bury St Edmunds. The town owed its existence to the Abbey but, by the fourteenth century, it was being denied the rights and freedoms enjoyed by many towns smaller than Bury St Edmunds. The Abbey was repeatedly attacked by the townspeople, notably in 1327, which resulted in the rebuilding of the Abbey Gate. Disasters occurred in the fourteenth century with the collapse of parts of the Abbey church and major fires. In 1539, as part of Henry VIII’s Dissolution of the Monasteries, the Abbey was surrendered and many of the buildings stripped of materials.

Following the Dissolution, the precinct was divided up and secular buildings began to be constructed. This included the construction of houses around remains of the ruined West Front that were largely built by the eighteenth century. The erection of buildings along the street frontages, which had begun in the later medieval period, continued after the Dissolution and some existing buildings were extended beyond the precinct walls into the former Abbey site. Clapton Asylum, now the Deanery, was built in 1744 as almshouses.

Interest in antiquity, starting in the seventeenth century and surging in the eighteenth, led to investigations and documentation of the former Abbey. The same Enlightenment thirst for knowledge led to the creation of the Botanic Garden in 1821 by Nathaniel Hodson and its relocation in 1831. The original focus on scientific understanding gave way to an increasingly ornamental planting of the gardens to attract paying visitors by the end of the century. It was opened as a free public park in 1912 and the central beds were laid out in 1937.

The nineteenth century also witnessed further building development, including the restoration of the Norman Tower, the demolition of abutting buildings and extensive works to St James’ Church by George Gilbert Scott. St James’ Church underwent a major transformation the following century, when in 1914 it became the Cathedral. From the 1960s, it was transformed to designs by Stephen Dykes Bower. The central Millennium Tower was completed in 2005.

SUMMARY OF HERITAGE SIGNIFICANCE

Principal amongst the many layers of the heritage significance of the Abbey of St Edmund project area is the heritage significance associated with particular aspects of the medieval Abbey. Historically, the international and national heritage significance of the site was as the location of the shrine of St Edmund, the focal point for pilgrims from across western Christendom. Today, the site’s international and national heritage significance arguably arises from it being the place where the Magna Carta, which established important principles of English law and so law across the world, was incubated.

Nationally, the project area is significant as a rare assemblage of monastic remains in an urban location which still demonstrates, in its layout, the symbiotic relationship between the Abbey and the town. The site further illustrates not only the tremendous destruction that accompanied the Dissolution but the underlying purpose of the Dissolution to crush rival sources of power to the Crown thus making it a nationally significant example. The visible medieval remains are complemented by a significant documentary archive and substantial below ground archaeology as the evidence of nearly the entire precinct is intact and preserved.

Locally, the Abbey site is woven into the lives of the community, as it has been for centuries in different ways. Many of the later uses continued or continue aspects of framework of community life and provision previously supplied by the Abbey and so create parallels across the centuries.

The evidential, historical, aesthetic and communal heritage values of the project area as a whole are all high.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

CONSERVATION FRAMEWORK
Conservation is the process of managing change to a significant place to ensure that what makes the place significant is retained and where possible enhanced. This Conservation Plan sets out a Conservation Framework that includes a conservation philosophy that articulates the overall approach to the conservation of the project area. It also includes policies and actions to guide decision-making about the site so that it accords with the conservation philosophy.

The Conservation Plan also provides a series of recommendations for each sub-area that will address issues in each sub-area and make the most of opportunities for enhancement.

The Conservation Plan is designed to be applied and considered immediately as well as when planning and carrying out work in the future. It should be applied to both to day-to-day activities and longer term management. The Conservation Plan should be reviewed and updated on a regular basis to ensure that it continues to be accurate and that the policies and recommendations within it remain applicable to the site.

ISSUES AND OPPORTUNITIES
There are a variety of issues that threaten the heritage values of the project area. One major issue across the project is the lack of maintenance of the scheduled monument, specifically the above ground remains. This is mostly due to lack of funding although another underlying issue is a need to clarify ownership and responsibilities across the project area. This in turn is potentially a constraint on funding for future works. Once ownership and responsibilities have been clarified, there is an opportunity to agree a standing scheduled monument consent for frequently undertaken works, which would reduce the burden of statutory control. Further key issues relate to disasters, such as flooding due to the presence of the river and climate change, which may have a significant impact on the built heritage, below ground archaeology and the site’s horticulture.

The greatest opportunity on the site relates to its interpretation. The re-presentation of the site through a variety of methods would enhance public understanding of the site’s heritage significance. Related to this are the opportunities for education, both for schools and for life-long learners and also for events that celebrate the heritage of the site. There are also opportunities for increasing the understanding of the significance of the project area through new research.

REVITALISING THE ABBEY OF ST EDMUND
The Heritage Partnership represents an exciting opportunity to bring together many interested parties to create a site that reflects its extraordinary history and heritage significance. Part II of the Conservation Plan provides assessments and recommendations to enable the development of projects for the project area, which are likely to include new interpretation, education provision, improvements to access and bringing underused or disused sites into better use.

Section 9 identifies four overarching tasks that will facilitate these changes: the investigation of a constituted organisation to lead the revitalisation of the Abbey of St Edmund; the identification of funding sources; the development of an overarching plan of projects to be undertaken; and how to obtain the necessary heritage consents.

The Abbey of St Edmund created the town of Bury St Edmonds, influenced the story of the English nation and impacted ideas of justice around the world. The site’s extraordinary buildings and the important events and people associated with them should be celebrated and conserved for present and future generations.
SECTION 1
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose and Scope of the Conservation Management Plan
1.2 Project Overview
1.3 Structure of the Document
1.4 How to Use this Document
1.5 Existing Information and Resources
1.6 Gaps in Knowledge
1.7 Consultation
1.8 Abbreviations
1.9 Glossary of Terms
1.10 Notes
1.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE CONSERVATION PLAN

Today the location of the medieval Abbey of St Edmund in a variety of ownerships and uses with buildings and landscaping that reflects the centuries of change since the Dissolution. However, the project area collectively reflects an unusually complete survival of a medieval abbey precinct in a town centre and, moreover, a town that has a long, symbiotic relationship with the Abbey, which can be seen physically in the surviving grid pattern created by early abbots. Historically the Abbey was an internationally significant pilgrimage site and one of the largest, wealthiest and most influential abbeys in England before the Dissolution with an extraordinary level of local and regional power deriving from its massive land holdings and privileges granted by the Crown. Today, its international heritage significance lies in its connection with the creation of the Magna Carta. It has resonance too as the historic location of St Edmund’s shrine. It is valued locally and regionally as a green space and a spiritual place.

The Conservation Plan has been commissioned by the Abbey of St Edmund Heritage Partnership to demonstrate the heritage value and significance of the site historically occupied by the Abbey of St Edmund. The purpose of the Conservation Plan is also to develop a strategic approach to the sustainable conservation management of the heritage assets within the site. It sets out a framework of understanding and approach that will facilitate sensitive and viable change. Additionally the brief required the Conservation Plan to consider actions and projects that the Heritage Partnership and its constituent partners could take forward to meet its vision for the site. The brief was prepared by the Heritage Partnership in discussion with St Edmundsbury Borough Council (SEBC) and Historic England, which funded the Conservation Plan.

The Conservation Plan has been prepared in the wake of a detailed Heritage Assessment by Richard Hoggett Heritage. The Heritage Assessment was based on extensive archival research and analysis of documentary sources, illustrative material and archaeological reports. It provides an account of the site’s history, focussing on the built fabric and buried archaeology, and a review of the archaeological excavations undertaken. The Conservation Plan summarises this information and should be read in conjunction with the Heritage Assessment.

At its heart, the Conservation Plan provides an assessment of the heritage significance of the site as a whole. This, with the Conservation Framework that comprises a philosophy and set of policies, should inform all future decision-making regarding the site, whether by the Heritage Partnership, its constituent partners or other owners. However, it has no status as a formal planning document and does not form part of the statutory decision-making process which rests with the local planning authority, Historic England and, where relevant the Cathedrals Fabric Commission for England and the local Fabric Advisory Committee.

The Conservation Plan also considers the current issues and opportunities associated with the site and potential projects to enhance the fabric of the site or its interpretation. In order to make the Conservation Plan usable for future works, a brief statement of significance, consideration of issues and opportunities and specific recommendations have been prepared for each sub-area.

The Conservation Plan covers principally the area within the Abbey precinct walls including the Abbey’s fishponds and vineyards together with the area east of the Abbot’s Bridge that may have been the site of some industries associated with the Abbey and No Mans Meadow. In addition, consideration is also given, though in less depth, to the areas immediately around the Abbey precinct to the north, west and south (Mustow Street, Abbey Hill, Crown Street and Honey Hill).

The Conservation Plan has been prepared by Rowenna Wood, Associate, with input from Oliver Chinn, Architect; Nick Mallinger, Heritage Consultant; Emma Healey, Assistant Heritage Consultant; Amelia Sisson and Richard Halsey, independent scholar. Advice has been provided by Jane Kennedy and Heather Jermy, Partners.
1.2 PROJECT OVERVIEW

1.2.1 The Heritage Partnership
The Abbey of St Edmund Heritage Partnership brings together a number of key stakeholders including St Edmundsbury Cathedral (which leads the Partnership), St Edmundsbury Borough Council, St Mary’s Church, the Abbey Gardens Friends, the Bury Water Meadows Group, the Bury Town Trust and the Bury Society. It was established in March 2016 with the mission to:

‘Deepen public understanding of the life and times of St Edmund and the Medieval Abbey and encourage people to experience the spiritual, historical and archaeological significance of the Abbey of St Edmund in the modern world.’

Its vision is:

‘The Abbey of St Edmund will be treasured and enjoyed by an increasing range of local people and visitors as the focus of our past history, our present culture and our future inheritance in the heart of Bury St Edmonds.’

The Heritage Partnership’s overarching aims are to undertake research and to secure a sustainable future for the Abbey of St Edmund’s historical environment. To this end, following consultation with Historic England and the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF), it has commissioned a Heritage Assessment of the site and a Conservation Plan. It is intended that these documents will form the basis for proposals for a series of projects to enhance the interpretation and conservation of the built fabric and buried archaeology within a coherent and collaborative framework.

The Heritage Partnership has continued to evolve the understanding of its purpose during the development of the Conservation Plan. Its aims for the site are:

- to enhance and protect the heritage significance of the whole Abbey of St Edmund and its setting;
- to conserve its heritage assets; and
- to improve its heritage interpretation for the information and enjoyment of the widest possible range of people.

As the Heritage Partnership continues to develop its strategy, the objectives and policies for the Abbey of St Edmund area and its sub-areas will be both strategic and operational. They will include the conservation and maintenance of the historic fabric and the historic landscape, visitor management and information across the parkland and other areas and the provision of new and better facilities for its many different functions. The objectives and policies will also include the business management and funding of the various common functions within the Abbey of St Edmund area and provide a basis for assessing any future proposals for change to the heritage assets and their wider setting.

1.2.2 Using the Conservation Plan to Achieve its Mission, Vision and Aims
The Conservation Plan looks holistically at the project area, including the Anglo-Saxon, medieval and post-medieval heritage above and below ground. It sets out the heritage significance of the project area to enable the Heritage Partnership to be able to contribute to its protection and enhancement. The Conservation Plan identifies the threats to the significance and to the physical fabric. It makes recommendations to address these threats, which can be incorporated into the future planning of the Heritage Partnership and its constituent partners. Moreover, the Conservation Plan provides a Conservation Framework to guide decision-making and project planning to ensure the protection and enhancement of the heritage significance of the project area and the conservation of its heritage assets.

An important part of enhancing the heritage significance of the project area is helping people to understand what the project area is and why it is significant. Interpretation and education are fundamental to enabling this. The Conservation Plan identifies the opportunities for improving heritage interpretation in its widest sense. The Conservation Plan also identifies the need for a research strategy and suggests some elements that might be incorporated into such a strategy, which would help to better understand the historical development and significance of the project area and which should in turn be shared with the general public.
1.3 STRUCTURE OF THE DOCUMENT
The structure of this Conservation Plan has been developed specifically to meet the requirements of the site but has been informed by the Heritage Lottery Fund’s Conservation Plan Guidance (2012) and discussions with Simon Buteux of Historic England.

This Conservation Plan has been divided into two parts. Part I: Conserving the Abbey of St Edmund, provides a baseline understanding about the site and an overarching framework for its ongoing conservation. It is intended to be usable by any interested party (i.e. owners and organisations that are stakeholders in the site), now and in the future. Part II: Revitalising the site of the Abbey of St Edmund, has been written specifically to inform the development of the Heritage Partnership and potential future projects by the Heritage Partnership and its constituent partners. It has a greater focus on the areas owned by SEBC, the Cathedral and St Mary’s, what might be deemed the more public areas of the site, though other parts of the site are still referenced in places.

The report contains the following sections:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part I: Conserving the Abbey of St Edmund</th>
<th>Part II: Revitalising the site of the Abbey of St Edmund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Understanding the Site</td>
<td>8 Considering the Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Historical Development and Wider Context</td>
<td>9 Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Heritage Significance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Issues and Opportunities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Conservation Framework</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Area Analysis: Precinct Sub-Areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **2 Understanding the Site**: This section provides a brief overview of the site, its setting and the heritage designations within it. It also briefly describes each of the sub-areas, provides an overview of the ownership and management of the site and an outline of the legislative framework that affects the site.

- **3 Historical Development and Wider Context**: The accounts of the historic development and archaeological investigations of the site from the Heritage Assessment are summarised. The historic development is supplemented with historical information to provide some context for events at the site and additional information to inspire potential interpretation of the site. The site is also considered in its wider context as a medieval abbey, as a surviving ruin and historically as a botanic garden.

- **4 Heritage Significance**: A summary statement of significance and an assessment of the heritage values of the whole site are provided alongside a plan showing the significance of each element. Key views are also identified. This forms the heart of the Conservation Plan as decisions about the project area should stem from an understanding of its significance.

- **5 Issues and Opportunities**: This section sets out the main issues and opportunities of the site under a series of headings including site management, visitor experience and environmental change.

- **6 Conservation Framework**: This section is the heart of the document for future decision-making and sets out the conservation philosophy and policies.

- **7 Area Analysis: Precinct Sub-Areas**: This section considers the following for each of the 15 sub-areas:
  - Heritage significance
  - Area-specific issues and opportunities
  - Area-specific recommendations.

- **8 Considering the Future**: This section identifies the potential for change across the site. It also articulates six key objectives for the future work of the Heritage Partnership to help it achieve its mission and vision, together with suggestions as to how to meet those aims.

- **9 Implementation**: This section considers both the process for adopting and reviewing the Conservation Plan and also the major steps needed to implement a programme of projects. A list of short-term, community engagement projects is also included.

A selective bibliography is included as an appendix. Further appendices include:

- Outline heritage assessments relating to the proposals referenced in Section 8.
- A handy guide to heritage consents for the Abbey of St Edmund, which provides practical guidance to navigate the complexities of the project area’s heritage designations when applying for consent for works.
- A table summarising the information from the listings of the memorials in the Great Churchyard as a precursor to future analysis of these or interpretation of the site.
- Whittingham’s plan of the medieval Abbey.

Enlarged versions of the historic development and significance plans and a summary of the conservation policies, actions and recommendations are also provided appendices.
1.4 HOW TO USE THIS DOCUMENT

This document has been designed for both long-term and short-term use. In both contexts, changes may be proposed to the project area and the flow diagram overleaf illustrates how to use the Conservation Plan when change is being proposed or developed.

IN THE LONG-TERM

This Conservation Plan has been developed to serve two key long-term functions and can be used in different ways depending on the need.

01 An overarching guidance document
In this function, the Conservation Plan should provide an overall understanding of the history, heritage significance, issues and opportunities relating to the project area, as well as providing general policies for ensuring successful conservation of the site and enhancement of its significance. To ensure successful use in this capacity, the Conservation Plan should be read thoroughly by staff within the Heritage Partnership and its constituent partner organisations, particularly those individuals involved in developing strategies, promoting projects and making decisions about change.

In the long-term, the Conservation Plan should form the basis for the constituent partners to develop policies, maintenance regimes, staff training and forward planning for future activities and alterations.

For use as an overarching guidance document
Users should start reading the Conservation Plan in order from Section 1 (Introduction). Part II has been developed principally for the Heritage Partnership to plan future projects.

02 A document to develop and inform proposals for change
In this function, the Conservation Plan should be used as a guidance document and decision-making tool when change is proposed. This will range from carrying out repairs to planning major projects. The process for managing change using the Conservation Plan is included on the following page; this process should be applied whenever change of any scale is proposed. The Conservation Plan has principally been written for the Heritage Partnership and its constituent partners but as it will be publicly available, other owners within the project area might want to use it.

For use in this capacity, the document is best utilised electronically. It is therefore hyperlinked directly from the contents and throughout.

To develop and inform proposals for change to a specific area
Users should:

- find the area affected within the defined project area sub-areas and understand the relevant sub-area overview (Section 7);
- understand the potential for change (Section 8.1);
- use the rest of the document as reference for developing proposals; and
- assess the heritage impact of proposals (Appendix B)

IN THE SHORT-TERM

The Conservation Plan has also been prepared to enable the recently created Heritage Partnership to develop holistic proposals to revitalise the Abbey of St Edmund project area.

In this function, the Conservation Plan should provide an overall understanding of the site, the issues and opportunities that could be addressed, the Conservation Framework within which projects should be planned and how to navigate the complexities of the heritage designations on the site. Part II of the Conservation Plan also sets out the tasks that should be undertaken to achieve the Heritage Partnership’s objectives. As part of this work, it may also be possible to address some of the smaller issues raised in relation to specific sub-areas.

To develop proposals to revitalise the Abbey of St Edmund
Users should:

- understand first the overall heritage significance of the site (Section 4) and then the significance of the relevant sub-areas (Section 7);
- understand the issues and opportunities facing the site (Sections 5 and 7);
- understand the Conservation Framework (Section 6);
- use Part II to develop the Heritage Partnership as an organisation to guide change to the site and to develop proposals to achieve its vision, aims and objectives for the site; and
- use the bespoke Statutory Heritage Consents Handy Guide to understand how to realise the opportunities to enhance the site’s heritage significance (Appendix C).
Informing Change
This flow diagram illustrates the process for carrying out change that is appropriate to the heritage significance of the project area. The heritage significance of the project area and its component parts is articulated in Sections 4 and 7. The significance of the site provides the basis for all decision-making regarding its conservation, including any major changes.

Change is Proposed

Has the area for change been decided?

- **YES**
  - Review the sub-areas and find the area where change is proposed. Understand the overview heritage significance and concerns relating to that part of the site.
  - **SECTION 4 – HERITAGE SIGNIFICANCE**
  - **SECTION 7 – AREA ANALYSIS:**
  - **PRECINCT SUB-AREAS**
  - Is further understanding about the area affected needed?

- **NO**
  - Is further understanding about the area affected needed?

Review the significance of the area using information contained within this Conservation Plan and any additional research necessary.

- **YES**
  - Prepare a more detailed assessment of the element affected, which would form the basis of a Heritage Impact Assessment or Statement required for any listed building consent application.

- **NO**
  - Identify potentially suitable locations by reviewing the significance plans and potential for change.

Establish the capacity for change.

- **SECTION 8.1 – POTENTIAL FOR CHANGE**

Develop proposals for change. This process should be carried out with a consideration for the conservation philosophy, policies and actions outlined in this Conservation Plan.

Assess the impact of change. If necessary, further develop proposals to ensure that change is acceptable.

Submit proposals for consent and, if successful, proceed with works.

Ensure information about works undertaken is recorded and filed.

*Where staff or volunteers of the Heritage Partnership’s constituent partners do not have skills, experience or resources to provide this information, specialist consultants should be commissioned. Consultation with Historic England, the County Archaeology Service and/or the local planning authority may help to establish the scope of what research or reporting is required, which could be to the cost benefit of the proposer of the works.*

**The Heritage Partnership is looking to create an overarching plan for the site and any changes should also align with this.**
1.5 EXISTING INFORMATION AND RESOURCES

There is a considerable number of publications and unpublished reports relating to the history and archaeology of the site. These, together with an array of archival sources, were consulted as part of the preparation of the Heritage Assessment and generally have not been revisited in the preparation of the Conservation Plan.

Some archival research was undertaken at the Bury St Edmunds branch of the Suffolk Record Office to consult some of the deeds held there relating to Abbey House and the acquisitions by Mary Davers. Plans of Bury St Edmunds displayed at Moyse’s Hall Museum were also consulted.

There are several existing Conservation Plans relating to parts of the site:
- The Abbey Gardens, Bury St Edmunds, Management and Development Plan, 1997, SEBC
- Abbey Gardens Conservation Statement, 1999, Bob Carr and Aileen Sheckwell Associates
- Abbey Gardens Management Plan, 2014, SEBC
- The Great Churchyard Conservation Plan, 1994, SEBC

A more extensive list of sources used in the preparation of this Conservation Plan can be found in Appendix A: Selective Bibliography.

1.6 GAPS IN KNOWLEDGE

The Heritage Assessment identifies some key gaps in knowledge with regard to the understanding of the history and archaeology of the Anglo-Saxon and medieval periods. There are also considerable gaps in knowledge relating to the post-Dissolution period, especially the division of the Abbey site and the use, demolition and construction of buildings in the second half of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries when there is no map evidence. Another major gap relates to the immediate period after the Dissolution. The few documentary sources identified indicate a period between the Dissolution and sale of the site of a very unusual length whilst there is no accurate account of how the buildings were dismantled, which would have been a considerable challenge given the size of the Abbey Church. Given that the Abbey’s assets, including privileges and offices, were sold separately, confusion can occur easily.

Another key area where there is a lack of clarity and certainty is the ownership of and responsibility for the boundary walls, including the precinct walls. Also the extent of English Heritage’s guardianship over the ruins in the Abbey Gardens is unclear in that the official agreement with smaller ruins not indicated on the plan. In practice, English Heritage tends to include these in condition surveys. Understanding this is fundamental for the good maintenance of the project area. It may also affect the statutory consents required for works and the potential of funding for works.

1.7 CONSULTATION

The production of the Conservation Plan has been overseen by the Conservation Plan Advisory Group of the Heritage Partnership. This comprises:
- Damien Parker, St Edmundsbury Borough Council (Contract Manager);
- Richard Summers, Heritage Partnership Core Group (Chairman);
- Lance Alexander, St Edmundsbury Borough Council;
- Chris Rand, St Edmundsbury Borough Council;
- Abby Antrobus, Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service;
- Shelley Garland, English Heritage Trust;
- Philip Orchard, Whitworth Partnership, Cathedral Architect and Church Architect for St Mary’s;
- Tim Jones, Diocese;
- Sophie Roeback, Abbey Gardens Friends;
- Andrew Hinchley and Jim Stephens, River Lark Catchment Partnership;
- Sarah Green, Bury Water Meadows Group;
- Peter Riddington, Bury St Edmunds Town Trust;
- Adrian Tindall, Heritage Partnership Core Group;
- Martyn Taylor, Chairman of The Bury Society; and
- Carol Rowntree, historian.

Matthew Vernon, Canon Pastor at the Cathedral and Chair of the Heritage Partnership Core Group, and Richard Hoggett, author of the Heritage Assessment also contributed. Simon Buteux of Historic England was an observer of the group as Historic England grant funded the preparation of the Conservation Plan. The composition of the Advisory Group was intended to allow all key stakeholders to be involved with the preparation of the plan.

The Conservation Plan has been prepared in phases with drafts issued in advance of a series of meetings with the Conservation Plan Advisory Group.

A separate consultation on the full draft was undertaken with the statutory consultees, namely:
- Will Fletcher, Scheduled Monument Inspector, Historic England
- Clare Campbell, Listed Building Inspector, Historic England
- Christine Leveson, Conservation Officer, SEBC.

Their comments have been taken into consideration in preparing the final document.

The Conservation Plan Advisory Group will undertake any additional consultation on the Conservation Plan, for example with the local community. A conference is planned for January 2019 to make the work on the Conservation Plan and Heritage Assessment known to local people.

1.8 ABBREVIATIONS

EHT – English Heritage Trust
GIS – Geographical Information System
HLF – Heritage Lottery Fund
LiDAR – Light Distance and Ranging
NPPF – National Planning Policy Framework
QII – Quinquennial Inspection
SEBC – St Edmundsbury Borough Council
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1.9 GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Built Fabric: A building, structure or man-made feature, whether above or below ground, or the component parts e.g. brick, stone, mortar.

Buried Archaeology: Any evidence of the past that exists below the ground surface. This may include remains of buildings, landscapes or artefacts.

Conservation: The process of managing change to a significant place in its setting in ways that will best sustain its heritage values, while recognising opportunities to reveal or reinforce those values for present and future generations.1

Conservation Area: An area of special architectural or historic interest, the character of which is desirable to preserve or enhance. A large part of the project area is within the Town Centre Conservation Area.

Enhance significance: To make the heritage significance of a heritage asset more easily appreciated. What this means practically depends on the significance of the heritage asset. It may include: making the historic plan form more visible through removing modern additions or partitions or by reinstating lost partitions, doors or windows; explaining the historic development of a heritage asset in a publicly accessible format; or returning a historic use to a space or building. It does not include changes that may be said to beautify a space or place for which there is no historic precedent.

Heritage Asset: Any structure or landscape, whether above or below ground, that is deemed to have special interest resulting from its historical and/or design and/or archaeological value. Heritage assets include scheduled monuments, listed buildings, registered parks and gardens, conservation areas and non-designated heritage assets.

Heritage Partnership Agreement: A statutory agreement drawn up between the local planning authority and the owner of a listed building that sets out certain works that can be carried out to that listed building without separate Listed Building Consent provided that the works are carried out using the methodology set out in the Heritage Partnership Agreement. Non-statutory heritage partnership agreements can also be agreed for other heritage assets, such as scheduled monuments or registered parks, to agree the significance of the heritage asset and help better management.

Listed Building: Any building, structure (which may include bridges and boundary walls) or feature (including monuments, memorials and sundials) that have been designated as having historic and/or architectural special interest at a national level. Grade I is the highest level of designation, followed by Grade II* and then Grade II.

Preservation: In a heritage context, preservation refers to the maintaining and enhancing of the significance of a heritage asset in the present and the future. Preservation does not prohibit change provided that it has no impact on the heritage significance or enhances the significance.

Registered Park or Garden: Any man-made landscape that has been designated as having historic special interest at a national level. Grade I is the highest level of designation, followed by Grade II* and then Grade II.

Reveal significance: See Enhance significance. It should be noted that revealing the heritage significance of a heritage asset does not equate with revealing more of the physical fabric of the heritage asset.

Scheduled Monument: Any structure, feature or landscape above or below ground that is designated under the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979. Typically these are features that are not in use, however, a building in use may sometimes be a scheduled monument, usually as a result of having been designated before the creation of listed buildings. There is no grading system.

Setting: The context in which a heritage asset is appreciated. This may be immediate physical surroundings or a wider area that contributes to the understanding of the heritage asset. As well as the physical appearance, it may encompass intangible elements such as sounds and smells. There is no legal definition of setting.

Significance (or Heritage Significance): The sum of cultural values that make a heritage asset important to society.

Upstanding Archaeology: Any historic built fabric above ground level. Typically used to refer to ruins of buildings above ground level, it can also refer to buildings and other structures that are in use.

This part of the Conservation Plan provides a baseline understanding about the site and an overarching framework for its ongoing conservation. It is intended to be usable by partners and stakeholders, now and in the future.
2.1 SITE OVERVIEW

The historic site of the Abbey of St Edmund is located on the east side of the large town of Bury St Edmunds, which is situated in western Suffolk. The surrounding area is largely agricultural with a dispersion of satellite villages. The confluence of the Rivers Lark and Linnet lies in Bury St Edmunds, specifically in the Abbey site. The historic town sits to the west and north of the rivers while later development has expanded the town on all sides. The A134 and A14 converge to the south of the study area and run north-south to the east of the rivers and study area and then diverge again to the north.

The study area lies to the east of the historic town grid created in the eleventh century though incorporating earlier streets. Forming the core of the study site is the Abbey precinct. It is bounded by Eastgate Street and Mustow Street to the north, Angel Hill and Crown Street to the east and Honey Hill to the south. The streets around the Abbey site are notable for the way in which they morph from narrow streets between historic buildings to wide open spaces. The buildings along the streets are mostly historic but are of different periods, styles, materials and heights, which creates a varied streetscape.

The core of the Abbey site comprises St Edmundsbury Cathedral and associated buildings, the Abbey Gardens and ruins of the Abbey buildings to the north and the Great Churchyard and the church of St Mary to the south. These are enclosed by the medieval precinct walls and predominantly listed buildings along much of the street frontage. Across the rivers to the east, lie the disused former Eastgate nursery site, Minden Close and The Vinefields which comprises houses, a care home and a disused middle school, and, further south, the water meadow known as the Crankles. These areas were the site of some of the Abbey’s vineyards and fishponds. The project area includes No Mans Meadow to the south-east.
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STUDY AREA PLAN
- Study Area Site Boundary
  01 Alwyne House
  02 Aviary
  03 Garden Café Kiosk
  04 Public WCs
  05 Abbey Gate
  06 Park Keeper’s Hut
  07 Abbey House (Cathedral Office and Library)
  08 Anselm Building
  09 31 Angel Hill (Gallery)
  10 32 and 33 Angel Hill (Gallery and Tourist Information Shop)
  11 34 Angel Hill (Cathedral Shop)
  12 St Edmundsbury Cathedral
  13 Cathedral Centre
  14 Norman Tower
  15 Tower House and 2–8 Crown Street
  16 Tower Cottage
  17 St Mary’s Church
  18 1–3 Honey Hill
  19 Old Shire Hall, Former Magistrates Court and Crown Court
  20 St Margaret’s House (former Council offices)
  21 Charnel Chapel
  22 The Deanery
  23 Clopton Cottage
  24 1 and 2 Abbey Precincts
  25 The Churchyard
  26 NHS Clinic
  27 Pre-School and Nursery
  28 St James Middle School (disused)
  29 St James Court Apartments (formerly King Edward VI Grammar School)
  30 The Martins Care Home
  31 Havebury Housing, Vinefields
  32 Haig Homes Housing
  33 Eastgate Cottage
  34 Abbey Bridge
  35 West Front houses
  36 Sundial
  37 Ranger’s Shop
  38 Gardeners’ Yard
  39 Remnants of medieval bridge

RUINS
- Ruins of the Abbey Church
- Ruins of the Crypt
- Ruins of the Chapter House and Abbots’ tombs
- Queen’s Chamber
- Dovecot

For a more detailed plan of the remains of the Abbey ruins, see Appendix E.

LANDSCAPE
- Formerly the Little Churchyard
- Great Churchyard
- Statue of St Edmund
- Labyrinth
- Cathedral staff car park
- Pilgrim’s Kitchen Garden
- Pilgrim’s Herb Garden
- Garden of Reflection
- Holocaust Memorial
- Sensory Garden
- Central Beds
- Events area
- Former Bowling Green
- Water Garden
- Appleby Rose Garden
- Play Area
- Woodland Play Area
- Tennis Courts
- Sacristy (shared garden for 1 and 2 Abbey Precincts)
- Public car park
- Minden Close Public Open Space
- Bowls Club Bowling Green
- Former Eastgate Nursery

Plan showing the names of different areas and key features within the site. This plan is not to scale.
© Crown Copyright and database rights 2018 OS 100029675 Use of this data is subject to <a ref='https://www.westsuffolk.gov.uk/disclaimer.cfm#maps'>terms and conditions</a>
2.2 TOWNSCAPE AND LANDSCAPE CONTEXT

The Abbey site is located on the east side of the historic town centre of Bury St Edmunds, which has retained its Norman grid pattern of streets. Two of these are particularly significant in terms of the Abbey’s setting: the two east-west streets of Churchgate Street and Abbeygate Street that originally joined the Abbey Gate with the market and the Norman Tower with the Guildhall respectively. Thought to predate these are the streets of Northgate and Southgate, which the Abbey precinct interrupted.

Whilst the street pattern has largely been preserved, the town around the Abbey has changed considerably in its appearance. There are many surviving timber framed buildings, mostly from the late medieval period, although some of these have been refaced in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries to give them a vernacular classical façade. This can be seen particularly clearly from the roofs of the towers in the project area. There are also buildings constructed from the Georgian period onwards including the Angel Hotel (late eighteenth century) and the nineteenth century pair of houses at 13 and 14 Angel Hill (unlike their neighbours 10, 11, 12 and 16, which have sixteenth century cores behind their nineteenth century façades). The former Council offices on Angel Hill are twentieth century in date but neo-classical in style, unlike the modern residential block that rises behind it.

Until the early twentieth century, Bury St Edmunds was a compact town surrounded by meadows, farmland and, on the south side, Hardwick Heath and the estates of Newton Court to the south-east and Ickworth to the south-west. These large green areas to the south have been preserved as has a strip of agricultural land to the east of the study site (although this is cut through by the A14). It is said that Bury St Edmunds is the only town in the country where there is a vista of open countryside from the town centre. The impression from the Abbey Gardens is of being on the edge of the town with countryside beyond but this is an illusion. There is a large housing estate further east, mirroring the one to the west of the town, which were created in the twentieth century. The part of No Mans Meadow outside the project area and the Leg of Mutton field are integral to the immediate natural setting of the project area.

Further photographs of the setting can be found in Section 4.5 Key Views and the sections on the two peripheral sub-areas, Sections 7.15 and 7.16.

[Listing Descriptions for 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14, 15, 16 and 17 Angel Hill]
2.3 HERITAGE DESIGNATIONS

Bury St Edmunds as a town has a high concentration of heritage designations reflecting the high quality of the historic environment in the town centre. The study site similarly has a high number of heritage designations of individual elements and much of it also falls within the Bury St Edmunds Conservation Area. The designations are illustrated on the following plans.

There are two scheduled monuments on the site: the Chapel of the Charnel is separately scheduled (List Entry Number 1003763). Much of the Abbey site is also scheduled as the remains of the Abbey (List Entry Number 1021450).

There are 21 Grade I listed buildings within the study area including 12 separate designations relating to the Abbey precinct wall, gates and churches and seven designations relating to the ruins of the Abbey. There are three Grade II* listed buildings and 115 Grade II listed structures, of which over 100 relate to memorials in the Great Churchyard.

The Abbey Gardens is a Grade II Registered Park and Garden.

For more information regarding the implications of heritage designations on the site, see the Abbey of St Edmund: Statutory Heritage Consents Handy Guide in Appendix C.
LISTED BUILDINGS IN THE PROJECT AREA

- Site Boundary
- Grade I
- Grade II*
- Grade II

01 Sworders
02 Crescent House
03 The One Bull Pub
04 Richard Green and Partners
05 24 Angel Hill
06 22, 22a and 23a Angel Hill
07 19, 19a and 21 Angel Hill
08 26, 28 and 29 Mustow Street
09 Lark House
10 Precinct wall to north of the Former Abbey of St Edmund
11 Precinct wall to north of the Abbey Gate
12 North wall of the Great Court
13 Garden House
14 Alwyne House and Alwyne Cottage
15 Abotts Bridge and adjoining East Precinct wall
16 Eastgate Cottage
17 Abbey Gate and Gatehouse
18 Ruins of Abbey Dovecote and part of wall
19 Precinct wall to south of the Abbey Gate
20 Ruins to the north of the Cloister
21 Abbey House
22 Ruins of Hall of Pleas and south wall of Great Court
23 Drinking fountain and sundial
24 31, 32 and 33 Angel Hill
25 Ruins to east and north of Abbey Church
26 34 Angel Hill
27 Cathedral Church of St James (St Edmundsbury Cathedral)
28 Norman Tower
29 1–3 West Front
30 Ruins of Abbey Church
31 Tower House
32 Tower Cottage
33 Garden walls and railings to Provosts House and No. 4 Churchyard
34 Provosts House (Deanery)
35 3 and 4 Crown Street
36 Outbuilding to 3 Crown Street
37 Garden Wall to 1 and 2 Churchyard
38 5 and 6 Crown Street
39 6 The Churchyard
40 7 and 8 Crown Street
41 Church of St Mary and attached wall and railings
42 1 and 2 Honey Hill
43 3 Honey Hill
44 St Margaret’s House
45 Precinct wall on south to east [sic] of Shire Hall

The names given are those on the official listing entries. Some building names may have changed since the time of listing. For clarity, some current names have been added in brackets.
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Plan showing the listed memorials in the Great Churchyard. This plan is not to scale.
© Crown Copyright and database rights 2018 OS 100019675 Use of this data is subject to <a ref='https://www.westsuffolk.gov.uk/disclaimer.cfm#maps'> terms and conditions</a>

Plan showing the part of the site included in the Bury St Edmunds Conservation Area. This plan is not to scale.
© Crown Copyright and database rights 2018 OS 100019675 Use of this data is subject to <a ref='https://www.westsuffolk.gov.uk/disclaimer.cfm#maps'> terms and conditions</a>
2.4 SITE SUB-AREAS

01 St Edmundsbury Cathedral
The stone and flint Cathedral has an almost cloister-like space formed from sympathetically constructed modern extensions and the historic buildings along the street. Abbey House has ranges of different periods whilst the Anselm Building is a rare Georgian coach house. Attractive gardens sit alongside a utilitarian car park.

02 The Abbey Gateway
The stone Abbey Gate has more intricate stone carving than the earlier Norman Tower. It is the main entrance to the Abbey Gardens with radiating paths from it. Shrubs and trees partially conceal the Gate as viewed in the Abbey Gardens.

03 Abbey Garden Facilities
Within the Abbey Gardens, a tree-lined path connects the public toilets, café kiosk in a Georgian folly, the utilitarian aviary and the concealed gardeners’ compound.

04 Formal Gardens and Amenity Area
The historic Botanic Garden with formal bedding, the Bowling Green, the Water Garden and the Rose Garden are separated by mature trees and level changes. These areas provide views of the Abbey ruins, the West Front properties and the Cathedral’s east end.
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05 River Lark Valley Floor
The shallow, slow-flowing river is fenced off though visible. On the east side, a footpath is connected via a modest footbridge whilst the substantial stone Abbot’s Bridge is not in use. West of the river, the visibility of the precinct wall and remains of the dovecot enhance gently sloping lawn dotted with mature trees and two play areas.

06 Abbey Ruins
Dominated by the rubble ruins of the Abbey, this sub-area also encompasses the tennis courts close to the crypt and site of the east range of the Abbey’s Great Court including Alwyne House and Cottage.

07 Norman Tower and West Front
St Edmund’s Green, a former part of the Great Churchyard, allows views of the south side of the Cathedral and the unique West Front houses built into the Abbey ruins. The stone Norman Tower, the formal and ceremonial entrance to the Abbey Church and now the Cathedral’s bell tower, stands apart.

08 The Great Churchyard
The vast historic churchyard is crossed by paths through avenues of mature lime trees. At the centre is the Charnel Chapel, which is enclosed by railings. There is a great variety of monuments including headstones, box tombs and coffin stones, which are only a proportion of the memorials that once existed.

09 St Mary’s Church and Honey Hill
One of the finest parish churches in the country, St Mary’s sits alongside historic domestic buildings. The former Walnut Tree Close is dominated by a public car park enclosed by part of the precinct wall with low-rise modern buildings to the north and disused historic public buildings to the south.

10 Cathedral Residences
The fine red brick Deanery, now subdivided, is set in its own small garden. Nos. 1 and 2 Abbey Precincts are a later red brick three-storey building with a mid-twentieth century range and porch. The remains of Victorian outbuildings and a large lawn surrounded by trees form a shared garden.

11 The Crankles and No Mans Meadow
Green open space with small trees, both young and mature. The Crankles is said to have been the site of the monastic fishponds whilst the meadow is pastureland. They are well served by riverside and cross-river paths.

12 Abbey Vineyards
The former Abbey Vineyards are now occupied by the disused St James’ Middle School and its associated sports field, a Victorian red brick former grammar school building set within gardens and various modest terraced housing and a care home surrounded by utilitarian landscaping. Flint walls contribute to a limited historic character.
13 Medieval Industries (Eastgate)
The larger half of the area, the former Eastgate Nursery, is partly bounded by the precinct wall and is an overgrown area with mature trees and the remains of glasshouse bases. To the west, Minden Close is a sloping open green space with specimen trees. There is archaeological evidence of the tanning industry operating in this sub-area in the twelfth to fourteenth centuries.

14 Angel Hill and Mustow Street
From the narrow, small-scale streetscape of western Eastgate Street with some jetted timber-framed buildings, Mustow Street widens between historic elegant three-storey town houses and twentieth century buildings to the open expanse of Angel Hill. This square is bounded by some large classical frontages, such as The Athenaeum, the Angel Hotel and Town Council offices, as well as the Abbey precinct walls. The square contains memorials but is dominated by car parking and the busy road past the Abbey.

15 Churchgate Street and Crown Street
The formal and ceremonial approach to the Abbey of St Edmund and to the extant churches of St James and St Mary. Elegant, predominantly eighteenth and nineteenth century (fronted) townhouses along the street and around Chequer Square contrast with the open vista into the Great Churchyard.
2.5 CURRENT SITE OWNERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT

The site has been in multiple ownership since the Dissolution in 1539. The parish church of St Mary is owned and managed by the parochial church council together with what remains of the Little Churchyard to the south (it once extended to the middle of the road) and a small strip to the north. A legal agreement was drawn up with the Borough Council to establish the boundary of responsibility on the church’s north side.

To the north, the Great Churchyard, including St Edmund’s Green, is owned and managed by St Edmundsbury Borough Council (SEBC). The Council’s Parks Service is responsible for the upkeep of the Churchyard with a separate team responsible for the maintenance of the trees.

SEBC also owns and manages the West Front properties, which are leased on long leases but the Council remains responsible for the upkeep of the built fabric. The Council owns most of the Abbey ruins and the Abbey Gate but these are managed by English Heritage Trust (EHT), which is responsible for the interpretation as well as maintaining the upstanding built fabric.

The Abbey Gardens are owned and managed by SEBC and the grounds (including trees) and activities (including events) are maintained and managed by SEBC’s Parks Service. Gardeners, rangers and gardener-rangers are overseen by one manager. They are aided by volunteers from the Abbey Gardens Friends, who spend two mornings a month assisting with tasks such as weeding. Maintenance of the built fabric not under the management of EHT falls to the Borough Council’s Properties Department. The Garden House refreshment kiosk is managed by a catering concessionaire.

SEBC has certain riparian responsibilities for maintaining the sections of the River Lark and the River Linnet which flow through the project area. Volunteers from the Bury Water Meadows Group assist the Parks Service with the care and maintenance of the rivers and river banks within the project area. The Parks Services maintains the verges of the footpaths.

---

02 There are short sections of wall and the remains of St Andrew’s Chapel which are owned by the Cathedral. Sections of precinct wall fall within private properties on the north and south sides of the site. The ownership of the south section of the precinct wall in the south-east car park has not been identified during the preparation of the Conservation Plan.
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Eastgate Nursery was formerly the Council’s nursery for growing plants for all its parks from the 1930s until the early 1990s. It remains in the Council’s ownership and there are plans for its redevelopment as public amenity space. Eastgate Cottage belongs to the Council and is rented out. The adjacent bowling green is owned by SEBC but is leased and maintained by the St Edmundsbury Bowls Club.

The Chapter of St Edmundsbury Cathedral owns and manages the Cathedral, Abbey House, and the buildings along Angel Hill between the two. It also owns and manages 3 Crown Street, the Deanery including Clopton Cottage, and 1 and 2 Abbey Precincts, which form accommodation for clergy and staff. The Norman Tower is the Cathedral’s bell tower and is owned by the Chapter but the built fabric is maintained by English Heritage. The Pilgrims’ Kitchen within the Cathedral Centre is run by a subcontractor. The shop, however, is managed in-house and mostly staffed by volunteers. The stewards in the Cathedral and in St Mary’s Church are also volunteers.

The Diocesan Board of Finance owns the former St James’ Middle School, which is currently disused.

Suffolk County Council owns and manages Minden Close Open Space and it owns the Crankles. The Guildhall Feoffment Trustees owns the adjoining No Mans Meadow. Both the Crankles and the meadow are leased and managed by SEBC with the assistance of the Bury Water Meadows Group. SEBC issues grazing licences to local farmers to keep the pastures grazed.

Along The Vinefields, The Martins Care Home is operated by the Methodist Homes for the Aged. Opposite it is residential accommodation provided by the Haig Homes charity for ex-Service personnel and by Havebury Housing. St James’ Court is a private residential apartment block between The Martins Care Home and the former St James’ School site.

On the south side of the site, the buildings nearest the river are operated by the Guildhall Feoffment Trustees as a pre-school and by the NHS as a clinic. The former council offices and courts are disused and awaiting redevelopment. The other houses on Honey Hill and Crown Street are thought to be private residential properties. The building fronting Mustow Street and Angel Hill mostly have retail or commercial uses at ground floor level whilst some have residential accommodation above. Alwyne House within the Abbey Gardens used to be owned by SEBC but is now a private residence.
2.6 LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK

This section provides a brief overview of current relevant legislation. It focuses on heritage legislation and policies relevant to the special elements of the project area. There is further legislation that covers an array of other aspects relating to the project area. The legislation and guidance is updated at intervals and the most up-to-date information should always be sought from the relevant website.

Appendix C, Abbey of St Edmund: Statutory Heritage Consents Handy Guide, provides more information.

2.6.1 National Legislation

National legislation governs the designation of heritage assets. Scheduled Monuments are designated and protected under the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979. Works that are exempt from consent to scheduled monuments are identified in the Ancient Monuments (Class Consents) Order 1994. Listed buildings and conservation areas are protected under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

National legislation also governs what change can be undertaken in the built environment. The current framework for the application of legislation has just been revised: the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2018). Of particular relevance for most of the Abbey of St Edmund project area is Section 16, which covers heritage assets of all types. Section 12, which addresses good design, is also important in maintaining the quality of the built environment in and around the project area.

Section 16 of the NPPF, specifically paragraphs 195 and 196, provide the tests against which proposals will be assessed by the local planning authority if the proposals will cause harm to a heritage asset. These include the weighing of the level of harm (which will be affected by the level of designation) against the public benefits. However, proposed works to heritage assets should, in the first instance, aim to cause no harm.

Listed buildings currently in use for regular worship are exempt from the secular consent system under the Ecclesiastical Exemption Order 2010. The Cathedral and St Mary’s Church are subject to a parallel system of statutory consent set out in the Care of Churches and Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction Measure 1991.

2.6.2 Local Planning Policy and Guidance

The local planning authority issues further policies and guidelines within the framework of the NPPF. The overarching policy for the borough is contained in the St Edmundsbury Core Strategy which was adopted in 2010. There are no specific policies relating to the Abbey of St Edmund, but Policy CS2 (Sustainable Development) applies to all sites.

Specific to the town of Bury St Edmunds is the Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031, which was adopted in 2014. Of specific relevance to the Abbey are Policies BV25 and BV26. These address the historic and natural environment and relate specifically to conserving the setting and views from the historic core (BV25) and the integrity of green infrastructure (BV26). BV25 makes particular reference to the preservation of views along Abbeystreet and from the River Lark water meadows, which are amongst the key views identified in Section 4.5.

Further town-specific planning policy has been published in the Bury St Edmunds MAP: A Masterplan for the Town Centre (2018). The site falls into three of the character areas but is principally covered by Area 8: Lark and Linnet Riverside. Most of the eight objectives in the MAP are relevant to part or all of the project area.

Day-to-day development management policies are contained within the Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury Joint Development Management Policies Document, which was adopted in 2015. Of particular relevance are policies:

- DM2, which relates to all development across the borough;
- DM10, DM11 and DM12, which relate to biodiversity and are particularly applicable to the Great Churchyard as this is a designated wildlife area;
- DM15, DM17, DM18, DM19 and DM20, which relate to the historic environment, conservation areas, historic parks and gardens and archaeology; and
- DM42 and DM43, which relate to open space and cultural facilities.

In addition to planning policy, there are also a set of bye-laws specific to the Abbey Gardens that specify uses and behaviours within the site.

Information and guidance relating to the conservation area can be found in the Bury St Edmunds Conservation Area Appraisal (2007).

2.6.3 Historic England Guidance

Alongside the national and local planning policies, Historic England provides a range of guidance on the historic environment, how to care for it and how to develop proposals for change. The overarching document, Conservation Policies, Principles and Guidance (2008), is currently under review. Other key documents include:


These are explained in more detail in Appendix C, Abbey of St Edmund: Statutory Heritage Consents Handy Guide.
3.1 HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

This section provides a summary account of the site's development together with an overview timeline for the pre-monastic, monastic and post-Dissolution periods. These draw closely from the information provided in the Heritage Assessment, which contains much more detailed information and references for further reading. The timeline here is intended to provide a baseline understanding of the chronological development of the site to aid use of the Conservation Plan. The timeline is supplemented with a selection of events, both local and national, that provide some context for the Abbey's development.

The section also provides further historical information.

---

3.1.1 Summary of the Site's Historical Development

Buried archaeological finds indicate activity in Bury St Edmunds from the Mesolithic period through to the Iron Age and evidence of settlement in the Anglo-Saxon period. Crucial to the town's history and influence is the king of the East Angles after which the town is named, Edmund. Details of his life remain uncertain but sources have placed his reign and death during the late ninth century. After his death, either in battle or in martyrdom depending on the account, he was buried at Haegelidun and then transferred to Beodricsworth.

In the twelfth century, the precinct expanded to incorporate the area that now forms the Cathedral Garth and Yard. Many of the claustral buildings were constructed early in the century followed by resumed construction of the Abbey Church under Abbot Anselm (1120–1148). The monastery was enclosed by precient walls with large gates. The first incarnations of the churches of St James and St Mary were also built during this period. Further development of both the Abbey Church and its ancillary buildings continued under Abbots Ording and Samson and the complex was initially completed in the late twelfth century. The church is claimed to have been the largest building (based on floor area) in western Europe since the fall of the Western Empire and larger than any building in Christendom until St Peter's Basilica in Rome was begun in 1506. In 1275, the earlier St Mary's Chapel and the remainder of the stone rotunda were demolished for the Lady Chapel.

The Abbey's enormous endowment and the importance of St Edmund's shrine gave the Abbey great wealth and influence such that it was closely connected with major political and social activities of the period. Abbot Samson played a role in the massacre of 57 Jews in 1190 and subsequent expelling of the remaining population the following year. These deaths are now commemorated in the Abbey Gardens. Samson's contribution to the release of Richard I earned the Abbey a visit from the king when he returned from Europe. In 1214 earls and barons convened in the Abbey Church and swore an oath against Richard's successor, King John, in the development of the Magna Carta.

The fourteenth century was a period of destructive conflict between the townspeople and the Abbey. The Abbey was attacked on a number of occasions, which resulted in many deaths as well as looting and building destruction. The Abbey Gate was rebuilt after the 1327 riot. The Abbey's wealth equally could not protect it from the ravages of the Black Death in 1349.

Development within the precinct continued into the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The rebuilding of St Mary's Church was begun in the fourteenth century and into the fifteenth, whilst parts of St James' Church were rebuilt at the beginning of the sixteenth century. The Abbey was devastated by various disasters when the west tower collapsed in 1430 and a large fire occurred in the Abbey Church and Refectory only a few decades later.

With Henry VIII's Reformation of the Church, the Abbey of St Edmund was dissolved in 1539. The Abbey buildings were stripped of much of their useful materials for reuse on the site, in the town and beyond. The site was no longer a place of pilgrimage and the town ceased to be one of the nationally important provincial cultural centres in England. The Abbey had also contributed substantially to the local economy, which went beyond being a large consu mer of goods, and so the Dissolution caused an economic downturn.

Following the Dissolution, secular buildings began to be constructed within the precinct. This included the construction of houses within the remains of the West Front, which were largely constructed by the eighteenth century. The erection of buildings along the street frontages that had begun in the later medieval period continued after the Dissolution and some existing buildings were extended beyond the precinct walls into the former Abbey site. Clapton Asylum, now the Deanery, was built in 1744 as almshouses for the poor of the parishes of St James and St Mary. In 1798, the Town Corporation bought the Great Churchyard.

Interest in antiquity, starting in the seventeenth century and surging in the eighteenth, led to investigations and documentation of the former Abbey. The same Enlightenment thirst for knowledge led to the creation of the Botanic Garden in 1821 and its resting in 1831 by Nathaniel Hodson, who was given the lease and accommodation in the newly constructed Alwyne House in 1831. The original focus on scientific understanding gave way to an increasingly ornamental planting of the gardens to attract paying visitors by the end of the century. It was opened as a free public park in 1912 and the existing arrangement of formal flower beds in the central area was laid out to celebrate George VI's coronation in 1937.

The nineteenth century also witnessed further building development, including the restoration of the Norman Tower and destruction of abutting buildings as well as extensive works to St James' Church by George Gilbert Scott. St James' Church underwent a major transformation the following century, when in 1914 it became a cathedral. In the 1960s Stephen Dykes Bower transformed the east end, the Cathedral Centre was built in 1990, the new central tower was completed in 2005 and the cloisters constructed by 2008.

Understanding of the site's buried archaeology accelerated in the twentieth century and some of the Abbey ruins were revealed. The local Council purchased the Abbey Gardens in 1953 and continued to develop them with new areas such as the Water Garden in 1959 and the Sensory Garden in 1990.

---

01 Francis Young, Talk delivered at the book launch, St Mary's Church, Bury St Edmunds, 8 September 2016, http://www.academia.edu/18306405/The_Abbey_of_Bury_St_Edmunds_History_Legacy_and_Discovery, accessed 17 May 2018.
### 3.1.2 Timeline of the History of the Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WIDER HISTORICAL CONTEXT</th>
<th>HISTORY OF THE ABBEY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mesolithic to Iron Age</td>
<td>597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 November 869</td>
<td>Early C10th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>927</td>
<td>945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finds relating to these periods recovered by archaeological excavations on the site.

Accounts of Sigeberht, King of the East Angles reportedly founded a royal monastery of Beodricsworth, to which he later retired. Buried archaeology has revealed part of the late Anglo-Saxon town of Beodricsworth occupied the project area.

Death of Edmund, King of the East Angles in battle against the Danes. Legend states that he was beaten, tied to a tree and shot with arrows, before eventual decapitation.

Edmund’s body moved to Beodricsworth. It is generally thought to have occurred during the reign of Æthelstan (924–939 AD) and that the body was housed in a large wooden church.

The new church received patronage from King Edmund of England. This included the grant of the Banleuca, the borough of Bury St Edmunds.

Edmund’s body moved to London for safekeeping by Ailwin to avoid the ravages of the Danes. It was returned to the Abbey, supposedly from Greensted church.

**St Edmund**

Surprisingly little is known about the life of Edmund, who was born c.841 and became king of the East Angles aged 14 on Christmas Day 855. He was consecrated as king in 856 at Bures by Hunberht, Bishop of East Anglia. A near-contemporary source, the Peterborough manuscript of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, records his death in battle against the Danes near Thetford in 869. The main source for the details of Edmund’s death was written between 985 and 987 by Abbot of Fleury, *Passio sancti Eadmundi*. This portrays Edmund as a peace-loving martyr who sacrificed himself to avoid the shedding of Christian blood. Edmund was captured by the Danes at Haegelidun (probably Bradfield St Clare), where he was beaten, tied to a tree, shot with arrows and beheaded. When his followers came in search of his body, the head cried out ‘here, here, here’ and was discovered being guarded by a wolf. When his body was translated to Beodricsworth decades after his death, his body was found to be incorrupt and the head reattached to the body with only a thin red crease marking the line of decapitation.

The legacy of Edmund became bound up with the legitimacy of English kingship. As such many kings made pilgrimages to his shrine including Cnut, Edward the Confessor, William the Conqueror, Henry I, Richard I, John, Edward I, Edward II, Edward III, Henry IV, Henry VI and Henry VII.

---

03 Ibid, p.61.
05 Ibid, p.62.
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3.1.3 Timeline of the Monastic History of the Site

- Allegedly to assuage the insult to St Edmund’s shrine made by his father, King Cnut founded a Benedictine Monastery. This saw the construction of the first Abbey Church and buildings in stone.

- The original chapel of St Edmund was built as a stone rotunda.

- Edward the Confessor granted to the Abbey the Eight and a Half Hundreds or Liberty of St Edmund, which equated to most of modern West Suffolk. The Abbey was granted both jurisdiction over its own tenants and all other tenants. It was technically entitled to all fines levied within the Liberty.

- Baldwin became Abbot.

- Baldwin increased the number of monks from 20 to 80, and with the sacrist Thurstan and Tolin, began to build a new Abbey Church, to accommodate them with construction continuing throughout the twelfth century.

- Baldwin’s connection with St Denis in France may explain the dedication of a chapel at Bury St Edmunds to the saint. His experience as a physician led him to establish a medical school at the Abbey, which was one of the most advanced in England at the time. Baldwin’s abbacy also saw the translation of the body of St Edmund in 1095 and the remains of St Botolph and St Jurmin.

- Abbot Baldwin (d.1097)
  - Abbot Baldwin was born in Chartres, France and became a Benedictine Monk at St Denis, Paris and subsequently served as a prior at Leberaw, Alsace. Baldwin was then offered the position of Edward the Confessor’s physician, which resulted in him migrating to England.
  - Due to these royal and international connections, Baldwin was appointed the abbot of Bury St Edmunds in 1065. During his time as abbot, Baldwin successfully defended the Abbey from diocesan control during the 1070s; King William’s support in 1081 confirmed the stability of episcopal control. Using his international connections, Baldwin increased the number of monks from 20 to 80, and with the sacrists Thurstan and Tolin, began to build a new Abbey Church, to accommodate them with construction continuing throughout the twelfth century.
  - Baldwin’s connection with St Denis in France may explain the dedication of a chapel at Bury St Edmunds to the saint. His experience as a physician led him to establish a medical school at the Abbey, which was one of the most advanced in England at the time. Baldwin’s abbacy also saw the translation of the body of St Edmund in 1095 and the remains of St Botolph and St Jurmin.

12 Hoggett, Heritage Assessment.
William I confirmed the freedom of the Abbey from episcopal control. Baldwin later increased the number of monks from 20–80.

Construction work began on a second, larger monastic church, which was completed late twelfth century.\(^{14}\)

Edmund’s remains were moved when the eastern end of the Romanesque Abbey Church was completed.\(^{15}\) The remains of St Botolph and St Jurmin were also translated into the new Abbey Church.\(^{16}\)

Godfrey (Sacrist) and Abbot Robert II completed the chapter house, refectory, dormitory, infirmary and abbot’s lodgings.

A fifth bay was added to the western end of the presbytery to facilitate access to the eastern aisles.\(^{17}\)

Godfrey and Abbot Albold advanced the westward construction working with a large and complex plan.\(^{18}\) The crossing piers, part of the original construction were repurposed as the western piers of the presbytery and a new crossing erected. Godfrey bought a large bell, possibly for this newly constructed tower.\(^{19}\)

Walls and gates were constructed around the town. Abbeygate Street may have been created at this time also.

Abbacy of Abbot Anselm saw the dedication of the altar of the high cross at the eastern end of the nave and the construction of the walls around the forecourt of the Abbey which interrupted the alignment of Northgate and Southgate Streets.\(^{20}\) Bronze doors were made for the western façade by Master Hugo.

Interpretation: Competitive Church Construction

When completed, the Abbey Church was one of the longest in western Christendom. It was longer than Canterbury Cathedral and it has been suggested that the reason for the change in the design of Bury St Edmunds’s church was to ensure it was longer than Norwich’s. Young claims the Abbey church was, based on floor area, ‘the largest building in western Europe since the fall of the Western Roman Empire’, was larger than any other building in Christendom until St Peter’s Basilica in Rome was begun in 1506 and was ‘without doubt, the largest Romanesque building ever built’.\(^{21}\) Competition was not just about size. When the bishop of Ely requested oaks from the Abbey’s woodlands for his cathedral construction, Samson agreed but quickly ordered the felling of the best oaks for the Abbey.\(^{22}\)

Probable period of construction of 342 new houses in Bury St Edmunds.

The Domesday Book records 207 households in Bury St Edmunds.

| 1080s | 1081 | 1086 | 1095 | 1097–1107 | 1107–1120 | 1114–1119 | 1121–1148 |

- 1080s
- 1081
- 1086
- 1095
- 1097–1107
- 1107–1120
- 1114–1119
- 1121–1148

15 Ibid., p.63.
16 Ibid., p.65.
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22 Wittingham, Bury, 6.
The porticos of St Faith over the porticos of St Denis in the northern arm of the western front was dedicated to Bishop John of Rochester (d.1142) which suggest the nave had reached the level of clerestory.\textsuperscript{23}

Church of St James constructed.\textsuperscript{24}

Abbot Anselm (d.1146) Anselm had a religious background, having been a monk at Chiusa, Italy from a young age. After his position as an Abbot of St Sabas, Rome from 1109 to 1115 and some time in Normandy waiting to come to England as papal legate, Anselm became Abbot of Bury St Edmunds in 1122.

During his abbacy, Anselm spent a large about of time abroad in Normandy and Rome, somewhat neglecting his abbatial responsibilities. However, some records suggest his trips were not completely fruitless as he promoted the interests of the Abbey whilst in the company of Henry I at court.\textsuperscript{25}

Abbot Anselm was responsible for the construction of a number of buildings in the Abbey site: the Norman Tower; the walls around the forecourt of the church; St Mary’s Church (none of this original fabric survives today); a mill in the Abbot’s court; the tower of St James; as well as the large bronze doors; and possibly the wallus ivory cross which once stood in the church. The church of St Denis was demolished during this time to make way for the new buildings. Abbot Anselm was additionally responsible for the commission of Master Hugo to create England’s first illuminated bible for the Abbey.\textsuperscript{26}

Abbot Anselm (1135–1121) Abbot Anselm was born in Tottington, Norfolk in 1135 and was affiliated with the Abbey of St Edmund from a young age, being taken to visit the shrine of St Edmund by his mother. After holding a number of offices within the Abbey, Anselm was elected as the abbot of St Edmunds in 1182.

Anselm began his abbacy by resolving the debt and maladministration of his predecessors, which resulted in intense conflict within the Abbey.\textsuperscript{27}

Abbot Anselm played a large role in the poor relief and education in the town, establishing the first school in England to offer free education for poor boys, which has sustained its legacy as King Edward VI School. He was also responsible for the foundation of the hospital St Saviour in 1184, the largest medieval hospital in Bury St Edmunds. During his abbacy, both the West Front’s central and octagonal towers were completed, marking the end of the first construction phase of the Abbey.

Samson helped to maintain royal relationships in the Abbey, he helped to raise ransom money and visited King Richard I during his time held captive in Germany; this resulted in a royal visit to the Abbey to give thanks. It was also during Samson’s abbacy that the massacre of 57 Jews occurred in 1190.

A new infirmary was constructed, which required the demolition of the tower of the Basilica of St Benedict.

Abbot Samson (1135–1121) Abbot Samson was born in Tottington, Norfolk in 1135 and was affiliated with the Abbey of St Edmund from a young age, being taken to visit the shrine of St Edmund by his mother. After holding a number of offices within the Abbey, Anselm was elected as the abbot of St Edmunds in 1182. Samson began his abbacy by resolving the debt and maladministration of his predecessors, which resulted in intense conflict within the Abbey.\textsuperscript{28}

Abbot Samson played a large role in the poor relief and education in the town, establishing the first school in England to offer free education for poor boys, which has sustained its legacy as King Edward VI School. He was also responsible for the foundation of the hospital St Saviour in 1184, the largest medieval hospital in Bury St Edmunds. During his abbacy, both the West Front’s central and octagonal towers were completed, marking the end of the first construction phase of the Abbey.

Samson helped to maintain royal relationships in the Abbey, he helped to raise ransom money and visited King Richard I during his time held captive in Germany; this resulted in a royal visit to the Abbey to give thanks. It was also during Samson’s abbacy that the massacre of 57 Jews occurred in 1190.

Abbot Samson himself was responsible for closing the gates on the fleeing Jews and creating the petition to expel the remaining Jews in the town.

Samson’s skeleton was one of those found during the 1903 excavation.\textsuperscript{29}

Abbot Samson was responsible for the completion of the West Front, including the central and flanking octagonal structures.\textsuperscript{30} Construction of the north range buildings of the Great Court was completed whilst the Abbot’s Palace was renovated as guest accommodation. Samson oversaw the creation of new accommodation for important guests (the Black Hostry) and what became the Hall of Pleas as his own accommodation on the south side of the Great Court.\textsuperscript{31}

Jocelin of Brakelond Jocelin of Brakelond is notable as the writer of an extraordinary account of life at the Abbey between 1173 and 1202, a period that covered much of Samson’s abacy. Jocelin is thought to have been from the area of Bury St Edmunds that was known as Brakelond and was possibly educated at the monastic school. In 1173 he entered the Abbey, where Samson was the novice master. Jocelin became chaplain to the prior in 1180 and then in 1182, chaplain to the new abbot, Samson.\textsuperscript{32}
HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT AND THE WIDER CONTEXT

1198
Fire in the church. The shrine of St Edmund escaped damage but was placed on a stone platform.  

Late C12th
Ancient stone parish church was dedicated to St Mary.  

1210
Central tower collapsed northwards and not repaired until the 1230s.  

1214
A group of earls and barons met at the Abbey, under the guise of making a pilgrimage, and allegedly swore an oath to challenge King John. The clauses of the Magna Carta are said to have been discussed.  

1215
Sacrist Richard of Newport oversaw the demolition and rebuilding of the chapterhouse and also completed a great bell for the central tower.  

1220–1234

Interpretation: Life in the Abbey
The Abbey was effectively its own world, ruled over by the Abbot. The daily routine of the monks varied with the seasons but included set times of prayer, worship, eating, sleeping and working. Different monks and laymen had different roles from working in the fields or industries to making bread and ale, producing manuscripts to managing the Abbey’s vast estates, overseeing building work and caring for the sick. The different tasks were overseen by different senior monks within the Abbey’s hierarchy: the Prior, Sub-Prior, Sacrist, Almoners and Cellarer.

The covered walk of the cloister linked, around a courtyard, a group of buildings essential to practical life for the monks. The typical layout of a monastic cloister would have comprised a dormitory and day room to the east, the refectory in the south (at Bury St Edmunds it was to the north), and the buttery, pantry and associated buildings to the west. The Abbey’s cloister contained a connecting walkway (the trayle), a garden in the middle and John Leland described the lead pipe that fed the lavatorium (communal washing area) in the cloister garden. The southern side of the cloister contained a covered walkway, which housed carrels and/or desks for the monks to study and write. It is thought that the substantial library was located above the southern cloister walk, but it has also been suggested that it was located over the Vestry and Chapterhouse. The Chapterhouse is where the monks assembled daily to conduct business.

The Great Court was the main area of interaction between the secular and monastic life to conduct ‘commerce, provisioning of the monks, the administration of monastic estates, and the great affairs of state’.

The Abbey produced its own provisions. The Dovecote provided meat, eggs and fertiliser. The Crankles are said to have been fishponds for the monks (although this is uncertain), which was a delicacy to them considering they were only allowed meat on their feast days. Additionally, the vineyard provided grapes for wine, which was used at both the monks’ table and services.

Interpretation: Magna Carta
Meaning the Great Charter, the Magna Carta is regarded as the foundation of English liberties. It contained 63 clauses, of which the most famous is: ‘No free man shall be seized or imprisoned, or stripped of his rights or possessions, or outlawed or exiled, or deprived of his standing in any other way, nor will we proceed with force against him, or send others to do so, except by the lawful judgement of his equals or by the law of the land. To no one will we sell, to no one deny or delay right or justice.’

This clause gave free men the right to a fair trial. It would later be interpreted as trial by jury. In the seventeenth century English Civil War, Magna Carta was invoked to limit the authority of Charles I. The interpretation of this clause as signifying individual liberty has been echoed in documents such as the American Bill of Rights (1791) and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948).

King John granted the Magna Carta on 15 June 1215 at Runnymede near Windsor. It addressed a range of issues from land ownership to the removal of certain royal servants.

John reneged on the Magna Carta almost immediately and the Pope declared it void. Civil war followed. John’s death in 1216 led to the crowning of Henry III, who issued a new version. Three clauses remain from the 1225 charter: the one above and clauses protecting the freedoms of the Church of England and the City of London.

The Magna Carta was both a charter of liberties and effectively a peace treaty. When King John failed to address the grievances presented by a group of barons and the Archbishop, some of barons renounced their oath of allegiance and captured the City of London. The king was forced to agree the Magna Carta on 15 June 1215 at Runnymede near Windsor. It addressed a range of issues from land ownership to the removal of certain royal servants.

The clauses of the Magna Carta are said to have been discussed.

33 Ibid, pp.63, 182.
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Abbot Simon de Luton (1257–1279) built a large Lady Chapel on the north side of the choir and the original rotunda, which had been in use as a Lady Chapel, was demolished.\(^41\)

The Chapel of St Botolph was built.\(^42\)

Chapel of the Charnel was built.\(^43\)

Abbey attacked by rioters as tensions grew amongst the townspeople and the Abbey.\(^44\)

An armed crowd stormed the Abbey and forced entry through the gate into the Great Court where they were attacked by the monks. The Treasury, Sacristy and carrels in the cloister were looted, and important monastic documents removed and destroyed. The Abbey Church was untouched by the attack, which focussed on the secular and administrative side of the Abbey.

The Abbey Church was attacked, the Abbey gates were set ablaze as were the Sacrist’s offices, the Abbey stables, malthouse, bakehouse and granaries on the north side of the Great Court, the guest quarters, cellarer’s offices and infirmary before being brought under control.

The Abbey Gate was constructed to the south of the earlier gate.\(^45\)

Despite the fear of further attack, the design of the rebuilt Abbey Gate was more concerned with appearance than defence.

Interpretation: The Candlemas Guild
The Abbey forbade the town’s merchant guild in response to the 1327 rising. However, the merchants of Bury St Edmunds were determined to have a forum for town matters so established a new guild under a religious guise. This was the guild of St Mary, also known as the Candlemas Guild, based at St James’s Church.

One merchant in particular, Jankyn Smith, repeatedly served as the head of the guild, the alderman, and played a crucial role in establishing the influence of the guild and undermining the power of the Abbey. On 10 September 1470, Smith established a charity and on the same day agreed a ‘charter’ with the Abbot that set out the privileges of the townspeople but also agreed the payment of 100 marks on the election of every new abbot (the Abbot’s Cope). Income from Smith’s foundation was to be used to pay the Abbot’s Cope and other taxes levied by the Abbey. His example was copied by others, such as Margaret Odeham, who set up similar though smaller foundations.\(^46\)
The Black Death reached Bury St Edmunds and decimated the monastic population. Plague returned in 1369.\textsuperscript{47}

Peasants’ Revolt resulting from socio-economic tensions generated by the Black Death compounded by high taxes.

1349

Jack Straw’s Rebellion. In Bury St Edmunds this resulted in the Prior being killed and his head being displayed on a spike in the marketplace. There was no lasting damage to the Abbey buildings.\textsuperscript{48}

1381

Chancel of St James’s church was rebuilt.\textsuperscript{49} The nave was probably rebuilt around the same time.

1390–1402

Rebuilding of St Mary’s church, parts of which survive at the lower level today.\textsuperscript{50}

1400

1430

The south side of the Western tower collapsed.\textsuperscript{51}

1431

The east side of the Western tower collapsed.\textsuperscript{52}

John Lydgate (c.1370–c.1451)

John Lydgate was born in Lidgate, Suffolk and was a poet and prior of Hatfield. Lydgate had a monastic upbringing and many of his poems reflect his religious education. He also had access to the fine library at the Abbey of St Edmund and also made valuable connections to sources of literary patronage through the Abbey. He is often simply referred to as the Monk of Bury.

In 1423 Lydgate was elected prior of Hatfield Regis, Essex, a small priory appropriated to Bury St Edmunds, a position he maintained until 1434. Much of Lydgate’s work pays homage to Chaucer, through the themes and topics explored as well as his use of language and rhetoric. At the request of Abbot William Curteys, Lydgate wrote the legend of St Edmund, patron saint of the Abbey and also one of St Fremund, the nephew of Edmund. In his writing, Lydgate gives the tale an epic twist by adding dramatic scenes and dialogue to the traditional tale of his martyrdom. Lydgate remained in Bury St Edmunds until his death in c.1449–1451, where he was then buried at the Abbey. Lydgate demonstrated the high level of art and craftsmanship achieved at the Abbey during the late medieval period.\textsuperscript{53}

\textsuperscript{47} Hogett, Heritage Assessment, p.66.  
\textsuperscript{48} Ibid, p.66.  
\textsuperscript{49} Ibid, p.215.  
\textsuperscript{50} Ibid, p.215.  
\textsuperscript{52} Hogett, Heritage Assessment, p.67.  
\textsuperscript{53} Ibid, p.67.
Construction of the Guildhall porch by the Candlemas Guild, possibly to hold the deeds of the charity created by Jankyn Smith.\textsuperscript{58}

The Western tower was dismantled and slowly rebuilt.\textsuperscript{54}

Henry VI wanted to spend Christmas at the Abbey and demanded the refurbishment of the Abbot’s Palace to accommodate him.\textsuperscript{55}

Major fire gutted the interior of the Abbey Church but St Edmund’s shrine survived.\textsuperscript{56} Most other monastic buildings were unaffected with the major exception of the Refectory.\textsuperscript{57}

Upper parts of St Mary’s church rebuilt and chancel chapels and sanctuary added.\textsuperscript{59}

Original nave of St James’s church rebuilt.\textsuperscript{60}

Start of the process of rebuilding the Abbey Church.\textsuperscript{61}

Mary, Queen of France and sister of Henry VIII was buried in the Abbey Church.\textsuperscript{62}

Major fire gutted the interior of the Abbey Church but St Edmund’s shrine survived.\textsuperscript{56} Most other monastic buildings were unaffected with the major exception of the Refectory.\textsuperscript{57}

Construction of the Guildhall porch by the Candlemas Guild, possibly to hold the deeds of the charity created by Jankyn Smith.\textsuperscript{58}

The Western tower was dismantled and slowly rebuilt.\textsuperscript{54}

Henry VI wanted to spend Christmas at the Abbey and demanded the refurbishment of the Abbot’s Palace to accommodate him.\textsuperscript{55}

Major fire gutted the interior of the Abbey Church but St Edmund’s shrine survived.\textsuperscript{56} Most other monastic buildings were unaffected with the major exception of the Refectory.\textsuperscript{57}

Upper parts of St Mary’s church rebuilt and chancel chapels and sanctuary added.\textsuperscript{59}

Original nave of St James’s church rebuilt.\textsuperscript{60}

Start of the process of rebuilding the Abbey Church.\textsuperscript{61}

Mary, Queen of France and sister of Henry VIII was buried in the Abbey Church.\textsuperscript{62}

---
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Abbey dissolved. 63

- Basilica of St Benedict may have survived to the Dissolution. 64
- Relics and treasures taken, although the monks may have removed many of the relics in advance as there is a suggestion that the relics had already been taken to the basilica of St Sernin, Toulouse. 65
- The Abbey Church and some other monastic buildings were stripped of their stonework and only their ruins remain.
- The boundary of the precinct, including the Norman Tower and Abbey Gate, survived together with the Abbot’s Bridge. 66

**Connection**

Some of the carved stonework removed from the Abbey following the Dissolution is displayed at Moyse’s Hall. Other carved stonework can be found incorporated into buildings all around Bury St Edmunds and in surrounding villages.

---

**Interpretation: The Development of the Guildhall Feoffees**

In anticipation of the Dissolution of the Guilds wealthy individuals bought the lands of the Candlemas Guild and were then reimbursed using funds from the sale of the plate of St Mary’s and St James’s churches. The lands were then deemed to be enfeoffed to the parishioners, which seems to have resulted in the effective though not formal translation of the Candlemas Guild into the Guildhall Feoffees. Sir Nicholas Bacon, Lord Keeper of the Great Seal (1558–1579) was a feoffee. Over time, the Guildhall Feoffees acquired sections of land within the Abbey precinct, some of which they still hold today. 67

The Guildhall Feoffees effectively governed the town until 1606 and took over many of the Abbey’s responsibilities including the repair or roads, bridges and the town gates. The Feoffees also established a bridewell or local gaol. 68

---

63 Ibid., p. 2.
64 Ibid., p. 158.
65 Ibid., p. 64.
66 Ibid., p. 67.
James I granted the incorporation of the town. This enabled the creation of a Corporation to run the town and gave it the right to elect burgesses. It also gave the town control over the markets and fairs, the rights to which had been sold at the Dissolution. The Corporation was housed in the Guildhall and remained there until 1966.77

1584 1606

1608 – 11 April 1614

1633 1637 1685–1688

Purchase of what is now the Cathedral shop building as a vicarage for St James’s Church. A house adjacent to the Norman Tower had been bought over a decade earlier for St Mary’s Church.72

A major fire broke out in Eastgate Street and destroyed around 160 houses and 400 outbuildings.74

The Corporation was granted the right to elect two MPs and the right to hold Quarter Sessions, a court leet (a manorial court) and coroner’s inquiries. The Corporation was also given the churches and their advowsons so they controlled who was appointed as the parish priests.

Sale of St Mary’s vicarage by the Norman Tower because the bells made it too noisy.75

The Chapel of the Charnel became an alehouse and then a blacksmith’s shop.76

The former Abbot’s Palace was used as a Jesuit school. In 1688 it was attacked and partially demolished.77

Connection
As the home of, first, the Candlemas Guild, then the Guildhall Feoffees and then the Town Corporation, the Guildhall represents the other half of the story of the power struggle between the Abbey and the town.

Interpretation: The Enlightenment
The start of the Enlightenment age is debated but often considered to have begun in the mid-seventeenth century. It initially began with the intention of proving the existence of God through the study of the universe and the natural world but it is now often seen as the ‘Age of Reason’ and much of the philosophical thought that developed was opposed to organised religion.

The Enlightenment involved the development of scientific analysis applied to fields such as physics, astronomy and anatomy as well as the expansion of knowledge in mathematics and economics and the development of politics and philosophy. Alongside the sciences a similar analytical approach was developed to understand and record the past. Antiquarianism encompassed the study of historic documents, buildings and archaeology.

In Bury St Edmunds, the Abbey site aroused considerable antiquarian interest and the eighteenth century saw the publication of histories of the Abbey, the recording of the Abbey ruins in illustrations and the study of the Abbey’s emerging archaeology. The same desire to catalogue and understand inspired the creation of the Botanic Garden and the formation of the Athenaeum.

72 Before the Dissolution the Abbey had provided the chaplains for the churches so vicarages had not been needed. Suffolk Records Society, Accounts of the Feoffees, xxxvi.
73 Suffolk Records Society, Accounts of the Feoffees, xi, xlvii.
74 Suffolk Records Society, Accounts of the Feoffees, lvii.
75 Suffolk Records Society, Accounts of the Feoffees, lvii.
76 Hoggett, Heritage Assessment, 213.
77 Ibid, p.220.
Major Richardson Pack acquired the main Abbey site. After demolishing some of the remaining buildings, he sold it to Sir Jermyn Davers, 4th baronet, of Rougham. It is thought the Davers family built Abbey House around this time.79

Earliest depictions of the Abbey ruins by Edmund Prideaux.81

Clopton Asylum constructed near the Abbey Church southern wall. This provided accommodation for the poor of both parishes.83 It has been suggested that James Burrough, architect of the Earl of Bristol’s house on Honey Hill, may have been the architect.84

Major Richardson Pack (1682–1728)
Born in Suffolk, Richardson Pack was educated at Merchant Taylors’ School and St John’s College, Oxford but left before completing his degree to study law at Middle Temple. He joined the army and was in command of a foot company by 1705. He fought in Spain in the War of the Spanish Succession, where his bravery earned him promotion to major. His time in Spain also inspired his poetry and prose.

He was back in Suffolk in 1714 but with the Jacobite Rebellion he was recalled and served a further three years. He married and had a son whilst living in London in 1719. The following year he and his family had moved to Bury St Edmunds, where he demolished the Abbot’s Palace and the remains of the formal gardens. His literary work was published from 1719 and his time in Bury St Edmunds inspired further poetry.

In 1722 he purchased Northgate House in Bury St Edmunds. By 1725 he was serving with the army in Exeter and was sent to Aberdeen with his regiment in 1727. He died and was buried there the following year.80

79 Ibid., p.232.
81 Hoggett, Heritage Assessment, p.77.
82 Manor House List Entry, https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1022551
83 Ibid., p.223.
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Mary Davers (1730–1805)

Mary Davers seems to have lived in Abbey House in the late eighteenth century and, interestingly, to have acquired a number of other plots of land in the Abbey precinct. Deeds at the Record Office in Bury St Edmunds indicate that she acquired land and a dwelling at the east end of St James’ Church from William and Mary Chaplin in 1760, the “Pallace Garden” from Jonathan Bullen in 1771 and the Vinefields from John Mayer in 1778. Although sometimes referred to as Mrs Davers, it seems likely that she was Mary Davers, eldest daughter of Sir Jermyn Davers. She did not marry and though her property passed briefly to her younger brother Sir Charles Davers, he died in 1806 so it passed to her nephew, the Marquess of Bristol.

The Davers family were prominent in Bury St Edmunds and Suffolk during the eighteenth century. The first baronet, Sir Robert, had been a Royalist in the Civil War and gone on to make his fortune in Barbados, where his son, the second baronet was born. The second Sir Robert Davers served as MP first for Bury St Edmunds and them for Suffolk for much of the period from 1689 until 1722. He made an advantageous marriage to the Hon. Mary Jermyn, co-heiress, which led him to sell the family’s seat at Rougham and move to Rushbrooke Hall. Two of his sons succeeded him in turn as baronet, including Sir Jermyn Davers, who also served as MP for Bury St Edmunds and then for Suffolk from 1722 until 1743, and who inherited the Jermyn estates from his great uncle, Baron Dover. Sir Jermyn was succeeded first by his son Sir Robert Davers, who was killed in Canada in Pontiac’s Rebellion, and then by Sir Charles Davers, the last of the direct line of Davers baronets.

1st Marquess of Bristol (1769–1859)

Fredrick William Hervey was educated at St John’s College Cambridge and Lincoln’s Inn. He served as MP for Bury St Edmunds in 1796 and 1802–1803 and was Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs 1801–1803. Although he was the second son, the death of his elder brother meant he inherited the title of Earl of Bristol from his father in 1803. His father had been responsible for the beginning of the construction of Ickworth House, with the vision of using it to house his large art collection. At the time of his death, the house was incomplete and the estate was largely in debt, leaving his son to resolve the issues with the estate and complete the house, a project which took over 20 years. He was created a marquess in 1826.

Although the Marquess of Bristol’s primary residence was Ickworth House, he also inherited Abbey House and its garden in 1806. In 1831, the Marquess of Bristol offered Nathaniel Hodson an area of garden at the northern end of the Abbey precinct for the expansion of the botanic gardens. The 1st Marquess died in 1859.

85 Ibid, p.81.
86 Conveyance of Moiety 1806, Suffolk Record Office, Bury St Edmunds, HA 507/2/221/1.
87 Hoggett, Heritage Assessment, p.167.
88 Ibid, p.82.
89 Ibid, p.91.
90 Ibid, p.223.
91 Ibid, p.222.
93 Hoggett, Heritage Assessment, p.232.
95 Hoggett, Heritage Assessment
Payne published a plan of Bury St Edmunds.

Nathaniel Hodson (1783–1861)
Nathaniel Hodson was born in Cambridge and from c.1800 worked for the War Office in London. Living in Lambeth, he seems to have developed a private collection of plants and contributed to publications. In 1818 he moved to Bury St Edmunds with the intention of creating a larger garden. By 1820, he had transferred his collection to a three acre site east of the Great Churchyard. It was not ideal as the ground was marshy but he nevertheless advertised for subscribers to help fund his endeavour. The quality of his collection is perhaps indicated by one of his subscribers being the Curator of the Cambridge Botanical Garden. He received seeds from other gardens and developed a significant collection that also provided seeds to others. By 1829 it was clear he needed a larger site and in 1830 was offered the Abbey Gardens by the Marquess of Bristol. The new garden was established by 1831 and whilst popular with subscribers and visitors, more were needed to fund the venture. By 1835, ornamental plants and a menagerie were added. Hodson served as Mayor of the Corporation in 1855/6 and died in 1861.

Marquess of Bristol offered Hodson an area of garden at the northern end of the Abbey precinct to create a new, larger Botanic Garden. Hodson’s new garden included a circular garden of concentric beds as well as various specimen trees. The Marquess allows Hodson to build a dwelling, Alwyne House.

1821-1823
Botanic Garden, first created by Nathaniel Hodson to the east of the Great Churchyard.

1823
Lenny’s survey of the Abbey House and Grounds.

1831
South porch of St Mary’s Church dismantled and taken to Newton Court.

1834
Construction of 6 The Churchyard.

1835–1884
Restoration of the Norman Tower.

1842–1846
The Crypt of the Chapel of the Charnel was partly dug into, revealing a floor of Barnack stone.

1844
The Abbey Garden, first created by Nathaniel Hodson to the east of the Great Churchyard.

Hoggett, Heritage Assessment, p. 232.
Ibid., p. 223.
Ibid., pp. 2, 237.

History of the Abbey Gardens in Bury St Edmunds, http://www.stedmundsburychronicle.co.uk/Abbey-gdns.htm

Clive Paine, St Mary’s, Bury St Edmunds. 2016, 38.

Hoggett, Heritage Assessment, p. 239.
John Darkin, clerk of the works for the restoration of St James’s Church, carried out excavations at the eastern end of the Abbey and monastic buildings near the river.

Railings erected on the south side of St Mary’s Church, following the removal of a wall in 1825.  

Enlargement and refacing of Eastgate Cottage by the Marquess of Bristol.  

Removal of the baker’s shop and two cottages to the north of St Mary’s Church tower.  

Chancel and nave roof of St James’ Church rebuilt by George Gilbert Scott.  

Restoration of St Mary’s Church by Sir Arthur Blomfield. Further major phases of restoration by local contractors or architects were undertaken in 1880, 1901, 1909, the 1960s, 1980s and 1990s.

103 Paine, St Mary’s, Bury St Edmunds, p.38.  
105 Ibid.  
106 Eastgate Cottage Listing Entry, https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1343603.  
107 Hoggett, Heritage Assessment, 215.  
108 Paine, St Mary’s, Bury St Edmunds, p.38–40.
Dispute over authenticity of relics in Toulouse, taken to the chapel at Arundel Castle, under the care of the Dukes of Norfolk.

- **1873**: Morant published an account of the history and architectural remains of the Abbey, with accompanying map.\(^{109}\)
- **1876**: Demolition of the house and buildings on the south and east sides of the chancel of St Mary’s Church.\(^{110}\)
- **1895**: M.R. James published the most substantial work on the history of the Abbey and layout of the Abbey Church revealing previously unknown work.\(^{111}\)
- **1901**: Excavation led by Sir Ernest Clarke identified the chapter house and revealed the abbots’ coffins.\(^{112}\) Further excavations revealed the foundations of many more walls in the north-eastern quarter of the cloister.
- **1902–1903**: Memorial erected to the 17 sixteenth century Protestant martyrs in the Great Churchyard.\(^{113}\)
- **1906–1907**: The Magistrates Court was built, partially replacing an earlier court building. It was designed by the architect A.A. Hunt.
- **1912**: Abbey Gardens opened as a public park with an entry fee. The Borough Council leased the gardens from the Marquess of Bristol. An area was retained as the garden of Abbey House (now the Garden of Remembrance and the Pilgrim’s Herb Garden).\(^{114}\)
- **1914**: After much debate, St James’s church was selected as the Cathedral for the new Diocese of Ipswich and St Edmundsbury.\(^{115}\)

\(^{109}\) Hoggett, Heritage Assessment, p.119.

\(^{110}\) Paine, St Mary’s, Bury St Edmunds, 38.

\(^{111}\) Hoggett, Heritage Assessment, p.121.

\(^{112}\) Ibid, p.121.

\(^{113}\) Ibid, p.241.

\(^{114}\) Ibid, p.2.

\(^{115}\) Ibid, p.2.
### Historical Development and the Wider Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year(s)</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1914–1918</td>
<td>Abbey Gardens used for convalescence during the First World War and for the display of captured German guns to boost morale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>War Memorial on Angel Hill was unveiled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>A battle-scarred Mk I tank, the ‘Kaffir’ was presented to Bury St Edmunds for raising £2 million for the local War Savings Campaign Committee. It remained displayed near the Abbot’s Parlour until 1933.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928–1933</td>
<td>Clearance and restoration of the Abbey, which revealed the eastern range and infirmary buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>Pillar of Salt road sign installed on Angel Hill. [117]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Conversion of the North Chapel of St Mary’s Church to the Suffolk Regimental Chapel by Sir Ninian Comper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>The central area of the gardens was redesigned replacing the concentric circles with 64 island beds as part of the Coronation celebrations for George VI in 1937. [118]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>An air-raid shelter dug in the north-west corner of the Abbey Gardens.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

[117] Pillar of Salt Sign List Entry, [https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/137651](https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/137651).


Bury St Edmunds Borough Council was created. It became St Edmundsbury Borough Council in 1973.

1944
- ‘Holidays at Home’ organized in the Abbey Gardens.

1945
- VE and VI Day celebrations in the Abbey Gardens.

1947
- Creation of the Appleby Rose Garden, funded by the donation of royalties from *Suffolk Summer*, a book by John Appleby about his experiences as an American serviceman stationed at Rougham in the Second World War. It contains a bench made from an American B52 bomber wing.\(^{120}\)

1952
- Whittingham developed a detailed plan of the layout of the monastic precinct identifying individual buildings.\(^{121}\)

1953
- The Borough bought the gardens from the Marquess of Bristol, reuniting the two main parts of the precinct – the Abbey Gardens and Great Churchyard – under one ownership.\(^{122}\)

1955
- The eastern parts of the Abbey Church were placed into the guardianship of the Ministry of Public Buildings and Works by the Borough of Bury St Edmunds.\(^{123}\)

1957–1964
- Ministry of Works excavated the ruins of the transepts, crossing, eastern chapels and crypt of the Abbey Church.\(^{124}\)

1958
- Removal of almost all the headstones and monuments in front of the West Front.

1959
- Creation of the Water Garden using profits from a pageant.

---

\(^{120}\) SEBC, Abbey Gardens (Guidebook).

\(^{121}\) Hoggett, Heritage Assessment, p.144.

\(^{122}\) Ibid, p.240.

\(^{123}\) Ibid, p.129.

\(^{124}\) Ibid, p.129.
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**1960s**
- Chancel of the Cathedral extended by Stephen Dykes Bower.\(^{125}\)

**1973**
- January: Designated as part of Bury St Edmunds Town Centre Conservation Area, which was revised in 2012.\(^{126}\)

**1976**
- Installation of the statue of St Edmund by Dame Elisabeth Frink on the green in front of the West Front.

**1976–1980**
- Anthony Fleming excavated the Queen’s Chamber, which also revealed evidence of Anglo-Saxon occupation.\(^{128}\)

**1990**
- Cathedral Centre completed.
- The Sensory Garden was created.

**1998**
- The new Pilgrim’s Herb Garden was opened by HRH The Prince of Wales.

**1999–2005**
- The central tower of the Cathedral was constructed.\(^{129}\)
- Abbey Gardens and Precincts designated as a Grade II Registered Park and Garden.\(^{130}\)

**2001**
- Cloisters added to the Cathedral.

**2008**
- The Cenotaph in St Mary’s Church, originally installed in 1920 to commemorate the dead of the First World War, was relocated near the Royal Anglia Chapel (the Suffolk Regimental Chapel until 2009).\(^{131}\)

**2014**
- The Peace and Holocaust Memorial Garden was created. It contains a distinctive teardrop sculpture.

**2015**
- The new Pilgrim’s Herb Garden was opened by HRH The Prince of Wales.

---

**Stephen Dykes-Bower (1903–1994)**

Stephen Dykes-Bower was born in Gloucester in April 1903 and spent much of his early life involved in the community of Gloucester Cathedral. Dykes-Bower’s religious background influenced his progression as an architect later in life, leading him to develop an interest in the Victorian tradition of church architecture. Through his work, Dykes-Bower aimed to emulate the beauty of existing architecture, rebuilding a number of churches, including the high altar for St Paul’s Cathedral.

Dykes-Bower was appointed to complete the Cathedral Church of St Edmundsbury in Suffolk in 1945. He designed a new choir and crossing, which saw the imposition of tall and light transepts, painted wooden ceilings within the interior and traditional stone carving and flint flushwork externally. His designs fit aptly with the existing structure, reflecting the late Gothic work. Dykes-Bower died before seeing the completion of a tower on the crossing; however, he requested the completion of the work by his former assistants Warwick Pethers and Hugh Matthew. A bequest in his will led to a fundraising campaign to build the Millennium Tower.\(^{127}\)

---

\(^{125}\) Ibid, p.215.

\(^{126}\) Ibid, p.135.


\(^{128}\) Hoggett, Heritage Assessment, p.138.

\(^{129}\) Ibid, p.215.

\(^{130}\) Ibid, p.40.

\(^{131}\) Paine, St Mary’s, Bury St Edmunds, p.40.
3.1.4 Historical Development Plan

This plan indicates the main construction dates of the surviving historic fabric on the site. It is a high level assessment and does not include detailed assessment of historic development. Individual elements may have been subject to later repairs and alterations, which are not recorded on this plan. This plan may be subject to revision as further information becomes available.

The assessment has been undertaken in relation to the buildings, structures and some landscape areas which have been created at a specific time. Open spaces and landscape arrangements that have developed over time have not been assessed.

This plan is reproduced as four enlarged quadrants in Appendix F.

---

Plan showing the age of the surviving historic fabric on the site. This plan is not to scale.
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3.2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL SUMMARY
Interest in the site’s history led to amateur attempts at investigation in as early as the seventeenth century, and the wider budding interest in antiquity led to enhanced attempts from the eighteenth century onward. This timeline provides a summary of the more detailed account in the Heritage Assessment by Richard Hoggett Heritage of the archaeological investigations that have been undertaken within the project area. There is potential for non-intrusive archaeological surveys in the future to consolidate and deepen the understanding of the site’s development and surviving archaeology.

Archaeological Timeline

1775
Archaeologia also recorded discoveries made by Mr Godbolt, including: the foundations of another semi-circular chapel which adjoins the great chapel of the Virgin; new information regarding the transept pillars; passages to the crypts; a sculpted head; and lead crosses with inscriptions (which were commonly placed with the interred).

1772
The ground plan of the Abbey Church was exposed and the Lady Chapel and two apsidal chapels were identified. King Edward’s discoveries were later recorded in the first scholarly account of the Abbey ruins, Archaeologia. He made note that there are two Saint Mary chapels, the northern Lady Chapel and the axial chapel of the presbytery. In the same year, the coffin of Thomas Beaufort, Duke of Exeter and third son of John of Gaunt, was discovered.

1775
King wrote to the Society of Antiquaries, which was later published in Archaeologia in 1777, about the discoveries of a twelfth century lead seal of Ranulph de Gernon, 4th Earl of Chester; a fragmentary piece of clay with relief lettering; and a stone with the inscribed name ‘Lydgate’, who had been buried in the church after his death c.1450.

1834
Thomas Beaufort’s body was again disinterred and his bones exhibited at an 1849 quarterly meeting of the Suffolk Institute of Archaeology and History.

1844
The crypt of the Chapel of The Charnel was unearthed and the Barnack stone floor was revealed beneath two feet of bones.

1848
A local newspaper recounted the discovery of wolf bones near St James’ tower. Their anatomy was confirmed by Richard Owen, a pre-eminent scientist of the time. It is thought that these post-date the Dissolution.

1849
John Darkin excavated the eastern end of the Abbey and monastic buildings near the river and discovered foundations, probably the remains of Bradfield Hall (a range of buildings attached to the infirmary). These would be again uncovered during excavations in 1962.

1849
The Suffolk Institute of Archaeology excavated the crypt and choir, which revealed paving in the choir as well as tiled paving and other details of the northern chapel’s altar.

1902–1903
M.R. James published a book in 1895 which very accurately identified and interpreted elements of the church as well as the identification of Abbot’s burial places. This led to an important excavation of the site in 1902–1903. This excavation was particularly interested in the burial locations of six Abbots identified in his book, and it discovered the Chapter House’s north, south, and east walls, tiled floor, and the bodies of six abbots (Abbots Ording, Samson, Richard de Insula, Rushbrook, Edmund de Walpole, and the unconfined Hugh I) precisely where predicted. Inside Abbot Samson’s coffin was a silver mount and a lead mortuary cross. The bodies were examined and then reburied. Today, one can see the new stone lids with their names inscribed. The excavation also included the discovery of the cloister’s foundation walls in the north-east area.

1928–1933
The Bury Corporation and Ministry of Works performed clearance and consolidation work. The area leased to the Corporation and all the boundary wall and masonry above ground were treated. Ground around the Infirmary, east of the Abbey Church, and north of the Chapter House and the Slype were excavated and the walls treated. The eastern range and Infirmary buildings were revealed and consolidated.

1930s
Sewer construction around St James’s tower led to speculation that the precinct was encircled by a ditch or moat.
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1948–1949
Excavations by N.C. Goldsmith and H.J.M. Maltby uncovered the full depth of the Crypt. The eastern face of the Crypt’s west wall was shown to be covered in the remains of fresco painting. A pier was also found. The efforts also discovered a supposedly earlier buried wall in the area of the crypt, but this has not been identified.

1957–1964
The eastern parts of the Abbey Church were obtained by the Ministry of Public Buildings and Works in 1955, and the church, which was covered in rubble and earth, was partly excavated. This included the transepts, crossing, eastern chapels and crypt down to original floor levels and the ruins were consolidated.

1958
Dufty and Radford discovered the West Front’s foundations and the footings of a Norman building, which was believed to be the west wall of St Denis Church. This church is thought to have extended under the West Front.

1959–1964
Excavation by the Ministry of Public Buildings and Works revealed the vaulted undercroft of St Botolph’s Chapel and a small oven, which is thought to have been used to prepare eucharistic wafer. The excavation also explored the Lady Chapel and discovered that it was three bays long and two bays wide and contained the burial of Prior Thomas Gosford. Furthermore, evidence of a cistern and well in the Treasury and vestries were found. The 1962 excavation at the eastern end provided some understanding of Bradfield Hall.

1976–1980
Excavation in the Queen’s Chamber revealed flints from Mesolithic and Neolithic use of the area. This includes Mesolithic flints, which indicate wider use of the confuence area in the Mesolithic period. Excavations of the Queen’s Chamber also revealed prehistoric cultivation of the river terrace, which is validated by the first century BC pottery. An early Anglo-Saxon boundary was discovered with bones, sherds, and a glass bead; suggesting that it may have been a cemetery. Additionally, middle Anglo-Saxon Ipswich Ware was found, and these finds were residual but substantial enough to assert activity during the period of 720–850 AD.

The excavations revealed late Anglo-Saxon timber buildings and associated structures from the sixth to tenth centuries, including early post-in-trench construction with associated pits containing butchered animal bones, fish, and oyster shells; while other outside structures incorporating wattle and daub building construction were also revealed.

The later timber buildings ran parallel to the river with a surface to the west that is thought to be part of a road. There was a main large building, which was built in the same plank-in-trench method and contained a central hearth and reused Roman bricks. Similar to the earlier pattern, wattle-and-daub buildings extended out of the excavation area. These buildings were found with pottery, animal bones from domestic types, horse, deer, crane bones, and sea-fish. Butchered sheep and weaving tools also indicate that wool and textile were important economic components. Remains of iron-smithing and tinning were found, including an iron stylus, which is typically associated with monastic life.

1980s
Documentation and archaeological finds from Mustow Street further validated speculation of a ditch or moat around the precinct.

1983
Further residual Iron Age pottery sherds were found within the precinct yard but may date to the early Anglo-Saxon period.

1988
Archaeological investigation discovered remains of the northern apse below the present ground level.

1980s–1990s
An archaeology excavation preceded the construction of the new Cathedral Centre and the Cathedral’s north transept. Evidence of an Anglo-Saxon road confirmed a main north-south road that linked Northgate Street and Spahawk/Southgate Street, and thus the Palace Yard area was outside the earliest precinct. The surface of the precinct courtyard was discovered, followed by a series of cobbled surfaces built on rammed sand and with a large ditch along the west edge. Two successive timber buildings of post-in-trench construction from the eleventh and twelfth centuries were found in this area. Stone buildings constructed here have shown to have had timber origins. Excavations also showed a number of other medieval buildings on this site.

1990
A survey suggested that the areas of the Infirmary, Abbot’s Garden, dovecot, and mill have the likely potential to yield the discovery of foundations. A geophysical survey may have discovered the Abbot’s Court mill.

1994
Middle Saxon fragments of pale blue glass, thought to be part of a vessel, were found between the tennis courts and eastern end of the crypt.

1999
Excavation occurred ahead of construction of the Cathedral’s north transept, and revealed flints, small pits, and linear features. Discoveries included at least 135 flints, including 64 Mesolithic flints, a late Neolithic/early Bronze Age assemblage and a later Bronze Age or Iron Age group.

2004
A flight of steps leading to a cellar to the north-east of the Chapterhouse were rediscovered when the backfill from the 1934 excavation collapsed.

2007
Excavation in the south-east precinct, to the south-west of the chapel dedicated to St Andrew, led to the discovery of two graves that are thought to date from the fourteenth century or later. Graves were also discovered in the nineteenth century, later identifying it as a Monk’s Cemetery.

2008
Survey around the tennis courts yielded the possibility of foundation walls related to the apsidal chapel and Bradfield Hall.

2009
The supposed course of the Linnet or a canalised channel through this area was identified by the Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service, while a subsequent investigation revealed crop processing in the area.

2009
Preserved pollen and organic samples taken by Birmingham Archaeo-Environmental provided dates from the Neolithic (2900–2700 BC), Middle Saxon (seventh-eighth centuries) and medieval (eleventh-twelfth centuries) periods. The pollen samples indicate that the site was an open sedge fen prior to the Abbey while peat on site suggests a flood plain and a river that continuously shifted.

2009
Trenching in the Magistrate’s Court car park revealed the south precinct wall of the Abbey and a mortar surface inside, which may be from the time of the Dissolution.

2009
Documentation and archaeological finds from Mustow Street further validated speculation of a ditch or moat around the precinct.
3.3 WIDER HERITAGE CONTEXT

The purpose of this section is to provide some additional contextual information on aspects of the site that enable an assessment of the heritage significance of the site at Bury St Edmunds. With a site as complex as the project site, there are many potential areas of comparison that could be studied. This section considers four:

**Medieval abbeys:** this explores briefly how the Abbey of St Edmund would have compared with other major abbeys of the period;

**Abbey ruins:** this provides an overview of how the surviving Abbey ruins compare with other medieval ruins extant today to understand whether they are particularly good examples nationally;

**Botanic gardens:** this explores the origins of botanic gardens to understand where the Abbey Gardens’ predecessor fits within the chronology of botanic gardens and considers the best known surviving examples today; and

**Urban relationship:** this considers the Abbey’s historic and current relationship to the wider town in terms of its urban layout.

### 3.3.1 Medieval Abbeys

#### Wealth

By the end of the Middle Ages, Bury St Edmunds was the fifth wealthiest Benedictine monastery in Britain on the basis of the *Valor Ecclesiasticus* compiled by Henry VIII. At a gross value of £2336 16s 11d in 1535, it was behind the abbeys of Glastonbury (£3,311), Westminster (£3,480), Canterbury Christ Church (£2,349) and St Alban’s (£2,102) and well ahead of Ely (£1,084) and Norwich (£874).

The great majority of this wealth came from ‘temporalities’, income from estates owned or controlled by the Abbey rather than from church tithes. In 1291 it had temporalities worth £774 out of an estimated total annual income of £1,000, including £40 from the shrine of St Edmund. The major source of this wealth came through control of the Bury St Edmunds Liberty, comprising much of west Suffolk, first given to Bury St Edmunds by Edward the Confessor. The original foundation by Æthelstan had control of the town which continued to the Dissolution and the Abbey had a mint until the fourteenth century, a rare privilege for any abbey. However, in 1353 it had the highest percentage of monastic income distributed to the poor, £398 15s 11½d, (17%).

Comparative figures for European monasteries are not available, but apart from the largest monasteries like Cluny or Monte Cassino, Bury St Edmunds was clearly one of the most important and wealthy churches of the Benedictine Order in Europe in the Middle Ages.

#### Age

Bede records St Felix helping King Sigeberht (d.c.640 AD) found a boys school and a later medieval addition to the twelfth century Liber Eliensis book II suggests Sigeberht founded a monastic institution in Bury St Edmunds c.633. It would not be surprising for a monastic institution to be founded this early in East Anglia and some such institution clearly existed by the early tenth century when Edmund’s body was transferred to a ‘large wooden church’, that came to be guarded by a community of priests established by King Æthelstan in 925.

This community was with Benedictine monks from Ely and St Benet at Holme (Norfolk) in 1020 by King Cnut, who also built a new stone church to house St Edmund that was consecrated by the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1032. This is quite a late date for monks to replace secular priests in England, a process begun by St Dunstan in the 940s. It is, however, the accepted foundation date for the creation of the Benedictine monastery at Bury St Edmunds. Only Bury St Edmunds and St Benet were founded by King Cnut, sometimes interpreted as ‘reparations’ for his Viking ancestor’s pillage of East Anglian monasteries.

Although not a King of England, Edmund, King of the East Angles, became patron saint of England, later jointly with Edward the Confessor. Both saints are seen as supporters to Richard II on the late fourteenth century Walton Diptych. St George was adopted by King Richard c.1198 and was further promoted by Edward III from c.1350, but St Edmund and St Edward remained important throughout the medieval period. St Edmund’s last miracle was recorded in 1375.

Although Winchester Cathedral and Westminster Abbey each had more royal burial, Bury St Edmund’s custody of the saint’s body made the Abbey a focus for pilgrimage and especially for royal visits and generosity until 1539. No other abbey had such an important and continuously recognised royal saint. The closest contenders are Shaftesbury Abbey (Edward the Martyr, King of England, d.978) and Hereford Cathedral (St Ethelbert, another King of the Angles d.794).

The descriptions of the eleventh century church housing St Edmund suggest it was a circular tower surrounded by an aisle. Remains of this structure were reportedly found in 1275 when the Lady Chapel on the east side of the north transept was being built. When Baldwin demolished a timber church (presumably the original, early tenth century structure) for his north transept at the end of the eleventh century, the central tower of Cnut’s church called the Round Chapel was left; a chancel of the ‘Round Chapel’ is listed c.1280. The Round Chapel would belong to a small group of centrally planned English churches built in the first half of the eleventh century that reflected churches like St Bénigne, Dijon and Chartroux in France, all perhaps ultimately deriving from the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem.

#### Architecture

The sheer scale of Baldwin’s Abbey Church means it was unlikely to be copied and apart from the West Front, it was not otherwise innovatory – just very big. There is no discernible architectural influence from Bury St Edmunds in the twelfth century, but that is mainly due to the lack of surviving twelfth century comparative material from the Abbey or in Suffolk churches. For instance, the huge missing tympanum from the Norman Tower may well have been imitated in twelfth century churches in Suffolk, if not beyond. It could have been in evidence before the more famous (but much smaller) Prior’s Door tympanum in Ely. Later, the tracery of the Abbey Gate (1337), in particular the four-petalled flower that takes full advantage of the ogee curve, was much copied in parish churches, most especially in the Bury St Edmunds Liberty. Heywood has also suggested that the round towers of parish churches in East Anglia might have been influenced by the Abbey Church or the Round Chapel.

132 Unfortunately the 1535 Valor Ecclesiasticus has gaps and missing figures. Most monasteries have gross and net figures, but some have a single figure often referred to as the ‘clear’ figure, which is generally reckoned to be a version of ‘net’. St Albans’ £2,102 is one of these ‘clear’ figures and so appreciably higher than Bury St Edmunds’ £3,656 net figure. The gross at St Albans will be at least another 10% so putting it higher than Bury St Edmunds’ gross of £2,336. The biggest figure of all, Westminster, is also a ‘clear’ figure, but already higher than the other gross figures.

133 Whittingham 1951.

134 Fernie 1983, 157; Clapham 1930, p.149.

Further illuminated manuscripts survive, including the fourteenth century Bury Psalter held in the Suffolk Record Office at Bury St Edmunds.

The other nationally known Bury St Edmunds monk was the poet John Lydgate (d.1451). His surviving output is huge, the largest poem being the Fall of Princes, based on a text by Boccaccio. He was commissioned by members of the Royal Court, especially Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, as well as by leading ecclesiastics and aristocrats.

As Marian Campbell has demonstrated, Bury St Edmunds seems to have become a major metalworking centre in the Middle Ages and this must surely have arisen from the direct patronage of the Abbey as well as its encouragement of craftsmen in developing and controlling the town. The Italian Abbot Anselm 1121–1148 is also credited with the creation of bronze west doors to the designs of Master Hugo, an idea he perhaps brought from his previous abbey of St Saba in Rome. They may have been the first in England, though very little is known of others.

3.3.2 Abbey Ruins

Surviving Abbey and Precinct

Although the whole medieval precinct has survived, the public park (especially facilities like the Bowling Green and tennis courts) and more particularly St Edmundsbury Cathedral, have greatly obscured comprehension of the fragments that survive. Many English Heritage sites like Thetford Priory may have similarly fragmentary survivals within a recognisably defined precinct, but the lack of post-Dissolution buildings enables the layout to be easily discerned. There are many monastic sites with more surviving buildings, usually remote rural sites like Fountains (Cistercian) Abbey in Yorkshire or Llanthony (Augustinian) Priory in Monmouth. There are also some of the urban monasteries that have retained better evidence than Bury St Edmunds. Ely, Peterborough, Westminster, Canterbury and Chester have retained much of their precinct, if not all their clausal buildings, mainly because they continued as or became cathedrals at the Dissolution. Bury St Edmunds was on Henry VIII’s c.1541 list of new cathedrals when he was looking to give each county a cathedral but considered the scheme too expensive.

The precise dimensions of all monastic precincts have not been tabulated but Bury St Edmunds, although sizeable, is by no means the largest ecclesiastical or monastic enclosure. Norwich, Salisbury, Canterbury and Ely are certainly larger and the first three also retain walls around most of their site. Such walls are difficult to date but Abbot Anselm (1121–1148) is recorded as building a stone wall in Bury St Edmunds.

Anselm is also credited with building the Norman Tower. It lost the huge Christ in Majesty carved tympanum from the west arch in 1789 and the battlements and Kilpeck dragon heads belong to Cottingham’s restoration of 1842–1846. Otherwise the details appear to belong to east of England practice of c.1130.

The Norman Tower is a unique survival, much taller than the usual two-storey twelfth century monastic gateway (for example, Peterborough) but with its large openings, rather less defensive than tall castle keep gateways (such as Ludlow, Shropshire of the late 1070s). Perhaps of greater interest is its position in line with the west door of the Abbey and at the end of the central street of Baldwin’s ‘new town’. It emphasises the central role of the Abbey in the town (over which it had total control). The tympanum carving of Christ in Majesty – a common topic for the west doors of French churches – must have reminded approaching visitors of the Abbey’s spiritual power too.

Detached bell tower entrances are uncommon anywhere in western Europe, as are monastic gatehouses in line with a main church entrance. Old St Peter’s in Rome had a central raised entrance block to the atrium and the gateway to the great court of Cluny III was almost in line with the west door. There may well have been other examples but none are known in England. The Norman Tower reflects the Italian origin of Abbot Anselm, who instigated its construction following the typology of campaniles in Italy. As the church itself had at least two large towers, this proliferation of great towers is quite remarkable and again places Bury St Edmunds in the context of Europe’s grandest medieval churches.

The Abbey or Great Gate of after 1327 is another major building, far bigger than its equivalent at Norwich (the Ethelbert Gate, c.1320 also rebuilt after a riot) but a tower gatehouse rather than the customary broad monastic gatehouse seen at, for example, Ely Porta, built in 1397. The Abbey Gate is extensively decorated but remains a defensive structure, with a big upper floor. Similar lavishly decorated gates survive at St Augustine’s Canterbury (1300–1308) and Battle Abbey, Sussex (1330s) and, more locally, at Butley Priory (1320s) but the Abbey Gate is the biggest.
Evidence.
Despite the lack of structural evidence, the layout (and evidence for their use) than is currently known at Beds.) have recovered more of the precinct buildings Norton (Cheshire), Bordesley (Worcs.) and Warden and research elsewhere at, for example, Glastonbury, Christ Church Gate, Canterbury HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT AND THE WIDER CONTEXT

139 Some recent programmes of excavation...a tower by c.1100) seems plausible. They just might be gross enlargements of the polygonal staircases at the end of the Ely west transepts. Their function is unknown but a font is recorded in the south one (though a baptistery was hardly needed with two parish churches in the precinct) and perhaps they had some secular abbey function (court or counting house), particularly if there were upper rooms. Edmund’s relics were translated to the new Norman church on 29 April 1095 by Wалкelin, Bishop of Winchester. The general plan and architectural character of Abbot Baldwin’s church of the 1080s fits into the established post-Conquest development of the great church seen in the south and east of England, following on from pre-1066 Normandy. An ambulatory chancel with three radiating chapels follows Battle Abbey, St Augustine’s Abbey Canterbury, Worcester and Gloucester Cathedrals. The three-storey elevation with a large middle gallery and big clerestory windows behind a continuous passage is established at Winchester, Old St Paul’s, Worcester and Gloucester. The ambulatory with radiating chapels plan had been developed in central/northern France in the eleventh century, often with a crypt and although few large crypts exist in Normandy, Baldwin would surely have known French examples like Chartres Cathedral (1020s) or Orléans Cathedral (1089–1031). However, his own abbey at St Denis did not have an ambulatory until c.1140.

The big octagonal structures at either end of the Bury St Edmunds façade extend well beyond the nave aisles to bring this west transept to about the same length as the east transept. These are unique to Bury St Edmunds and McAleer was unable to suggest parallels. His suggestion that they echoed Caen’s 1020 round chapel for St Edmund (reduced to a tower by c.1100) seems plausible. They just might be gross enlargements of the polygonal staircases at the end of the Ely west transepts. Their function is unknown but a font is recorded in the south one (though a baptistery was hardly needed with two parish churches in the precinct) and perhaps they had some secular abbey function (court or counting house), particularly if there were upper rooms. Edmund’s relics were translated to the new Norman church on 29 April 1095 by Wалкelin, Bishop of Winchester. The general plan and architectural character of Abbot Baldwin’s church of the 1080s fits into the established post-Conquest development of the great church seen in the south and east of England, following on from pre-1066 Normandy. An ambulatory chancel with three radiating chapels follows Battle Abbey, St Augustine’s Abbey Canterbury, Worcester and Gloucester Cathedrals. The three-storey elevation with a large middle gallery and big clerestory windows behind a continuous passage is established at Winchester, Old St Paul’s, Worcester and Gloucester. The ambulatory with radiating chapels plan had been developed in central/northern France in the eleventh century, often with a crypt and although few large crypts exist in Normandy, Baldwin would surely have known French examples like Chartres Cathedral (1020s) or Orléans Cathedral (1089–1031). However, his own abbey at St Denis did not have an ambulatory until c.1140.

What distinguishes Bury St Edmunds is its scale. As Fernie points out, ‘Bury St Edmunds is a giant of a building’ that approached the scale of Winchester (1079–1093), which was the cathedral of the former English capital and with the most royal burials at that time. Bury St Edmunds also had similar dimensions to the emerging capital’s Old St Paul’s begun by Bishop Maurice (1087–1107) and probably completed by his successor Bishop Richard I (1107–1127). Whilst the east end ground plan of Old St Paul’s is disputed, it seems to have had an ambulatory and three chapels. With a 12-bay nave, the overall length was around 150 metres, as was Bury St Edmunds. Baldwin was undoubtedly wishing to impress and in particular, to outdo the Bishops of Norwich building their cathedral from 1096. The English tradition of linking bishop’s cathedrals to Benedictine monasteries must have seemed odd to Baldwin, a French monk from the Abbey of St Denis north of Paris. He wished to retain Bury St Edmunds’ independence from episcopal (and archiepiscopal) control and building a vast church to honour St Edmund (Norwich had no saint to celebrate) would be the most obvious demonstration of this superiority. The widening of the nave and extension of the chancel to accommodate an eastern aisle to the transept are probably attributable to this rivalry. However, the Bury St Edmunds transept has two apsidal eastern chapels, unknown in England except perhaps at Old St Paul’s, which also probably had a four-bay choir and five-bay hexaconta in stylos at a crypt as at Bury St Edmunds. Both churches were perhaps inspired by the three largest ‘pilgrimage churches’ at Tours and Toulouse in France and Santiago de Compostela in northern Spain, all being built in the later eleventh century. These had aisled transepts with two eastern apsidal chapels and long naves, but their east ends were shorter, with five radiating chapels and their architectural character was quite different. It is equally possible that Bury St Edmunds two chapels to each transept were based on Winchester (or even Ely), where three chapels exist within the eastern aisle of each transept.

135 Whittingham, 1951 and Department of the Environment Guidebook.
140 Fernie 2000, p.118.
147 Conant, 1966, p.159.
Bury St Edmunds has the only ailed crypt to its chancel in the east of England. Although Worcester, Evesham and Gloucester followed the Canterbury crypts, only Winchester and Old St Pauls had crypts in the south of England. Bury St Edmunds’ crypt never held the saint’s relics and seems to have had an altar dedicated to Our Lady as Canterbury Christ Church. It was possibly built with a church entrance. The Abbey Gate is the largest level than the nave, a common use of crypts in the eleventh century.

The earliest botanic gardens in the UK were developed at Oxford, Chelsea and Edinburgh. Small gardens were also cultivated by individuals, such as those founded by Rev. William Turner (1510–1568) at Kew and Wells, and another at Holborn established by John Gerard (1545–1612).118

The Chelsea Physic Garden is also a Grade I registered garden, which occupies four acres on the edge of the River Thames in London. It was founded in 1673 by the Society of Apothecaries and was laid out as a series of rectangular beds divided by straight paths to facilitate teaching. The river location was important not only in terms of the milder climate, but also in facilitating access for the delivery and dissemination of plants from around the world and across the British Isles. Its international seed exchange scheme, Index Seminum, was established in 1700 and continues today.119 Nathaniel Hodson engaged in exchanging seeds on an international level when developing his botanic garden at Bury St Edmunds.120

Edinburgh’s Royal Botanic Garden was established in Holyrood Park in 1670 but moved to Inverleith in 1820, a year before Nathaniel Hodson established his first botanic garden in Bury St Edmunds. At this time, Edinburgh’s Botanic Garden was much larger than Bury St Edmunds at 14 acres and it continued to expand by another 28 acres during the nineteenth century.120

Perhaps the most famous Botanic Garden in the world is the Royal Botanic Gardens at Kew, which are a World Heritage Site. Established in 1759, the gardens became the “centre of botanical exploration” under Sir Joseph Banks, the famous botanist who accompanied Captain Cook on his voyages of exploration. Unlike other botanic gardens of the period, Kew had no association with a university or educational institution but was created by the Dowager Princess of Wales, Princess Augusta. Today Kew occupies 128 hectares and has over 50,000 taxa of living plants.121

The closest Botanic Gardens to Bury St Edmunds are those of Cambridge University. First established in 1762, they were moved to a new 16 hectare site in 1831, the same year as Nathaniel Hodson was relocating his garden in Bury St Edmunds. The Cambridge Botanic Garden was opened to the public from 1846. This became typical of many botanic gardens in the mid-nineteenth century.122

The Botanic Garden that was created at what is now Abbey Gardens belongs to the later phase of the development of botanic gardens in Britain, which had evolved from a small number of gardens created for scientific research, medicine and education to places that combined an interest in collecting and understanding with public enjoyment. It was the smallest of all the gardens considered here but was a local incarnation of a wider trend to educate, explore and increase wellbeing. Being principally the work of one man, the botanic gardens at Bury St Edmunds were not maintained as such and increasingly became a public amenity. Today only the circular form of the central area and a small number of original trees survive to indicate its earlier function.

Although not laid out until 1844, the Museum Gardens in York offer an interesting comparison with Bury St Edmunds in that they contain the ruins of the Benedictine St Mary’s Abbey, which was founded in 1086. The garden was established by the Yorkshire Philosophical Society for its members as a pleasure ground. It was only in 1961 that the Society gave the gardens and the museum to the citizens of York. Today the 3.64 hectare site is maintained as a public park.130

Summary

The Botanic Garden that was created at what is now Abbey Gardens belongs to the later phase of the development of botanic gardens in Britain, which had evolved from a small number of gardens created for scientific research, medicine and education to places that combined an interest in collecting and understanding with public enjoyment. It was the smallest of all the gardens considered here but was a local incarnation of a wider trend to educate, explore and increase wellbeing. Being principally the work of one man, the botanic gardens at Bury St Edmunds were not maintained as such and increasingly became a public amenity. Today only the circular form of the central area and a small number of original trees survive to indicate its earlier function.

### 3.3.4 Urban Relationship

The Abbey of St Edmund was fundamental to the medieval growth and development of the town of Bury St Edmunds. Through its 500 year history, the Abbey changed and its precinct evolved and at the same time the Abbey created what is now the historic core of the town, establishing a pattern of streets that suited the Abbey and possibly made the whole town the setting of St Edmund’s shrine. Its creation is thought to have imposed on the existing Anglo-Saxon settlement and its continuous expansion inevitably affected the town’s layout. What is debated by scholars is the extent to which the streets around the Abbey were completely new in the Norman period or whether they had existed in an earlier Anglo-Saxon form. As the Abbey changed, so too did the character of the town and the challenge of the townspeople would change the fabric of the Abbey. Despite the town’s hostility towards the Abbey by the late medieval period, the Dissolution of the Abbey did not lead to the reclaiming of the Abbey precinct and its incorporation into the town, but the fabric of the Abbey’s buildings was quarried and dispersed in buildings throughout the town and further afield.

This brief section outlines the main information and debates regarding the urban development of Bury St Edmunds and its relationship to the Abbey. It is a subject of evolving scholarship and there is considerable scope for further study.

**Beginnings as an Anglo-Saxon Settlement**

The Abbey site appears to be located in the middle of an Anglo-Saxon settlement. Archaeological evidence revealed during the Cathedral Centre excavations showed that there was a road connecting what is now Northgate Street and Spahawk Street and Southgate Street. This is thought to have formed the ‘high street’, the centre of the Anglo-Saxon settlement. A number of other streets, such as Raingate and Cotton Lane, further support a potential Anglo-Saxon planned system. The front alignment of the Abbey itself seemed to run alongside the connected high street of Northgate Street and Spahawk Street and Southgate Street. The archaeological evidence may indicate, though far from conclusively, a seventh-century settlement, which correlates in terms of timing with the account of Sigeberht’s founding a religious organisation at Beodricsworth.

**Alterting the Anglo-Saxon Settlement and Establishing the Grid System**

The extent of the Abbey precinct in the early eleventh century is not known but the year before the Norman Conquest, a Frenchman, Baldwin, became Abbot and he had great ambitions for the Abbey. It is generally thought that Baldwin was responsible for significant change including the construction of 342 houses, possibly as a result of clearing Anglo-Saxon houses from the precinct or possibly to help fund the development of the Abbey and construction of its new church. Although some have argued this took place between 1066 and 1086, Gauthiez suggests that it occurred shortly after the Domesday survey of 1086. Although the location of the houses is not known, it has been suggested that they were laid out in a system of streets parallel to the Saxon road system that ran through the Abbey site. Gauthiez argues that the evidence of the use of a geometric system based on the square root of two is evidence that the grid is Norman as it follows precedents in Normandy. Fernie notes however, that the same geometric system can be found in early tenth century English settlements such as Wallingford and Wareham. Gauthiez also argues that Churchgate Street was created by Baldwin to create a ceremonial route to the Abbey Church that he was building.

Defending the Precinct

By the fourteenth century, tensions were simmering between the Abbey and town and resulted in riots in 1305 and, more notably, in 1327. The Abbey Gate was badly damaged and rebuilt so that it was no longer aligned with Abbeygate Street. This ensured the repaired old gate remained to protect the precinct whilst the new one was built and that in the future there could be no repeat of the attack on the Abbey Gate with a burning hay cart being rolled down Abbeygate Street. The Abbey undertook further measures in the fourteenth century to ensure the security of the precinct. The access to the parish churches was limited to porches facing the Great Churchyard, rather than off the street. Additional walls were built to shut the Great Court, a public space, off from the Precinct Yard.

The Abbey’s influence is suggested in other ways too. For example, thirteenth century rentals show that luxury trades, such as goldsmiths and glovers, were located on Chequer Square and Churchgate Street near the monastic heart of the Abbey whereas services such as cobblers, farriers and tailors were situated on the Mustow, near the Abbey Gate. This reflects how strong the influence of the Abbey was.

---


158 Gauthiez, “Planning of the Town of Bury St Edmunds,” p.90–93. According to entries in the 1086 Domesday Book, it is speculated that the development Baldwin proposed was only planned, and only built in later years. This has been assumed by looking at the land rent increases during this period.


162 For more information, see Antrobus, Abby L. “Urbanisation and the urban landscape: building medieval Bury St Edmunds” (PhD diss., Durham University, 2009), http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/1948/56


HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT AND THE WIDER CONTEXT

After the Dissolution
In the years following the Reformation, the Abbey was dismantled. The materials were used in the other buildings in the town as well as further afield. The town continued to change, especially during events, such as the 1608 fire with alterations to the street pattern, but these were not sufficient to obscure the main grid pattern.

The Abbey precinct was divided into separate private ownerships. This completely shut the townspeople out of the old Abbey site, apart from the Great Churchyard, until the creation of the Botanic Gardens in 1821 and recreation in 1831. The Botanic Gardens were not however, free to enter and general admission to the gardens was only possible once the Town Corporation opened the gardens as a public park in 1912.

Conclusion
Although it is not clear whether Baldwin created the grid of streets afresh in the Norman period or whether there was an earlier Anglo-Saxon pattern that he expanded, the Abbey’s power is clearly demonstrated by its occupation of the middle of the Anglo-Saxon settlement and its displacement of the town again in the early twelfth century. The relationship between the Abbey and the town was not entirely one-sided and the physical fabric of the Abbey was affected by the perceived and real threat of the townspeople to the Abbey.

Abbey Gate in relation to Angel Hill and the regular grid system. Notice how Abbey Gate is not in line with Abbeygate Street, providing evidence that it is not the original tower. Angel Hill is also very wide, reflecting the Norman street planning outside the Abbey as altered by Anselm.

166 Statham, “The Medieval Town of Bury St Edmunds.”
Evolution of the Urban Development Surrounding the Abbey
By analysing a number of staged maps by Gauthiez, the urban growth of Bury St Edmunds around the Abbey precinct has been plotted on the adjacent plan. The core of the Anglo-Saxon settlement seems to have been incorporated into the larger Norman street pattern. The Abbey may have built over first one and then a second of the Anglo-Saxon streets as it expanded. The second phase of expansion in the late twelfth century may have created Angel Hill as well as other streets. Alongside the growth of the Abbey, the positioning of the markets and site for fairs is an important component in understanding the development of the town.

URBAN DEVELOPMENT PLAN
- Suggested Anglo-Saxon street
- Suggested Anglo-Saxon street which has been lost
- Suggested Norman street
■ Suggested introduction from late 12th century, including Angel Hill, the town wall and the Abbey Precinct
01 Suggested location of the St Edmunds rotunda which became the location of the Abbey. Also notice how the front of the Abbey lines up properly with the suggested Saxon street.
02 Location of the original market, Old Market, located at St Mary’s Square. It was later turned into a horse market
03 Location of the new market, Great Market, which is perceived to have been built in the 11th century
04 Angel Hill, originally called 'The Mustowe' or meeting place, acted as the location of the town fair.

Plan showing the suggested survivals from an Anglo-Saxon street pattern and the later Norman market place. This plan is not to scale. © Google Earth 2018
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The following section provides an overarching assessment of the heritage significance of the Abbey of St Edmund project area. This significance is specifically the significance from a heritage perspective. It forms the foundation of understanding and decision-making about the site because conservation is based on the principle of preserving and enhancing significance. This section considers the site as a whole, whereas Section 7 provides a brief statement of significance for each sub-area. The heritage significance of individual buildings has not been assessed in any detail.

This section contains an overarching statement of significance which captures the essence of what makes the site significant (Section 4.2). The more detailed assessment of heritage values in Section 4.3 considers the key phases and themes that relate to the whole site. This provides greater explanation for the assessment that is summarised in Section 4.2. Section 4.4 contains two plans that show the overall significance for each building, structure, feature and area of landscape.

### 4.1 CRITERIA FOR ASSESSMENT

Heritage significance can be defined as the sum of the cultural values which make a building or site important to society. When making an assessment of significance numerous aspects are considered including: architectural interest; historic interest; group value; social value; former uses and local distinctiveness. These aspects can be grouped under a series of four values outlined in Historic England’s Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance (2008): Evidential, Historical, Aesthetic and Communal. A description of each value is given under the following headings.

- **Historical Value:** This derives from connections with particular events or people and/or from how it illustrates visually a particular period or periods of time. Historical value includes both associative and illustrative values.
- **Aesthetic Value:** The ways in which people draw sensory or intellectual stimulation from a place. This can, for example, be as a result of good design, the use of suitable materials in buildings or the character of the setting or landscape.
- **Evidential Value:** The potential for a place to yield evidence about the past which could alter or enhance the perception of why it is significant. This could, for example, be in the form of intact below ground archaeology not yet known or excavated, or the concealment of significant period décor in the historic building by modern surface treatment.
- **Communal Value:** The ways in which the site brings people together as a community and the associated meanings of the place for the people who relate to it, or for whom it figures in their collective experience or memory.

These four values were developed to facilitate thinking about and understanding significance and they have been used in assessing the significance of the Abbey of St Edmund project area. The heritage significance of a place can be articulated without specific reference to the heritage values. To provide a manageable and usable written account of the project area’s significance, the heritage significance of the Abbey of St Edmund has been articulated thematically using themes that cut across the heritage values. The whole project area is considered first in terms of its two broad principal phases of historical development: the Abbey of St Edmund and the Post-Dissolution Development. Understanding how these broad layers map out on the physical fabric and landscape, and also the shorter phase layers within the two overarching phases, is critical to conceptualising the project area as a whole and, in the future, for assessing the impact of proposals. The whole project area is then considered in terms of the different uses or types of engagement with the place which cut across the historical time periods. This reveals the depth, breadth and longevity of the communal valuing of the project area. Then, reflecting the importance of the site’s archaeological value, this is explored separately. Finally the setting and wider context of the project area are discussed briefly in terms of contributing to its significance. More detail of the wider context is explored in Section 3.3.

For the site overall, all the heritage values are high, which means that the element or aspect is of national or international importance and makes an important contribution to the overall character or significance of the project area. As all the heritage values for the project area overall are high, the levels of the heritage values are not specifically referred to in the text of Sections 4.2 and 4.3.

The rating of heritage values for each different element of the site, however, varies as does the overall level of significance relative to other elements on the site. Consequently, plans have been prepared that illustrate the relative significance of elements (buildings, structures, features and landscape areas) to each other and based on their physical fabric. This assessment has been made within the framework of the heritage designations on the site, i.e. national designated heritage assets are mostly given a rating of high or very high with a few given a medium rating relative to other assets on the site. An explanation of the different ratings is given in Section 4.4.

Although significance is the sum of the heritage values, it does not follow that in every case, all heritage values are of equal weighting. One heritage value may far exceed the others and therefore it is possible for a heritage asset to be of high significance for its high historical value even though all the other heritage values are low or neutral.
4.2 SUMMARY STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

Principal amongst the many layers of the heritage significance of the Abbey of St Edmund project area is the significance associated with particular aspects of the medieval Abbey. Historically, the international and national heritage significance of the site was as the location of the shrine of St Edmund, the focal point for pilgrims from across western Christendom. Today, the site’s international and national heritage significance arguably arises from its being the place where the Magna Carta, which established important principles of English law and so law across the world, was incubated. Nationally, the project area is significant as a rare assemblage of monastic remains in an urban location which still demonstrates in its layout the symbiotic relationship between the Abbey and the town. The site further illustrates not only the tremendous destruction that accompanied the Dissolution but the underlying purpose of the Dissolution to crush rival sources of power to the Crown thus making it a nationally significant example. Locally, the Abbey site is woven into the lives of the community, as it has been for centuries in different ways. Many of the later uses continued or continue aspects of the framework of community life and provision previously supplied by the Abbey and so create parallels across the centuries.

The heritage values for the project area as a whole are all high.

Historical Value
The area is exceptionally important as the historic site of the Abbey of St Edmund, which was for nearly five centuries one of the wealthiest and most influential ecclesiastical institutions in England with important international connections also. This wealth and influence derived from the legacy of the extraordinary patronage of the early English kings and its position as an important international pilgrimage site focused on the national patron saint, Edmund. His enshrined body was cherished by the monks and miracles associated with St Edmund continued until the fourteenth century. The surviving assemblage of architecturally fine gateways, above ground ruins that reveal the extent of the massive Abbey Church, a large discernible precinct, outer precinct and associated features, and medieval churches and chantry house is of national importance. Its survival in an urban context makes it all the more rare. Complementing the physical fabric is a large documentary archive that enables the interpretation of the site.

At a local level, the Abbey was a major determinant of the urban layout and the wealth of the town of Bury St Edmunds. The centre of a monastic borough, the Abbey exemplified the way in which monasticism was loved and loathed in the medieval period. Its unusual experience of the Dissolution and the extent of destruction that was elicited is highly visible today in the contrast between the meagre surviving ruins and the vast scale of the medieval Abbey indicated by the Abbey Church plan and remnants of the West Front.

The site encompasses a variety of nationally designated heritage assets that illustrate the site’s evolution during the 500 years since the Abbey’s Dissolution in 1539. The West Front houses are probably unique in their form but other houses across the site, such as Abbey House, Alwyne House and the Crown Street houses, illustrate how the Abbey precinct was carved up into private ownership. The Abbey Gardens reflect a local example of the Enlightenment search for knowledge in the remains of the circular form of the Botanic Garden created by Nathaniel Hodson and also the outworking of Enlightenment principles that led to the belief in free universal access to green spaces which saw the Gardens become a public park in 1912. Whilst the Abbey Church was considered, but not selected for, conversion to a cathedral after the Dissolution, in 1913 St James’s church was made the Cathedral.

Communal Value
The Abbey site is highly significant as a place of continuous Christian worship for over a millennium. This is represented now by the church of St Mary and St Edmundsbury Cathedral with its associated buildings.

The project area has been a place of commemoration for as long as it has been a place of worship. The earlier incarnations of this can be seen in the Abbot’s tombs, the Great Churchyard the Chapel of the Chantry and the memorials in the Church and the Cathedral whilst there is archaeological evidence for the Monks’ Graveyard. More recent memorials have been created including the Martyrs’ Memorial, the Holocaust Memorial, the Rose Garden and the Garden of Remembrance. It is not only people that are remembered; great events are commemorated through plaques and installations, pageants and services in the Abbey Gardens, Cathedral and St Mary’s Church. The most important of these is the meeting of the barons ahead of the signing of the Magna Carta.

The Abbey was a place that provided education, dispensed justice and served the poor and the sick. These functions have reoccurred over the centuries in the almshouses of the Clapton Asylum (now the Deanery), the courts and council offices on the south side of the area, the schools, care home and affordable housing on The Vinefields and the clinic and pre-school in the former Walnut Tree Close, although many of these occupy buildings of no heritage value.

The area as a whole encompasses spaces that are valued by the community as a place of leisure, a place for community events and a place for quiet and reflection. The spiritual value extends beyond that associated with the places of worship to encompass the wider spiritual value of the green, open space of the Abbey Gardens as a place of inward renewal. The Abbey ruins remain a place of spiritual value for some Christians whilst the site is also valued as part of other spiritual traditions.

The symbolic importance of the Abbey site locally and regionally cannot be overstated. As the site of St Edmund’s tomb and the place where the clauses of the Magna Carta were said to have been agreed, it is the place that gives Bury St Edmunds its identity as ‘Shrine of a King, Cradle of the Law’. Edmund gave his name to the town, the borough and the Liberty. The symbols of Edmund, the crown and arrows, not only adorn many arms and badges of the town’s institutions and teams but also the arms of the county of Suffolk.

Aesthetic Value
Alongside the considerable historical and communal values of the site, the project area contains buildings of considerable architectural value and fine craftsmanship from the Norman Tower and thirteenth century Abbey Gate to the Cathedral tower completed in 2005. Different types of landscape design enrich the site from the avenues of trees in the Great Churchyard to the formal layout of the Rose Garden and the residual form of the Botanic Gardens. The relationship between the built fabric and the landscape also contributes to the aesthetic value.

Evidential Value
The above and below ground archaeology, particularly relating to the medieval and earlier periods, has considerable potential to contribute to a knowledge of the site and potentially to an understanding of Anglo-Saxon towns and medieval abbeys more widely and is nationally significant.

There are hints of evidence of settlement on the site from as early as the seventh century. There is great potential for below ground archaeology to survive relating both to the Anglo-Saxon and pre-twelfth century medieval urban settlement and the later development of the site. Moreover, the lack of agricultural use and built development across much of the site means that the quality of archaeological survivals will be high.

Setting and Wider Context
The retention of the medieval grid pattern of streets and the predominance of historic buildings in the centre of Bury St Edmunds enhances understanding of the project area’s relationship to the historic Abbey site. The view along Churchgate Street has survived since the Norman period. The preservation of a belt of agricultural land to the east of the project area enables an understanding of the rural setting that existed on the east side of the project area historically. The addition of the fine Cathedral tower has created a focal point for long distance views of the project area within the town.
4.3 ASSESSMENT OF HERITAGE VALUES

4.3.1 The Abbey of St Edmund

The medieval Abbey of St Edmund was one of the wealthiest and most important Benedictine monasteries, not only in England but also in Europe. Its precursor meant that the site was already significant as the shrine of St Edmund. By the Dissolution, the Abbey was distinguished by having the most continuously recognised royal saint. From the tenth until the sixteenth centuries, monks at the Abbey tended and continually improved the shrine whilst miracles continued to be recorded in association with the saint until the fourteenth century. Edmund’s shrine was a nationally and internationally significant place of pilgrimage, which contributed to the influence and wealth of the Abbey.

The Abbey was extremely powerful locally and regionally. The wealth and influence of the Abbey derived also from the extraordinary gifts and privileges granted and confirmed by the early English and medieval kings, including King Edmund and William I. This was experienced in West Suffolk and in Bury St Edmunds (the Liberty of St Edmund, the banleuca and the town) as the Abbey controlled vast estates, the markets and exercised judicial power. Its local influence in the town of Bury St Edmunds left a lasting legacy in the street pattern of the town. This is not only seen in the Norman grid pattern that was established by Abbot Baldwin but also in the disruption of the earlier Anglo-Saxon street pattern and the expansion of the Abbey precinct westwards in the twelfth century.

The site today is significant as an example of an urban monastic site where the precinct survives as a defined entity with large stretches of surviving wall and two particularly fine gatehouses. Within the precinct, the above ground ruins illustrate the scale of the exceptionally large Abbey Church and also indicate some of the layout of the claustral buildings. The survival of these ruins in an urban context is notable. The legibility of the layout of the Abbey has been obscured by later development and the loss of much of the built fabric above ground, although better examples of surviving Abbey ruins are usually Cistercian monasteries in remote rural locations in areas where stone is readily available.

The Abbey ruins, especially those of the Abbey Church and the raised ground level illustrate the scale of destruction wrought on the Abbey by the Dissolution. This in turn reflects the power of the Abbey, which would have made it a particular target for the Crown.

Although the Abbey ruins have some fortuitous aesthetic value, the higher aesthetic value associated with the Abbey period (excluding the Cathedral and St Mary’s Church) is derived from the Norman Tower and the Abbey Gate, both of which are notably fine examples of their respective periods and the Abbey Gate is a particularly balanced composition. The precinct was a deliberately designed space, as all Benedictine monasteries were, and there is a fair level of visible fabric to allow its design to be understood, although it is obscured somewhat by later buildings and landscaping.

4.3.2 Post-Dissolution Development

The site also reflects both the development of the site itself over the 500 years since the Dissolution and the national social and cultural developments. Like many former monastic sites, the Abbey of St Edmund became a private residential place. Although Eyre’s home, the former Abbot’s Palace, has disappeared, other houses illustrate the site’s use as private homes, including Abbey House, the houses along Crown Street, Alwyn House and the various cottages, such as Eastgate Cottage. Whilst these are typical of most post-monastic residences in being newly built or incorporating convenient monastic walls, the extraordinary West Front houses are thought to be unique surviving examples of construction of dwellings within a substantial amount of surviving monastic fabric. Whilst all the buildings have some evidential potential relating to their historical development, especially in multi-phase buildings, the West Front houses also have evidential value relating to the medieval Abbey Church.

The site also illustrates the use of parts of the site for a range of activities that were once part of the functions accommodated within the Abbey. These are discussed in greater detail in the subsequent sections.

The Abbey Gardens connect the site with the important national cultural development of the Enlightenment. The Botanic Garden exemplified the Enlightenment approach of collecting and understanding by categorising, in this case nature. It would have had a natural affinity with the slightly later Athenaeum, just outside the Abbey precinct, where scientific, literary and historical study was pursued.21 Traces of the planned landscape of the Botanic Garden survives in the basic circular layout but the characteristic circular beds have been lost. Whilst the Botanic Garden became an ornamental garden out of commercial considerations, its eventual conversion to a public park reflects the underlying Enlightenment belief of the universality of man, from which the idea of all people having the right to green open space developed.

The post-Dissolution buildings on the site form an illustrative series of fashionable architectural styles expressed in the local vernacular. This encompasses an array of buildings from No.34 Angel Hill’s jetted, timber-framed structure via the classical eighteenth century Deanery and frontage of Abbey House, the contrasting austere townhouse façades and the more picturesque cottages of the early nineteenth century to the revival styles of the Victorian and Edwardian periods in 1 Crown Street and the former Magistrates’ Court. Of particularly high aesthetic value in its own right is the Deanery, which may have been designed by James Burrough and is a fine example of its type.

The landscape also reflects changing fashions from the appreciation of picturesque ruins in the landscape and the imposing of order with lime tree avenues in the Great Churchyard in the nineteenth century to the creation of different gardens within the public park in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. The remains of the circular form of the Botanic Garden reflect a very specific type of designed landscape.

The unique West Front houses

The imprint of the Botanic Gardens overlain with the 1937 planting scheme
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4.3.3 Place of Worship
The Abbey site is highly significant as a place of Christian worship for over a millennium. This is now represented by St Mary’s, long the town’s civic church, and the Cathedral, formerly the parish church of St James’. Before the Dissolution there were other churches and chapels on the site, including St Margaret’s and the chapels of St Denis and St Andrew as well as the Abbey Church. Earlier still was the religious foundation that is said to have been established in the seventh century by Siæberht. The presence of both the surviving church buildings and the active congregations contribute to the site’s illustrative and communal value.

The Church and the Cathedral contribute to the aesthetic value of the site. St Mary’s is one of the finest Perpendicular parish churches in the country with many notable features including the angel hammerbeam roof of the nave and the decorative north porch. The Cathedral combines medieval architecture with the remnants of the Victorian alterations by George Gilbert Scott, the fine twentieth century work of Stephen Dykes Bower and the many crafts people who contributed to the Millennium project. Both buildings are important contributors to the site’s overall aesthetic value.

4.3.4 Place of Political Challenge
The project area has many associations with significant challenges nationally and locally to the status quo. St Edmund thus became a symbol for an idealised English kingship and a nationally significant place for early English and medieval kings to visit to reinforce their legitimacy.

One of the most famous challenges to an English king who was deemed to be overreaching himself began at the Abbey. The gathering of the barons in preparation for the Magna Carta is remembered amidst the ruins, in the Abbey Gardens and in the Cathedral. Although Bury St Edmunds’ role in Magna Carta is less well known, the lasting impact of the document is experienced across the world and makes the site internationally significant.

At a local level, the Abbey Gate is illustrative of the challenges by the townspeople to the Abbey that led to the creation of the Candlemas Guild and ultimately to an alternative form of government in the Guildhall Feoffees. These events contribute to the site’s overall historical and communal value.

4.3.5 Place of Commemoration
The site has a long history as a place of commemoration and indeed the commemoration of St Edmund was central to its existence, wealth and influence in the medieval period. Whilst there has been no shrine to St Edmund for nearly five centuries, there are a number of points at which he continues to be commemorated on the site including the east nave window in St Mary’s, the statue on St Edmund’s Green and, in the Cathedral, the statue, the Chapel of St Edmund and the south aisle window. His legacy lives on in the name of the town and the borough.

Other commemorations surviving from the medieval period include the Abbots’ tombs in the Chapter House ruins, the Chapel of the Charnel and the Great Churchyard, although the tombs and gravestones are mostly eighteenth and nineteenth century. The Monks’ Graveyard is not visible but survives below ground.

The parish churches have been constant places of commemoration and St Mary’s has a particularly fine collection of wall memorials as well as floor slabs and brasses. Many of these include notable local figures, such as Jankyn Smith. The most important, although aesthetically unremarkable, tomb is that of Mary Tudor, Queen of France, whilst the window to her given by Queen Victoria has associative value for the connection to both queens. St Mary’s also houses the Royal Anglian Regimental Chapel, which is a place of commemoration particularly for the regiment and its predecessor, the Suffolk Regiment.

Across the site are a range of memorials including the listed Edwardian Memorial to the Martyrs in the Great Churchyard and the more recent Holocaust Memorial in the Abbey Gardens. The Rose Garden is connected with the US Army Air Force stationed in the area during the Second World War whilst part of the garden of Abbey House is now a Garden of Remembrance.
As well as permanent memorials, the site has been a place for collective temporary commemorations, such as the anniversary celebrations of the Magna Carta.

The use of the site for various forms of commemoration throughout the centuries contributes to its communal value.

4.3.6 Place of Community Provision

The Abbey of St Edmund was a focal point for provision of healthcare, education and justice. St Mary’s Church was a place where the surplus bread made by bakers would be distributed to the poor whilst in the mid-eighteenth century, the construction of the Clapton Asylum (now the Deanery) created almshouses for the poor of the parishes of St Mary and St James. This reflected the long-standing (but after the Dissolution even more important tradition) of provision for the poor by wealthy individual benefactors. The care home, housing for ex-service personnel and the affordable housing on The Vinefields represent modern provision.

In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the site once again became a place of education with the construction of the new King Edward VI Grammar School buildings on The Vinefields, a fitting place given that the grammar school was founded in the sixteenth century to replace the one established by the Abbey. Until recently, St James Middle School continued the tradition of education on the site, a baton now carried by the pre-school. This has links with the Guildhall Feoffment Trust, which continues the work of the Guildhall Feoffees who provided the governance of Bury St Edmunds in the wake of the Dissolution.

The nineteenth century also saw the establishment of the Magistrates and Crown Courts on the south side of the site, re-establishing the site as a place where justice was dispensed until the recent closure of the courts. Similarly, the NHS clinic is a contemporary incarnation of the healthcare provided by the Abbey infirmary. The First and Second World Wars also saw the Abbey Gardens being used as a place of recuperation.

The site has been an important place of provision for the community in different incarnations that reflect the social practices of the time. This contributes to its high communal value. Whilst some of the uses are currently housed in modern buildings of no heritage value, the historic buildings, such as the Deanery and the courts contribute to the aesthetic value of the site.

4.3.7 Place of Public Leisure

The Abbey Gardens are a highly valued local amenity space. A public park since 1912, the Gardens have continued to evolve providing a range of spaces for different activities and for important local events such as the Christmas Fayre and Bonfire Night fireworks. In addition, on the east side of the river, the bowling green provides what is at least the third incarnation of a bowling green within the project area. The use of the site for leisure activities is well-established and contributes to its communal value. However, some of the modern provisions, such as the tennis courts and the play area, detract from the historic character of the site, as a monastic site and as the former gardens to a private house.

The Abbey Gardens has been more than just a public park since the early twentieth century. It has been a focal point for collective activities from morale boosting events in two world wars to a muster point for military parades.

The central flower beds in Abbey Gardens
4.3.8 Spiritual Value
The project area has been a place of formal Christian worship for well over a millennium. It was a place of monasticism and a place of pilgrimage focused on St Edmund’s shrine. Despite the destruction of the Dissolution and loss of the Abbey Church, there Place of Spiritual Value remain two active churches on the site whilst some Christians are conscious of the spiritual qualities of Abbey Church ruins. There are further layers of spirituality to the site. Some believe the pre-Christian earth energy lines of St Mary and St Michael ‘kiss’ at the site of the Abbey church’s east end. Some believe that the site is also the centre of the Bury St Edmunds Zodiac and the Bury St Edmunds Heptagon. There are elements of the site’s landscape that have meaning for those of many organised belief systems, such as running water. The Abbey Gardens, the Cathedral and the Church are also places of tranquillity and inward renewal for those who do not have any particular faith or spiritual beliefs but who seek a place of quiet refreshment. This is a particularly important component of the site’s communal value.

4.3.9 Archaeological Value
The site is known to contain evidence of the seventh century Anglo-Saxon settlement and the early medieval town that predated the twelfth century expansion of the Abbey precinct. There is also considerable surviving below ground archaeology relating to different phases of the Abbey, some of which has been excavated previously and for which there are good records. Even where investigations have taken place, there is considerable scope for additional analysis to interpret results. This, in addition to the unexcavated areas, means there is potential for the site to yield considerable evidence about its previous forms and uses. Given that the project area, including the east bank, has experienced relatively little development since the Dissolution, the quality of survival of archaeological remains is likely to be high. This has been shown to be the case where excavations have taken place previously. There is also potential for archaeology to survive relating to the post-Dissolution uses of the site, about which less is known, particularly between the Dissolution and the eighteenth century.

The project area is also important for its bioarchaeology. It was the burial place for townspeople in the medieval period until the eighteenth century and therefore more or less the entire population of the town in those centuries will have been buried in the project area.

4.3.10 Setting
The most significant element of the project area’s setting are the Rivers Lark and Linnet. The presence of freshwater was critical to the potential of a site to support a monastery and the flow of the river determined the orientation of the site. The arrangement of the cloister at Bury St Edmunds was directly influenced by the river. The course of the rivers has changed over time but they remain an important part of the site’s setting.

Also of importance is the historic centre of Bury St Edmunds, which reflects in its street plan the influence and importance of the Abbey. The physical relationship mirrored a deeper symbiotic relationship between the town and the Abbey, which would have affected every aspect of people’s lives in the medieval period. The town has never grown and flourished to the same extent as it did during the medieval period and the Dissolution is said to have caused stagnation that ensured the town remained within the boundaries of the Banleuca until the mid-twentieth century. The town also provides an important contrast with the Abbey precinct area, which is predominantly green space with a small number of buildings although some of those are on a grand scale, unlike the tightly packed streets outside. Within the town, it has a historical, though not physical, affinity with other key medieval buildings, such as the Guildhall and Moyse’s Hall and collections held at Moyse’s Hall and West Stow. Historically there were also a number of medieval hospitals in Bury St Edmunds that were founded by the abbeys at various times, which contributed to the wider physical and social setting of the Abbey. Ruined remains of the hospitals of St Stephen and St Nicholas still stand. Further enriching the local historical context were the granges and barns associated with officials of the Abbey.

The green open space to the east and south-east of the project area is the third important element of the site’s physical setting. Although Bury St Edmunds has grown up beyond this, the meadows and fields create the impression that the historic rural setting of the Abbey site on this side has been preserved. It is, however, marred by the prominent pylons and cables.

The Abbey site sits within several wider contexts. One is sites associated with St Edmund. Although the exact location of his death has been the subject of ongoing academic debate, there are several places in Suffolk that claim to be it, with Bradfield St Clare deemed the mostly likely based on evidence currently available. It is thought that the village of Bures may have been where Edmund was crowned king of the East Angles.

The Abbey of St Edmund can also be considered to have a wider setting of other ruined monastic sites and also of monastic sites that were repurposed after the Dissolution. In East Anglia, there are examples of ruined monastic sites such as Thetford Priory, Binham Priory, Greyfriars at Dunwich and many more. There are also many ruined abbey sites across the country, from the well-known former Benedictine Abbey at Whitby to smaller institutions, some just cells of larger foundations. These, together with the surviving repurposed abbeys, such as Westminster, and those which survive in name only as country houses, give a sense of the density of religious houses and the scale of destruction in the Dissolution. It is also worth noting that whilst there were various Benedictine institutions in East Anglia during the medieval period, ranging from cells to large independent monasteries, the Abbey of St Edmund was the largest in Suffolk and comparable in East Anglia perhaps only with Ely and Norwich (both now cathedral sites) and St Benet’s at Holme, Norfolk (abandoned due to its remote location).

A further context in which the site should be understood is as the centre of an Anglican diocese. The relatively late designation of the church of St James as a cathedral means that it does not have the gracious arrangement of a cathedral close that is typically associated with English cathedrals. The buildings that are used as offices and accommodation for the Cathedral were mostly constructed for other uses originally. The Cathedral itself is notable for being probably the most recently completed Anglican cathedral in England.
4.4 SIGNIFICANCE PLANS

These plans provide an overview of the heritage significance of the extant built fabric and the landscape arrangement within the project area. The plans have been coloured to give the overall heritage significance of each element, which may have some heritage values that are higher or lower than its overall significance value. For example, Eastgate Cottage is of high significance within the project area as reflected by its designation as a national heritage asset. However, not all its heritage values are high: its aesthetic and historical values are high but its evidential value is medium and its communal value is low.

The significance plans have been prepared with an appreciation of the national heritage designations across the site as well as with consideration of the various contributions to significance of individual elements within the site (discussed in Section 4.3). Generally nationally designated structures have been assigned high or very high significance but occasionally some simpler heritage assets, such as the walls of the Deanery garden, have been assigned medium significance to reflect the relative importance and quality of the different heritage assets. The very high category has only been used in the context of the significance plans (and not in the written statements of significance) to distinguish between the relative importance of the many highly graded national heritage assets that exist within the project area. The Abbey Church ruins, for example are identified as very high, compared to high for the rest of the ruins, in reflection of the exceptional size of the church and the fact it was the pilgrimage focal point as it housed Edmund’s shrine.

The significance values assigned to the landscape areas are based on the above ground landscape and therefore do not reflect the site’s archaeological value as this is generally high across the site. The assessments of significance are based on a good understanding of the site based on the information available in the preparation of this Conservation Plan. However, as new research or assessment is carried out, new appreciation of various elements may be revealed.

The heritage significance of the built fabric and landscape of the Abbey of St Edmund is assessed using a scale of significance ratings ranging from Very High down to Detrimental:

- **Very High**: The most valuable themes, features, fabric or characteristics of the site. These elements are considered essential to the understanding and appreciation of the site, and as being key contributors to its overall character as well as its national importance. Some elements may be of international importance.

- **High**: A theme, feature or characteristic which is important at a national or international level, with high cultural value and important contribution towards the character and appearance of the site.

- **Medium**: Themes, features, buildings or spaces which are important at regional level or sometimes higher, with some cultural importance and some contribution towards the character and appearance of the site.

- **Low**: Themes, features, buildings or spaces which are usually of local value only but possibly of regional significance for group or their value. Minor cultural importance and contribution to the character or appearance of the site.

- **Very Low**: Themes, features, buildings or spaces which are usually of local value only. Very minor contribution to the character or appearance of the site or, more usually, one element of it.

- **Neutral**: These themes, spaces, buildings or features have little or no cultural value but do not detract from the character or appearance of the wall and its setting.

- **Detrimental**: Themes, features, buildings or spaces which detract from the values of the site, its setting, character or appearance. Efforts should be made to remove or improve these features.

These plans are reproduced as four enlarged quadrants in Appendix G.
Plan showing the heritage significance of the extant built fabric. This plan is not to scale.
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Plan showing the heritage significance of the landscape areas. This plan is not to scale.
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4.5 KEY VIEWS

4.5.1 Introduction

An analysis of key views is an important part of understanding the setting, context and overall character and value of the site. They can also help to establish any potential threat to the heritage significance of the site due to change within or close to the site. Any future changes within the project area or its setting should be assessed in terms of its impact on the views of the heritage assets in the project area.

The project area is a large area and there are many potentially key views of individual heritage assets on the site. The key views selected here therefore do not encompass all the views that should be considered if assessing the impact of proposals on a single heritage asset. This includes the views of the Millennium Tower, which can be seen from considerable distances, such as from the village of Fornham St Genevieve to the north and the approach from Sicklesmere to the south.

The selection of key views in this section represents the 15 most important views. They can be divided into two groups: views towards and views within the Abbey precinct (views 01 to 07 and 08 to 15 respectively).

The completion of the Millennium Tower to the Cathedral has created a focal point for long distance views towards the site and within the site. Although these are new views, they are nonetheless significant as the Tower is now the tallest and most prominent feature of the site. The medieval Abbey Church’s west tower was in a similar location but significantly taller and, unlike the Millennium Tower, would have been on axis with Northgate Street and Churchgate Street.

Key views 04 and 06 are amongst those specifically identified as being protected in local planning policy BV25 in the Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031.
4.5.2 Views Towards the Abbey Precinct

Northgate Street is a historic street that probably predated the Abbey and therefore whilst the buildings that frame the view and the project site have changed over time, this raised vantage point is a long-standing viewing point. The jettied, timber-framed buildings across the north side of the precinct and the Millennium Tower of the Cathedral create the impression of viewing the historic centre of the town. The trees of the Abbey Gardens are of varying species and heights which are less satisfactory in the view, but indicate the survival of specimens from the early nineteenth century Botanic Garden. The view is marred by the frequency of traffic at this major junction and the prominent traffic signs.

In the medieval period, the west tower of the Abbey Church would have been on axis with the street, unlike the Millennium Tower today.

The view down Mustow Street takes in some of the obviously older surviving buildings in the area, the unaltered timber-framed ones and the three-storey nineteenth century townhouses that are more typical of this part of the town centre. The vacant site of the demolished garage mars the streetscape, although this is temporary and work has begun on redevelopment.

The view to the south is a particularly impressive and important one, providing an excellent vista of the three medieval towers of the Abbey Gate, Norman Tower and St Mary’s Church. This array of fine yet strong stone structures encapsulate the power and importance of the lost Abbey. A number of later heritage assets, including the war memorial, contribute to the quality of the historic environment in the view, which is marred only by the car park and the tall industrial chimneys beyond the Atheneum. It is noted that many local people regard the Greene King chimneys as a local landmark.
VIEW 03: View along Abbeygate Street towards the Abbey Gate

This is an historically significant view for the fact that the Abbey Gate is off-centre and so can only be seen close to the west end of the street. This illustrates the way in which the Gate was rebuilt adjacent to the original one after it was destroyed by rioters. The view is marred by the positioning of the lamppost. Also framed in the view is the unique 1935 traffic sign post that is an important local landmark as well as a national heritage asset.

VIEW 04: Looking east along Churchgate Street at the junction with Guildhall Street

This is a highly significant view. Although the houses lining the street have changed since the Norman period, the view of the Norman Tower along the street laid out in the Norman period as a processional route is still clear. The new Millennium Tower is off-centre in the view and somewhat distracts from the focus on the smaller Norman Tower. In the medieval period, however, the Abbey Church towers would have been on axis with the Norman Tower and overshadowed it considerably.

VIEW 05: Dynamic view looking north along Crown Street (here from the junction with Westgate Street)

The narrowness of Crown Street focuses the view tightly on the south elevation and tower of St Mary’s Church with a glimpse of the spires of the Millennium Tower of the Cathedral beyond. Moving northwards, the industrial buildings of the Greene King brewery give way to attractive Georgian and earlier houses that form a more open setting at the junction with Honey Hill. The traffic signs at the north junction intrude on the view.
**HERITAGE SIGNIFICANCE**

**VIEW 06: From the A134 looking north-west across the Leg of Mutton field towards the Millennium Tower**

The tower is prominent above the trees of the meadow and Great Churchyard. The tower of St Mary’s Church and its gable with pinnacles is also clearly visible. This is an important view recognised with protection in the local planning policies. Not only is it an attractive view in which some of the most important buildings in the project area can be seen in a natural landscape setting, but it would have historically been important as the view which greeted pilgrims approaching from the south-east.

This image is representative of several variations of the view across Leg of Mutton field and along the River Lark water meadows, some of which marred by the profusion of pylons and cables.

Photograph by Jillian Macready and reproduced with her kind permission.

**VIEW 07: From Eastgate Street towards Abbot’s Bridge**

This view on the eastern approach to the town centre juxtaposes the small scale, two-storey houses and the jetted public house with the impressive stone bridge and tall remaining section of the precinct wall. The River Lark provides the setting for the Bridge and is a reminder of one of the reasons for the selection of the site for a monastery.
4.5.3 Views Within the Abbey Precinct

**VIEW 08:** From the north path of the central beds area of Abbey Gardens looking south

The central beds area is an attractive and popular part of the gardens and the open space has long been a popular vantage point for views of the Cathedral, as seen in historic photographs. The Millennium Tower now gives a better focal point. From this point on the path, the irregular mass of the Abbey’s West Front is visible, providing a contrast with the smooth lines of the stone Cathedral.

**VIEW 09:** From the west bank path across the River Lark to the Abbot’s Bridge

The Bridge and the adjacent precinct wall, which is one of the best preserved sections, provide a focal point at this end of the Abbey Gardens. The willow trees and wildflower turf along the river create a picturesque view that is slightly marred by the modern railings.

**VIEW 10:** From the east side of the River Lark across the ruins

Two footpaths meet on the east side of the River Lark at an elevated position that gives a good view of the ruins of the Abbey Church and the Cathedral beyond framed by trees. The play area is largely screened by shrubs.
VIEW 11: Panoramic view from the footpath across the ruins

From this vantage point there is a sense of the scale of the Abbey buildings as the ruins spread out around one, marred only by the disused tennis courts that obtrude. From this point, the Cathedral is framed by some of the tallest standing remains of the north transept of the Abbey Church.

VIEW 12: View down into the ruins of the crypt

This is a much frequented viewing spot within the ruins with an interpretation panel nearby. The raised position gives a good view of the remains of the crypt, of which more discernible detail survives than amongst much of the ruins. The access to the enlarged shrine of St Edmund is visible but the shrine itself is tantalisingly absent.
The unique West Front houses, with their troglodytic quality, are an arresting sight, particularly the octagonal form of the Samson Tower with its echoing round windows. In the foreground St Edmund’s Green has the statue of St Edmund by Dame Elisabeth Frink, which was erected in 1976 and is a reminder of the pilgrimage site that once lay within the Abbey Church. The box tomb is a reminder that the Great Churchyard extended up to the Cathedral whilst through the mature trees that form avenues through the Churchyard, the Chapel of the Charnel can be glimpsed. The medieval ruins contrast with the twentieth century east end of the Cathedral.
VIEW 14: View of the Norman Tower and Cathedral from the north edge of the Great Churchyard

The view captures a spectrum of nearly 900 years of building on the site from the mid-twelfth century Norman Tower to the Millennium Tower completed in 2005 with fifteenth, nineteenth and twentieth century components of the Cathedral and the mid-nineteenth century restoration of the Norman Tower in-between. The materials, however, create a harmonious assemblage. The stone also elevates these key buildings above the red brick neo-Tudor Victorian buildings adjacent, which are fine examples of their type and listed buildings.

Image reproduced courtesy of Richard Summers.

VIEW 15: View from the south of the Great Churchyard towards the Chapel of the Charnel

There are many characteristic views across the Great Churchyard which give an impression of its profusion of gravestones and tombs but the mature trees often limit set piece views of other heritage assets around the periphery, such as St Mary’s Church. This view is a striking one from the path by the car park and captures the character of the Great Churchyard whilst the mature tree avenues frame a single specimen pine and the Chapel of the Charnel. The pinnacles of the Millennium Tower are also just visible.
5.1 ASSESSING ISSUES AND OPPORTUNITIES

5.1.1 Content
Having set out the heritage significance of the project area in Section 4, it is important to understand the current threats and opportunities relating to the significance of the project area. These will continually evolve as change occurs on or around the site although some are long-term, ongoing or inherent issues. This analysis of the issues and opportunities has informed the development of the Conservation Framework which follows in Section 6.

This section sets out the issues and opportunities that relate to the project area as a whole or multiple sub-areas. Issues and opportunities relating to individual sub-areas are discussed in Section 7. The issues and opportunities in both sections relate to the heritage values. This means the issues that are currently, or have the potential to, affect the heritage significance of the project area or a particular heritage asset and the opportunities that could enhance the heritage significance or understanding of the significance of the project area or a specific heritage asset.

5.1.2 Summary of Key Issues and Opportunities
There are a variety of issues that threaten the heritage values of the project area. A major issue across the project area is the lack of maintenance of the scheduled monument, specifically the above ground remains. This is mostly due to lack of funding although another underlying issue is a need to clarify ownership and responsibilities across the project area. This in turn is potentially a constraint on funding for future works. Once ownership and responsibilities have been clarified, there is an opportunity to agree a standing scheduled monument consent for frequently undertaken works, which would reduce the burden of statutory control. Further key issues relate to disasters, such as flooding due to the presence of the river and climate change, which may have a significant impact on the built heritage, below ground archaeology and the site’s horticulture.

The greatest opportunity on the site relates to its interpretation. The re-presentation of the site through a variety of methods would enhance public understanding of the site’s heritage significance. Related to this are the opportunities for education, both for schools and for life long learners and also for events that celebrate the heritage of the site. There are also opportunities for increasing the understanding of the heritage significance of the project area through new research.

5.1.3 Consultation
This section and Section 7 have been informed by site visits and discussions with the Heritage Partnership Conservation Plan Advisory Group, both collectively and individually where appropriate. In addition, information has been provided by:

- Jane Sheat, Diocesan Director of Education
- Jeffrey Dyer, Surveyor, EHT
- Kate North, Properties Curator (East), EHT
- Timothy Cockerill, Free Sites Partnership Manager, EHT
- Will Fletcher, Scheduled Monument Inspector, Historic England
- Simon Collin, Parks Infrastructure Manager, SEBC
- Rebecca Davis, Horticultural Officer, SEBC
- Christine Leveson, Conservation Officer, SEBC
- Philip Banks, Canon Precentor, St Edmundsbury Cathedral
- Rachel Clover, Head Verger, St Edmundsbury Cathedral
- Stephen Dart, Ancient Archivist, St Edmundsbury Cathedral
- Jane Harrison, Enterprises Retail Manager, St Edmundsbury Cathedral
- Hannah Ratcliffe, Visits and Communications Manager, St Edmundsbury Cathedral
- Suzi Metcalfe, Clive Paine, Jackie Post and Daniel Holt, members of the PCC/DCC at St Mary’s Church
- Stephen Brunner, West Front resident; and
- Ricky Shuttleworth, West Front resident.

Information on the Pilgrims’ Kitchen and events at the Cathedral was collated by Matthew Vernon, Canon Pastor and Sub-Dean, St Edmundsbury Cathedral.

5.2 SITE MANAGEMENT

5.2.1 Clarity Over Ownership
Clarity regarding ownership and responsibilities for some of the built fabric, particularly boundary walls, could be improved. These include parts of the Abbey precinct walls, such as the south precinct wall bounding the car park and other boundary walls between different ownerships, such as those that divide the Cathedral properties from the Abbey Gardens. There is also no official plan of the area under English Heritage’s guardianship; some smaller, scattered ruins are certainly not marked on the unofficial plan but increasingly these have been included in the EHT’s condition surveys. As a result of the absence of clarity regarding ownership and responsibilities, some of this historic fabric is not being adequately maintained.

Although not a significant issue, it is worth noting that certain types of funding are available or not available depending on the ownership or guardianship of a heritage asset. As such clarity of responsibility has the potential to affect access to some funding.

5.2.2 Co-ordinated Management
Whilst there is some sharing of information currently, it would facilitate the better overall management of the site if the principal parties, namely SEBC, the Cathedral, EHT and St Mary’s Church, were to have an annual meeting to discuss the care of the site, any issues and any proposed projects. Improved communication between all parties between these annual meetings would also be beneficial.

An even more integrated approach could be explored by investigating existing models on sites where there are multiple owners involved. One such example is Chiswick House and Gardens, where the house is owned by English Heritage and the gardens by the London Borough of Hounslow. They have given over management of both to a trust that can manage the whole site holistically. Some arrangements can also give access to funding streams that neither EHT nor local authorities have access to.

5.3 CONSERVATION AND MAINTENANCE

5.3.1 Statutory Heritage Consents
A scheduled monument requires permission for almost every type of work. The basic activities of maintaining the gardens, such as planting (provided that it does not involve digging to a depth greater than 300mm or the planting of potential damaging plants such as trees), are deemed to be permitted under the first class consent of the Ancient Monuments (Class Consents) Order 1994. Other works to the landscape or the built fabric require scheduled monument consent. This provides protection for the buried and above ground archaeology of the scheduled monuments, but it also slows the process of carrying out some basic maintenance works. There is an opportunity to develop a standing clearance agreement with Historic England for certain repetitive tasks provided they are done in accordance with the agreed methodology.

Similarly, listed buildings require consent for most types of work. If a listed building frequently requires the same type of works, a methodology can be agreed with the local planning authority through a Heritage Partnership Agreement. This means that those types of works would not need listed building consent each time they are carried out provided the agreed methodology is used. It is less likely that this model will be applicable to the site.

More information regarding statutory consents can be found in Section 9.2.5 and Appendix C.

5.3.2 Vegetation Growth on the Scheduled Monument
There is extensive vegetation growth on the Abbey ruins, the Abbot’s Bridge and the scheduled walls. This includes areas of thick moss, woody saplings and well developed areas of valerian and ivy. The roots of plants cause the mortar to fail and flints to fall out, and, if it becomes severe, can cause structural failure. Plant growth also affects the appearance of the scheduled elements and the degree to which they appear well managed and cared for. The amount of vegetation
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2. There may need to be multiple agreements as they are usually between Historic England and one organisation.
ISSUES AND OPPORTUNITIES

varies depending on the party responsible for the maintenance.

5.3.3 Failure of Previous Repairs
There are many areas of the medieval abbey structures where past repairs have failed or are failing, including the Abbey Gate and the tall remains of the Crossing. This has the potential to lead to the failure and loss of historic fabric, with associated impact on the appearance of the heritage assets and the risk to members of the public and staff.

5.3.4 Visitor Impact
The Abbey Gardens are extremely popular with over 1.3 million visitors annually. A Green Flag accredited site, the Abbey Gardens are much used both as a pleasant thoroughfare and a destination, whether for a short lunch break, a pleasant walk or a place to visit. As the town’s only large central green space and as a publicly funded park, it is right that it should be much used.

However, there is an inevitable impact on the site, such as wear to the grass near paths and on popular routes through the Abbey ruins. There is also damage caused to the Abbey ruins themselves from people climbing on them or picking at them, causing flints to loosen and fall out. The impact of visitor activities is compounded by the lack of maintenance which means that flints are not as secure as they should be. A zoning of uses across the Abbey Gardens might help to reduce unsuitable activities such as ball games in the vicinity of the ruins and help people to understand that the ruins are a heritage asset.

5.3.5 Maintenance of the Abbey Gardens
The Abbey Gardens are much used for a variety of activities but they are generally well maintained, particularly the more formal areas. The grass around the Abbey ruins, however, could be edged more neatly, which would enhance the setting of the ruins and contribute to an impression of better maintenance of the ruins.

5.3.6 English Heritage Trust’s Resources
English Heritage Trust (EHT) holds heritage assets on behalf of the Government. It has very limited funding for the number of sites in its care. Sites from which EHT cannot generate revenue have to rely on a share from this limited funding.

Whilst it is acknowledged that the two largest landowners in the project area, SEBC and the Cathedral, also have limited resources, they do currently have opportunities to earn income from their respective sites. One of the challenges and the opportunities for the Heritage Partnership is to investigate ways that income from the project area can be maximised and reinvested in the conservation of the heritage assets on the site.

5.3.7 Buried Archaeology
Within the project area, there is a considerable amount of archaeology relating to the Abbey and evidence of its demolition as well as to the earlier Anglo-Saxon town. Some of this archaeology has been explored through previous excavations or archaeological watching briefs. Even taking into account the potential risks to the buried archaeology from climate change, outlined in Section 5.8, the buried archaeology in the project area appears to be stable and unthreatened in its current position and there is no urgent justification for its exposure and recording. Some buried archaeology is destroyed by excavation whilst other elements, such as the remnants of the walls, have the potential to be retained and exposed. However, condition of the already exposed archaeology reinforces the need for a clear strategy of long-term protection and maintenance if any more buried archaeology is to be exposed.

The buried archaeology does present a potential opportunity to learn more about the site’s development and the functioning of the Abbey. Exploring this opportunity through non-intrusive methods, such as LIDAR, multi-spectral imaging and geophysical survey, could generate a considerable amount of information to enhance understanding of the site when analysed with the findings of previous archaeological investigations, surveys of standing remains and surviving documentary sources. Non-intrusive surveys preserve the buried archaeology in situ and do not risk loss of significance.

Opportunities for limited intrusive archaeological surveys may arise when there is a need for groundworks associated with any projects that are considered acceptable through the scheduled monument consent process, such as trenching for new buried services. Any more extensive intrusive archaeological investigation would need to be supported by a rigorous, academically-based research proposal and should be in line with national research priorities and regional research priorities outlined in the East of England Regional Research Framework, and of demonstrable community benefit to understanding the site. This is because of the inherently destructive nature of intrusive archaeological investigations and the absence of an immediate threat to the buried archaeology. Further information on justifying works to increase knowledge can be found in Appendix C.
5.4 VISITOR EXPERIENCE

5.4.1 Access

Circulation

Many visitors use the Abbey Gardens as a pleasant thoroughfare as well as a place to walk and explore. There are opportunities to improve the connectivity of the site. A key example would be to improve access from the south into Abbey Gardens as the Churchyard gate between the Cathedral and the West Front house is small and not intuitive to find so is easy to miss. The gate is narrow which can cause congestion. One potential solution is to open up the existing vehicular access between the Great Churchyard and the Abbey Gardens to pedestrians. This would have the potential benefit of reducing anti-social behaviour in the cul-de-sac near the locked gates although the potential impact on the ruins would need to be assessed.

Another improvement to the circulation, that would benefit the understanding of the site's historic unity, is increasing the connectivity between the Cathedral area and the rest of the site. This might include a new opening in the wall between the Cathedral area and the Abbey Gardens and improving pedestrian access from Angel Hill.

The proposed relandscaping of the former Eastgate Nursery offers an opportunity to improve the connectivity between that area and the Abbey Gardens, potentially including the area along the river bank and the Abbot’s Bridge.

Further opportunities are described in Section 8.

Level Access

The provision of level access to the main areas of the Cathedral and St Mary’s and to the Abbey Gardens and the Great Churchyard is generally reasonable. There are, however, some areas of the Abbey Gardens that are only accessible via steps, namely the Crypt, or where the shortest connections between two areas is via steps. To aid visitors who require level access routes, it would be helpful to have the location of steps marked on the maps of the Abbey Gardens to enable them to plan their routes. Currently steps are not shown.

5.4.2 Interpretation

Interpretation is a significant issue on the site. There used to be a heritage trail around the site with interpretation panels explaining what different parts of the site were as part of the medieval Abbey. This presented the Abbey as mostly static and did not convey the amount of change that occurred. Some of the panels remain in situ whilst others have been removed. Of the remaining panels, some have been vandalised. Whilst designed to be robust as inscribed metal panels, they are very difficult to read because of the lack of contrast and impossible if the sun is shining directly on them.

Other components of the interpretation for the Abbey remains include:

- a faded copy of a drawing of a speculative recreation of the Abbey site in the Abbey Gate, which has no accompanying explanation;

- a model of the medieval Abbey near the Water Garden. It is a simple but effective tool although it is most beneficial if there is someone to explain it. The model’s coating is crazed and will continue to deteriorate in appearance;

- some metal labels typical of the Ministry of Works survive on the Abbey ruins and indicate the historic use of a room. These are at least discreet, fairly robust and can then be linked back to the guide book. They are considered to be of historic interest in their own right. One or two, such as for the Basilica of St Benedict, no longer reflect current thinking regarding the layout of the Abbey and are therefore misleading for visitors. Other labels are missing. There is an opportunity to reinstate missing labels or replace inaccurate labels in the same style. However, the labels reflect a particular snapshot in the understanding of the site and therefore any new labels should be of a subtly distinctive replacements to ensure the legibility of the historic and current layers of interpretation; and

- a fairly old-fashioned guidebook about the Abbey ruins published by English Heritage. It is densely written and difficult for the casual visitor to use as a guide book to the site though it is a useful study. The guide book can be bought from the Ranger’s Shop provided that it is open. There are busy periods for the rangers where the shop is closed for days at a time. The guide book can also be bought from the Cathedral shop and the shop at Moyse’s Hall.

There are various other interpretation panels around the site, such as the ones for the Crankles and the River Lark, which focus on the wildlife. There are two historic plaques about the Magna Carta in the Crossing, which are particularly difficult to read as some of the lettering has gone. There is also a newer installation relating to the Magna Carta near the Aviary.
There is considerable opportunity to improve the interpretation. An interpretation strategy should be developed to avoid a piecemeal approach. As well as considering any permanently available interpretation, such as panels, guidebooks and leaflets, the interpretation strategy could identify changing interpretation opportunities. These could include thematic displays or a series of events that either illuminate a particular aspect of the site’s history or engage with current topics or anniversaries. This would create variety that would encourage visitors to return, would enable the site to engage with events or trends of the moment, and allow more of the site’s history to be explored.

There are a number of considerations that should be taken into account. These include:

- the multiple points of entry to the site;
- the ways in which the different layers of the site’s history can be told;
- the ways in which interpretation can be created that engages children of different ages;
- the opportunities and costs associated with personal digital interpretation methods;
- the interpretation provided in the Cathedral and St Mary’s Church and how that relates to the wider interpretation of the site;
- the potential to explain about the buried archaeology; and
- the potential to celebrate conservation work on the site.

Tours are currently provided by local guides and include both general tours of the site and specific themed tours. Any future interpretation plans should also consider the information they share with the public and how this links with the fixed interpretation.

There used to be an audio trail about the Abbey ruins available from the Tourist Information Centre (TIC) but this ceased with the closure of the TIC.

There is currently no visitor centre or museum on the site. There was a short-lived museum in the Samson Tower which closed several years ago. There is potential to create a small exhibition or interpretation point as an introduction to provide visitors with an overview of the site’s complex history. The cost of creating this, where it would be located, who would run it and who would staff it would all need to be considered. The potential to strengthen connections with the museum in Moyse’s Hall and the Guildhall could also be explored as these already contain displays relating to the history of the town.

5.5 EVENTS

5.5.1 Co-ordinated Programming and Publicity

There is a wide range of types and scales of events that occur in the Abbey Gardens, the Cathedral and St Mary’s Church. The Abbey Gardens hosts major events including the Christmas Fayre and Bonfire Night fireworks, as well as live music, open-air theatre and cinema, family events and memorial services. The Cathedral and St Mary’s Church hold concerts and exhibitions. The Cathedral hosts other events, such as dinners, whilst St Mary’s is used for a range of activities from book signings to training sessions. There is potential for a coordinated approach to developing a programme of events and publicising these. Developing a working relationship with the new Bury St Edmunds and Beyond tourism marketing organisation might also be beneficial.

5.5.2 Enhancing Understanding of the Site’s Heritage through Events

Many of the events that are held in different parts of the project area, including Abbey Gardens, the Cathedral and St Mary’s Church, are popular but not specifically related to the site’s heritage. There is an opportunity for more events that specifically enhance understanding of and celebrate the history and heritage of the site and its relationship with the town. These could range from talks and exhibitions to pageants and theatrical performances.

The Bury St Edmunds tour guides currently offer ‘armchair’ tours, where they give talks to local groups. This offers the opportunity for people to learn more about the history of the site even without visiting it.

5.5.3 Balancing Income Generation with Impact on the Heritage Assets

Whilst events present certain challenges, they generate much needed income. For more information regarding the issues relating to events in different parts of the site, see Section 7.

5.6 EDUCATION

5.6.1 Opportunities for Developing a Schools Programme

The Abbey was fundamental to the history of the town and there should be considerable potential for interest from schools in visiting the site to learn about the history of the site and the town. The importance and influence of the Abbey in West Suffolk also means its history is entwined with many other local villages and so there is potential for school visits from the region.

It is not only the site’s history but also the natural environment and nature conservation that may tie in with the school curriculum.

Schools are more likely to visit a place if there are clear packages available that explain how visits can be tailored to link to specific elements of the curriculum for different ages. Providing visiting schools with paper work, such as risk assessments, also encourages visits. Developing such packages could be taken forward by the Heritage Partnership.

There is an opportunity to work with other historical attractions in Bury St Edmunds, such as Moyse’s Hall and the Guildhall, to develop a co-ordinated education offer including combined school visits.

5.6.2 Facilities for School Groups

There are no dedicated facilities for schools on the site, although it may be possible to connect with the Cathedral’s education work in the Cathedral Centre, the Discovery Centre. The lack of facilities is likely to discourage school visits from schools outside the town. Facilities that need to be considered include:

- room for learning activities, possibly including a workshop for art activities;
- lunch room (it is generally recognised that it is preferable for this to be a separate room from the learning space);
- lockers; and
- separate WCs from the general public WCs.

Facilities that need to be considered include:

- separate WCs from the general public WCs.
5.6.3 Life Long Learning
There is also potential for the site to be seen as a place for lifelong learning. There are a number of volunteer groups operating on the site for the Cathedral, St Mary’s Church, in the Abbey Gardens and along the River Lark. These groups could potentially offer local people of all ages to learn new skills. There is also potential for more formal programmes of lectures about the site’s history, heritage or associated crafts. These could be programmes that are repeated annually or a constantly changing programme.

5.6.4 Apprenticeships
SEBC runs an apprenticeship programme for ranger/gardeners. This should be continued both as a way to serve the community and a means to train potential new staff. The Abbey Gardens also provides a place where staff can develop their horticultural skills and knowledge as a result of the variety of gardens and plants involved with some of the trees being a legacy of the Botanic Garden.

5.7 SAFETY AND SECURITY
5.7.1 Risk from degrading masonry
As noted, the nature of the flint rubble ruins means that they are constantly degrading and they present a potential, though mostly very low, risk to the public. The level of risk directly correlates with the maintenance of the ruins.

The West Front houses are not open to the public but present a similar danger to residents and guests, especially at the rear of some of the properties.

The Anselm Building’s decaying brick soffit presents a risk to visitors walking along the path below it.

5.7.2 Staff Safety
In addition to the safety of visitors, the safety of staff should also be considered. Accessing parts of the Cathedral roofs and the Abbey Gate, for example, carry inherent risks that need to be managed and minimised through safety procedures.

5.7.3 Flooding
The proximity to the river means that flooding does occur occasionally although generally not affecting much of the historic built fabric. The historic structures at greatest risk from the effects of flooding around the river are the Abbot’s Bridge and the footings of another medieval bridge further south along the river. It is not only the raised water level that threatens the fabric of the Bridge, but also branches or other detritus that may get carried along by the swollen river.

No Mans Meadow is a water meadow and, as part of the floodplain, will flood readily. As such it is not appropriate to build on it and it should remain a water meadow to reduce the risk of flooding to the Abbey precinct area.

Flooding may also occur within buildings as a result of water getting into the building, particularly as a result of exceptionally heavy summer rainstorms, or from failures in the plumbing or sewerage systems.
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03 Ranger/gardener is a combined role of ranger and gardener.
5.7.4 Fire
Fire is a risk to the historic buildings and to the landscape areas, especially when hot weather dries out the vegetation. Preserving life will always take precedence over preserving property and changes may need to occur to historic buildings to minimise the risk to life. Experienced fire engineers who are used to dealing with historic buildings will be familiar with less intrusive options.

5.7.5 Lightning
With tall buildings and trees on the site, consideration should be given to maintaining lightning protection systems. These minimise the risk of damage to tall buildings.

5.7.6 Out-of-hours Security
The Abbey Gardens are locked at night, limiting ease of access to the gardens and ruins. The Great Churchyard is not secured at night.

CCTV covers some of the buildings on site.

5.7.7 Occupation
There is no particular focal point for expressions of public protest in Bury St Edmunds. There is a very slight chance that the Abbey Gardens or even the area around the Cathedral could be occupied as part of a public protest, in the manner of the occupation outside St Paul’s Cathedral in 2012, partly because of the associations with political challenge, such as the Magna Carta, and as a major public space in the town.

5.7.8 Terrorism
As high profile public places in the town and, moreover, ones where large numbers of people congregate and some events have military or civic personnel involved, there is an underlying though low risk that the main buildings and the Abbey Gardens could be targets of terrorist activity.

5.7.9 Disaster Planning
Disaster planning involves planning for natural or man-made disasters, such as fire, flood and terror attacks. It may also involve training staff and carrying out practices of procedures. Disaster planning relates to the management of visitors and staff as well as to mitigating the impacts of disasters on buildings. Where there are significant collections of objects held in a building, it is good practice to have a plan for salvaging these objects in the event of a fire or flood. There is an opportunity for the Heritage Partnership to facilitate a coordinated approach to safety and security, particularly with regard to Disaster Planning.

5.7.9.1 Occupation

5.8 Environmental Change

5.8.1 The Potential Impacts of Climate Change
As noted, the riverside location means that flooding does occur periodically. Climate change may increase the risk of flooding both from the river and in buildings due to leaks either in the building’s external envelope or failed drainage. Summer rainstorms are predicted to increase in number and intensity which test the weather-tightness of buildings and drainage capacity. New rainwater management solutions may need to be designed that can cope with the increased rainfall whilst not compromising the appearance of the historic buildings.

Predicted climate change has a significant potential impact for buried archaeology with drier conditions causing the ground to dry out in some seasons whilst increased rainfall and flooding may saturate the ground in other seasons.

Greater extremes of wetting and drying may increase the risk of subsidence and affect both the ruins and the standing buildings. It will also affect the fabric of the structures, causing damage to stonework and brickwork as well as flint rubble.

More frequent and intense rainfall may cause erosion that exposes more buried archaeology as well as foundations of structures.

Changes to the climate may affect the distribution of pests, which may in turn affect buildings, objects in them, and planting schemes within the project area.

5.8.2 Energy
Introducing energy-saving or renewable energy sources may reduce the risk of climate change as well as reducing costs associated with energy consumption. Any such introductions need to be carefully selected, designed and located. Poorly designed or inappropriate energy-saving or alternative energy solutions may detract from the historic environment.

5.8.3 Horticultural Planning
In recent years, a policy of using plants that attract pollinators has been adopted. This has seen an increase in the number and species of insects and birds in the Abbey Gardens and along the River Lark. Outside the formal areas, such as the Central Flower Beds and the Rose Garden, plants are also increasingly being selected for drought tolerance to reduce the water requirement as well as reduce staff time.

5.9 Human Remains
There are several parts of the project area that contain human remains. Apart from the Great Churchyard, there are burials in the garden south of St Mary’s Church and also under St Edmund’s Green, which were a churchyard and part of the Great Churchyard respectively. There are also likely to be burials around the east end of the Abbey Church and possibly south of this as far as the precinct wall as this is the approximate area of the Monks’ Cemetery. Any works that might require exhumations require a Home Office licence if the ground is not consecrated and permission is required from the church authorities (Bishop’s Faculty consent) if it is consecrated. It is also necessary to liaise with the police. Environmental Health may need to be contacted in relation to lead coffins and vaults.

The Garden of Remembrance, south of Abbey House, is used for the burial of cremation ashes and therefore is also deemed to contain human remains.
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SECTION 6.0  
CONSERVATION FRAMEWORK

6.1 INTRODUCTION
This section provides the long-term framework for future decision-making by all parties separately and collectively involved in the management and future development of the project area. It should be applied both to day-to-day activities and longer term management.

Conservation is “The process of managing change to a significant place in its setting in ways that will best sustain its heritage values, while recognising opportunities to reveal or reinforce those values for present and future generations.”

Conservation embraces change as being necessary but acknowledges that it needs to be carefully managed so that what makes a place special in heritage terms, its significance, is maintained and, where possible, enhanced now and for future generations. Enhancing significance means making what is special about the place more visible or understandable.

This section sets out an overarching Conservation Philosophy that describes the approach to sustaining and enhancing the heritage significance of the site of the Abbey of St Edmund. Deriving from this is a set of Conservation Policies that will be used as the basis for decision-making for works and projects of all sizes from minor maintenance upwards. To make it more practical to incorporate these into the management of the site, the number of policies has been kept low. For each policy, there are associated actions. These are generally intended to endure but may need to be changed within the framework of the main policies when the Conservation Plan is periodically reviewed.

The Conservation Framework has been principally conceived for the areas of the site that are not in private ownership.

6.2 CONSERVATION PHILOSOPHY
The Abbey of St Edmund is nationally and internationally significant historically as the shrine of St Edmund at the centre of an immensely powerful abbey and today for its critical role in the birth of the Magna Carta, the document that is sometimes argued to be the foundation of civil liberties in the West. It is also highly significant locally for its symbiotic relationship with the town and for the communal, particularly spiritual, value deriving from the public areas. Any conservation decisions need to balance the implications of preserving and enhancing the two different levels of heritage significance within a coherent approach to the conservation of the Abbey of St Edmund as a whole.

Multiple layers of history and heritage significance make the site complex, and this complexity is an important part of its character and heritage value. The site will therefore be managed to enhance the legibility of its historic development and heritage significance. Opportunities will be taken to enhance the heritage significance of the site by making the key phases and uses of the site clearer and more readily understood. The public areas of the site should be accessible physically and intellectually to the fullest extent possible without compromising the heritage significance of the site.

The historic fabric is evidence of different phases of development and will be conserved in accordance with its relative heritage significance. Planned preventative maintenance will be given great attention to minimise the natural deterioration of materials and finishes. Change to ensure the future sustainability of the project area will preserve the heritage significance of the site and, where possible, to enhance it.

The layers of development are represented below ground as well as in standing fabric above ground. All future works will be mindful in their design and execution of the known or potential buried archaeology across the site. Appropriate opportunities to explore and record the buried archaeology will be maximised to better understand the site’s evolution.

Where works are undertaken, whether as part of routine maintenance or a major project of renewal or change, these will be carried out using conservation best practice, utilising the skills of experienced consultants and contractors. Any new additions will be designed to a high standard and built using high quality materials and construction methods, in a way that is sensitive to the setting of the site in terms of its massing, scale and materiality. In addition to obtaining the necessary statutory consents, Historic England, the local Conservation Officer, County Archaeologist and, where relevant, the Fabric Advisory Committee and the Cathedrals Fabric Commission for England will be consulted early in the process to facilitate the success of the proposals.

The Abbey of St Edmund’s many layers of history and heritage significance will be shared with the widest possible audience through a variety of interpretation techniques. New research and analysis will continue to enhance the understanding of the site and contribute to its vibrancy. Exciting discoveries will be shared so that successive generations care for and are fascinated by the site.

Good communication between different parties will be essential to facilitating the future conservation of the many heritage assets within the Abbey of St Edmund. The excellent work of the Heritage Partnership will be developed. The implementation of a long-term approach to the coordinated management, maintenance and interpretation of the site will ensure its enduring sustainability and celebration.

---

02 See overleaf
CONSERVATION BEST PRACTICE

Conservation best practice is a term used to describe various methodologies, practices, systems and philosophies that result in the successful maintenance, management and conservation of heritage assets. Applying these methods will protect and reveal the heritage significance of the heritage assets in the project area and prevent damage to the integrity and character of the place.

Some of the general principles of conservation best practice are:

- Undertake a cyclical programme of inspection and recording of the condition of heritage assets.
- Undertake a regular programme of preventative maintenance.
- Ensure that staff, consultants and contractors have the necessary knowledge, skills and experience to make decisions and undertake work that is required.
- Works should be undertaken using materials, techniques and details that are appropriate to the specific heritage asset affected. Appropriateness may be determined by appearance, performance and quality.
- Significant historic fabric and landscape elements will be retained in situ as much as possible.
- Where significant or historic fabric requires repair, this work should be undertaken on a ‘like-for-like’ basis in terms of materials and techniques, providing that the existing materials are not causing harm. Where modern fabric requires repair, the work should be carried out mindful of the impact of modern materials and techniques on any adjacent fabric.
- Repairs should be undertaken where the exact nature and cause of the defect is understood.
- All decisions regarding maintenance and other works should be based on a sound understanding of the heritage significance of the heritage asset(s) and the built fabric affected.
- The decision-making process and the works undertaken should be recorded and the record archived so that it is accessible in future.
- Proactive recording of or research into buildings, landscaping and buried archaeology may be undertaken to better understand the heritage asset and its significance.
- Careful consideration should be given to services within a heritage asset. Redundant services should be removed unless of heritage significance. Historic fittings should be refurbished and reused where possible. New utility services should be kept to a minimum and their layout recorded when installed.
- Sustainability (environmental and economic) is an important consideration in the management of the historic environment. Opportunities to enhance environmental sustainability should be incorporated provided that they do not harm the heritage significance or built fabric of any affected heritage assets.
- Comply with statutory legislation and guidance provided by statutory stakeholders (Historic England and the local Planning Authority).

Historic England publishes a range of guidance for managing the historic built environment, such as its Practical Building Conservation Guides, which cover topics such as Brick and Terracotta, Glass and Glazing, and Mortars, Renders and Plasters. Other organisations, such as the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings also provides guidance.
### 6.3 CONSERVATION POLICIES

The following table sets out a concise series of Conservation Policies that should permeate all decisions made about and works that are carried out to the heritage assets in the project area. They should act as guiding principles within the context of the Conservation Philosophy. They also form specific criteria to test any future proposals within the project area. The conservation policies are primarily intended for use by the Heritage Partnership and its constituent partners in managing the project area and developing proposals for change. They will also inform the statutory authorities when they are providing advice or evaluating proposals. However, the conservation policies are not statutory planning policies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY NO.</th>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>REASONS</th>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CP1</td>
<td>Undertake the development and implementation of new works or procedures within a coherent and integrated approach that preserves and enhances the heritage significance of the project area as a whole.</td>
<td>To develop a holistic and coordinated approach to the management of the project area so that the former Abbey site can increasingly be understood as an entity. To ensure that works to one part of the project area will benefit, or at least not adversely impact, the project area as a whole.</td>
<td>a Use the Conservation Plan as a basis for decision-making. b Develop an overarching plan for the project area. c Ensure continued dialogue between the constituent partners of the Heritage Partnership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP2</td>
<td>Use the Conservation Plan to guide change.</td>
<td>To enable a coordinated approach to the site’s future. To ensure appropriate repair, alteration and change to the site.</td>
<td>a Use the Conservation Plan as the basis of decision-making regarding the site. b Update the Conservation Plan when major change occurs or at least every five years. c Collect information between updates for inclusion in the Conservation Plan as new information becomes available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP3</td>
<td>Ensure that the heritage significance of heritage assets and their setting is understood and considered when planning change, including repairs.</td>
<td>The preservation of heritage significance is at the core of conservation. This can only be achieved if the significance is understood before works are planned and if the significance is given due weight in the planning of works. To ensure due consideration is given to relationships between the heritage assets within the project area and nearby.</td>
<td>a Use the heritage significance section in this Conservation Plan to provide a baseline understanding. b Carry out further research on specific heritage assets if a more detailed understanding is required. c Carry out a heritage impact assessment prior to implementation of any works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY NO.</td>
<td>POLICY</td>
<td>REASONS</td>
<td>ACTIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| CP4       | Ensure the long-term good condition and appearance of the heritage assets. | To ensure that the aesthetic value of the heritage assets is preserved and enhanced. | a. Undertake regular condition surveys and implement the recommendations of the surveys.  
  b. Implement planned and coordinated programmes of repairs and maintenance.  
  c. Carry out conservation and repair works on a ‘like-for-like’ basis.  
  d. Ensure works are planned and carried out by skilled and experienced staff, consultants and contractors.  
  e. Ensure that minor accretions and alterations are carried out with careful thought to avoid gradual erosion of character.  
  f. Ensure procedures and protocols for events protect the historic fabric and that these protocols are followed for all events.  
  g. Consider zoning activities across the Abbey Gardens.  
  h. The location of any proposed new tree planting will be developed with due consideration of both upstanding and buried archaeology. |
| CP5       | Retain in situ as much significant historic fabric and landscape features as possible. | To preserve the evidential and illustrative values of the heritage assets. | a. Prioritise retention of historic fabric in repairs or periodic renewals of built fabric.  
  b. Where possible, avoid the relocation of historic fabric to off-site locations.  
  c. Proactively record the significant historic fabric so that its location and condition is known.                                                                 |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| CP6       | Bring disused or vacant areas into good repair and regular use.        | To maximise the use and appreciation of the site.                       | a. Identify disused, vacant or underused areas.  
  b. Identify uses for these areas and maintain these areas in use.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
<p>|           |                                                                        | To prevent deterioration of the built fabric or landscape through lack of maintenance. |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
|           |                                                                        | To minimise the risk of unnoticed disasters.                            |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY NO.</th>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>REASONS</th>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| CP7       | Ensure minor additions and alterations cumulatively will not erode the historic character of the heritage assets. | To ensure the historic character and heritage significance of heritage assets endures for future generations. Whilst minor additions or alterations can appear to cause no harm individually, especially to a heritage asset as large as the Abbey Gardens or the scheduled Abbey, multiple minor additions or alterations over time can erode the quality or character of the heritage asset. | a Consider the impact of any minor additions or alterations both on the heritage asset or part of a heritage asset most immediately affected and on the wider context.  
 b Evaluate each proposal; it will not be presumed that because a minor change has been acceptable previously that it will be acceptable repeatedly.  
 c Add new memorials (built or horticultural) to individuals to the Abbey Gardens only through the schemes already in place, namely the Memorial Tree and the benches, and any other such scheme SEBC may develop in the future.  
 d Add new memorials (built or horticultural) commemorating groups of people or anniversaries to the Abbey Gardens only when such an addition enhances the heritage significance of the Abbey Gardens by making its history better known. |
| CP8       | When developing proposals for any part or element of the site, consider their impact on the site as a whole. | To ensure that heritage assets are not considered in isolation. To meet the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework to consider the impact of proposals on all relevant heritage assets. | a Consider the site and its heritage significance holistically even when working on a particular area.  
 b Consider whether there are enhancements that could be made to adjacent areas to the part of the site under consideration. |
| CP9       | Maintain records of maintenance and major works carried out. | To provide a record of what works have been carried out, when and the materials and methods used. To ensure an understanding of works that have been carried out that can be passed on when there is a change of staff personnel. To facilitate the future development of repair or major works projects. | a Document, record and archive changes to built fabric and landscaping and also record ‘as is’ prior to change.  
 b Develop a maintenance log for maintenance works for each of the main areas of the site. |
| CP10      | Ensure a high standard of design in all new works. | To retain and enhance the heritage values of the project area. | a Give due weight to the longevity of the proposed works and the heritage significance of the heritage assets.  
 b Employ suitably qualified and experienced consultants and contractors.  
 c Remedy any existing poor works or remove negative features when the opportunity arises. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY NO.</th>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>REASONS</th>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CP11</td>
<td>When planning any change, ensure compliance with statutory procedures relevant to the designation level.</td>
<td>To ensure protection of the heritage significance of the heritage assets. To uphold high standards of stewardship.</td>
<td>a. Understand which parts of the site are covered by the guardianship agreement. b. Obtain all relevant consents in advance of carrying out works. c. Explore the potential of establishing a Heritage Partnership Agreement and/or standing scheduled monument consent for certain types of works to reduce the need for repeat applications. d. Ensure all relevant staff understand the designations and requirements for consents for the heritage assets for which they are responsible. e. Seek pre-application advice prior to developing proposals at an appropriate point in the design development process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP12</td>
<td>Carry out archaeological assessment and evaluation prior to any below ground works commencing or prior to any development works.</td>
<td>To prevent accidental loss of the buried archaeology and to preserve its evidential value. To increase understanding of the historical development of the site.</td>
<td>a. Liaise with Suffolk County Council Archaeological Unit and Historic England regarding the appropriate level of investigation. b. Employ a consultant with relevant expertise to carry out the archaeological investigation and to report and analyse the results. c. If necessary, amend the proposals in response to the archaeological findings in liaison with Suffolk County Council Archaeological Unit and Historic England. d. Undertake non-invasive archaeological investigations to enhance understanding of the archaeology within the project area. e. Where there is an appropriate opportunity or need, undertake targeted intrusive archaeological investigations as agreed with Historic England and Suffolk County Council Archaeological Unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP13</td>
<td>Ensure the full recording, archiving and publication of archaeological investigations.</td>
<td>To clear the backlog of past archaeological investigations that have not been written up and made publicly available through archiving. To ensure that the results of future archaeological investigations are promptly recorded and made available to all interested parties.</td>
<td>a. Carry out the works recommended in the Heritage Assessment to record and analyse the findings from past excavations and make these publicly available. b. Ensure that any future archaeological investigations are followed with full reporting and subsequent archiving of the report. c. Ensure that the impacts, and costs, of any archaeological investigations is considered well in advance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY NO.</td>
<td>POLICY</td>
<td>REASONS</td>
<td>ACTIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: OWNERSHIP AND COMMUNICATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP14</td>
<td>Ensure a clear understanding of ownership and responsibilities for each aspect of every built and landscape element.</td>
<td>To enable the parties responsible to plan and undertake conservation works.</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To ensure that the heritage assets are well maintained.</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP15</td>
<td>Develop and maintain good working relationships between stakeholders.</td>
<td>To facilitate the sharing of knowledge and expertise.</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To enable the development of joint projects or maintenance arrangements.</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To make fundraising easier.</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP16</td>
<td>Engage with the wider community regarding major proposals for change and development.</td>
<td>To facilitate a sense of shared ownership of and responsibility for the public heritage assets.</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## C: EDUCATION AND ACCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY NO.</th>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>REASONS</th>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CP17</strong></td>
<td>Encourage increased understanding of and education about the site.</td>
<td>To improve the interpretation of the site for visitors.</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To facilitate greater understanding of the site’s complex history and archaeology.</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To encourage people to appreciate and care for the site as a group of heritage assets.</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To encourage the use of the site in learning by local schools.</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To encourage study of and research into the site or aspects of its history by educational institutions.</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To promote the site further afield through publications and exhibitions.</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To widen intellectual access to the site.</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| <strong>CP18</strong>   | Improve accessibility across the site. | To fulfil the requirements of the Equality Act (2010) as far as is reasonably possible without compromising the significance of the heritage assets. This applies to the public areas of the site. | a  | Undertake an access audit or utilise an existing access audit for each of the public areas/buildings of the project area to identify key improvements that are required. |
|            |        | To improve circulation around and through the site. | b  | When projects are undertaken, look to incorporate key access improvements. |
|            |        |                                                | c  | Ensure that any obstacles to level access are made clear on visitor maps. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY NO.</th>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>REASONS</th>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D: MANAGING RISK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| CP19 | Ensure the safety and security of visitors and staff with minimal impact on the heritage significance of the site or individual heritage assets. | The safety of visitors and staff should be paramount. Where there is a notable risk to safety, changes that do not harm the significance of the heritage asset should be made. | a Ensure all public areas have a regularly updated risk assessment.  
b Carry out long-term solutions to minimise the duration that temporary barriers or safety measures need to be in place.  
c Provide sufficient signs to warn of dangers without compromising the appearance of the heritage assets. |
| CP20 | Ensure a coordinated approach to disaster preparedness planning for all areas to which the public have access. | To minimise the risk of disaster.  
To minimise the impact on the heritage assets should any disaster occur.  
To share resources and best practice across the site. | a Review existing Disaster Preparedness Plans and identify commonalities.  
b Prepare a coordinated Disaster Preparedness Plan or coordinate existing plans.  
c Ensure that all staff are aware of emergency procedures. |
| CP21 | Promote environmental sustainability and resilience to climate change. | To minimise the impact of the uses of the site on the environment.  
To improve energy efficiency.  
To improve water conservation. | a Identify potential works to reduce energy consumption and, where possible, use sustainable energy sources.  
b Identify measures to reduce water consumption and to recycle water where possible.  
c Foster biodiversity within the green spaces of the site.  
d Encourage recycling of waste.  
e Use building materials and construction techniques with inherent durability (subject to the other conservation policies) and, where possible, low embodied carbon levels.  
f Where sustainable urban drainage systems are proposed, ensure the impact on archaeological remains is carefully considered. |
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SECTION 7.0
AREA ANALYSIS: PRECINCT SUB-AREAS

7.1 INTRODUCTION
7.1.1 Purpose and Content
This section provides greater detail for each of the 15 sub-areas with regard to what is significant in the sub-area and the specific issues, opportunities and recommendations associated with the sub-area. It has been written to provide more detail for the benefit of the general reader without over complicating the earlier whole site sections on heritage significance and issues and opportunities. It has also been written for the benefit of anyone planning or working on a project in a specific area of the project area so that they can readily find the additional relevant detail that is needed. It is intended that this section, or any individual sub-section, should be read alongside the site-wide sections on significance (Section 4) and issues and opportunities (Section 5).

7.1.2 Notes on the Summary Statements of Significance
The summary statement of significance for each sub-area identifies what is most significant in each sub-area. Reference is generally not made to elements of less or no heritage significance. The sub-areas themselves are not given individual levels of heritage significance as the framework of sub-areas is simply a tool to understand the site, not a division that is historically meaningful.

The summary statements of significance are only summaries and there is therefore scope for much greater analysis, especially of individual buildings, structures or landscape areas. Individual buildings and landscape areas have been assigned overarching significance levels on the significance plans in Section 4.4. (Note that the Very High category has not been used except on the significance plans). Where values have been assigned in the summary statements of significance, these values have been consistently applied across the site, rather than relatively within a sub-area.

7.1.3 Notes on the Area Specific Recommendations
The area specific recommendations (set out for each sub-area in the following sections) sit below the Conservation Policies set out in Section 6. Unlike the policies, they are likely to change as new regimes are implemented and works are carried out in the future.

Some of the area-specific recommendations are expanded on in more detail in Section 8, Considering the Future. Conversely other recommendations, usually those associated with maintenance, offer more detail than the overview of improving management and maintenance referenced in Section 8.

The area specific issues and opportunities point to required actions that are included in the area specific recommendations. The area specific issues and opportunities also makes suggestions for future actions but these are not included as recommendations.
7.2 SUB-AREA 1: ST EDMUNDSBURY CATHEDRAL

7.2.1 Summary Statement of Significance
The sub-area is dominated by the Cathedral building, which is of high significance. Combining the medieval craftsmanship, including that of John Wastell, master mason, with George Gilbert Scott’s alterations, the twentieth century additions and alterations by Stephen Dykes-Bower and the magnificent twenty-first century Millennium Tower, the high quality of materials, decoration and design contribute to its high aesthetic value. Furthermore, the incorporation of flint roots it in the architectural language of East Anglia. As one of the two surviving medieval churches on the site, its connection with the Abbey contributes to its historical value though, unlike St Mary’s Church, it has been much altered since the Dissolution. Its high communal and spiritual value encompasses not only its centuries-long continued use as a place of worship but also its many uses as a place of contemplation, commemoration and celebration. The Cathedral Centre and cloister contribute to the setting of the Cathedral church as does the open green space of the Cloister Garth. There has been a conscious celebration of the site’s medieval heritage in the wider setting of the Cathedral with the creation of the Pilgrim’s Herb Garden based on a design influenced by a thirteenth century manuscript written at the Abbey (now at the Bodleian Library).

The sub-area also contains another of the most important buildings in the project area, Abbey House, which was the centre of the small estate created by Major Richardson Pack, expanded by the Davers family, especially Mary Davers, and finally owned by the Marquesses of Bristol. Besides its associative and historical values, Abbey House has high evidential value deriving from its piecemeal creation and the known survival of late sixteenth century timber-framing. Its aesthetic value stems principally from its symmetrical front façade and the elegant rear elevation that is dominated by a Venetian window. Internally, the ground floor room currently used as a library is the most significant historic interior. The Anselm Building is one of the surviving historic ancillary structures contributing to the setting of Abbey House and is also an example of a Georgian coach house in Bury St Edmunds. Although part of the later division of the site in its form, and altered in its landscaping in recent years, the small garden of Abbey House remains part of the immediate setting of Abbey House.

The medieval precinct wall, though partially rebuilt, contributes to the significance of the sub-area as does the high potential for buried medieval archaeology in the undeveloped areas of the site. Some of the medieval precinct wall has been incorporated into the buildings west of it along Angel Hill, reflecting the site’s post-Dissolution development. These buildings are also of significance for their contribution to the streetscape of Angel Hill.
7.2.2 Area Specific Issues and Opportunities

- Movement into this sub-area is constrained. The connectivity with the Abbey Gardens is poor with the current access through the Herb Garden leading to a narrow path around the Cathedral car park. There is potential to improve access to the Cathedral and especially the Pilgrims’ Kitchen from the Abbey Gardens. There is usually no access for the public into the Cathedral from St Edmund’s Green except when the south door is open. The potential for public use of the south door could be explored.

- The Cathedral’s primary function is as a place of worship but it accommodates a wide variety of other events around services. The pews present a challenge in adapting the Cathedral nave for events and set up can be time consuming. Events and services would be benefited by underfloor heating and improved lighting. It is noted, however, that there are ledger stone slabs (grave covers) beneath the existing nave floor and any works affecting these would need careful consideration. The existing light fittings by Stephen Dykes Bower are an integral part of the current Cathedral design and should be retained and supplemented by additional lighting.

- A larger kitchen in the Cathedral Centre would benefit both the café and catering for events. A larger serving area in the café would also assist staff.

- The deliveries to the café are currently via the Cathedral car park, which is problematic when it is congested. If a development project were considered, improving the delivery route would be beneficial.

- The Anselm Building, a Georgian coach house, is a locally significant building but is in extremely poor repair and is disused. This means that deterioration will not be immediately noticed. The condition of the brick soffit potentially poses a risk to those who walk below it. The building is in a good location, close to the main street and has potential for conversion into useful space.

- The Cathedral car park is not an especially attractive space and detracts from the setting of the Cathedral. Improving its appearance with landscaping would, however, almost certainly result in a reduction of the number of parking spaces, which is already inadequate.

- The entrance area off Angel Hill to the Cathedral Office and car park could be improved. It offers a poor impression for any visitors who walk through this way.

- There is a lack of cycle parking in the Cathedral area. There is an opportunity to improve the setting of the Cathedral and Abbey House by providing both cycle parking and a concealed place for the bins.

- Abbey House is divided into various uses. The Cathedral Office sprawls across most of the upper floors and is a rabbit warren that is difficult to navigate. There is significant potential to improve the appearance and functionality of the spaces. The two rented retail units were not inspected. The basement of Abbey House is mostly unused apart from for some storage. It is damp with associated deterioration of the built fabric.

- Nos. 31–34 Angel Hill are used as the Cathedral shop and tourist information point and as a gallery. The shop suffers from a lack of display space since the wall was removed that separated it from the former tourist information point. The quality of the shop display racking could be improved as could the lighting. The shop also lacks storage on the shop floor. A large amount of shop stock is held in the basement, which is damp, or on the first floor. The staircases to access both are awkward and narrow. There is no space for processing deliveries so this is done on the shop floor, which is constrained by preventing health and safety risks to customers. As well as damp in the basement, there is damp visible in places in the shop itself.

- The peripheral green areas, such as the rear of the Cathedral shop and the strip of ground east of the Cathedral Centre are not well maintained. They are overgrown and, whilst they are not highly visible, there is potential to create a pleasant usable space at the rear of the shop. The area to the east of the Cathedral Centre should be maintained as much for the benefit of the built fabric as for the creation of a usable space.

- The English Heritage guardianship of the walls between the Cathedral area and the Abbey Gardens covers the walls east of the herb garden but not from the herb garden westwards. The appearance of the walls varies not in line with this division but between the Cathedral and Abbey Gardens sides, with the Cathedral side being largely kept clear of vegetation but the Abbey Gardens side is not.

- The notice of the gate opening times by the gate to St Edmund’s Green is tatty and does not contribute to a good impression of the maintenance of the Abbey Gardens. Better designed and better quality signs should be used.

- The recesses in the Cathedral cloister offers the opportunity to create a short exhibition about the history of the Cathedral or potentially the Abbey of St Edmund.
7.2.3 Area Specific Recommendations
• Bring the Anselm Building area back into good repair and a sustainable use.
• Review the arrangement of the shop, including back of house areas and improve both the organisation and the appearance of these spaces.
• Ensure a regular maintenance programme for ‘hidden’ green spaces within the sub-area.
• Improve the appearance and quality of surfacing and signage of the entrance area to the Cathedral Office.
• Improve the appearance of the Cathedral car park and if possible lessen its visual impact on the surrounding heritage assets, particularly the Cathedral.
• Explore options to improve connectivity between this sub-area and other sub-areas.
7.3 SUB-AREA 2: THE ABBEY GATEWAY

7.3.1 Summary Statement of Significance
The Abbey Gate is a magnificent survival of mid-fourteenth century masonry craftsmanship with its fine proportions and delicate carving. There are less than a dozen surviving gatehouses of the same period\(^1\) and the closest rival, the great gatehouse at Battle Abbey commissioned by Abbot Alan of Ketling was altered in the sixteenth century and does not surpass the Abbey Gate at Bury St Edmunds. Besides its aesthetic value, its location has high illustrative value as it reflects the site of the rebuilding following the 1327 riot, which is off-centre with Abbeygate Street. The location, scale and defensive style of the gate reflect the ongoing tensions between the Abbey and the town and the threat that the town was to the Abbey despite the Abbey’s power and wealth. The flanking precinct walls are an important part of its setting.

Its immediate setting today reflects the evolution of the nineteenth century Botanic Garden into the public park of Abbey Gardens, incorporating radiating paths that facilitate views of the Abbey Gate within the Gardens, and a semi-concealed garden building, the Park Keeper’s Hut, that is of low heritage value. This may have been used for controlling access to the Botanic Gardens when they first opened.\(^2\)

---

\(^1\) National Heritage List for England, search for ‘Gatehouse’ and 1327–1353’, accessed 9 August 2018. More locally are the Gatehouse of Mettingham Castle in Suffolk, an imposing but relatively plain flint edifice, and the more elaborate gatehouse of Burnham Norton Priory in Norfolk, which incorporates flush flintwork.

\(^2\) Pers. comm. Adrian Tindall, 28 September 2018
7.3.2 Area Specific Issues and Opportunities

- The quinquennial inspection (QQI, 2016) identifies a significant programme of repairs to the exterior of the Abbey Gate. The previous major repair project was undertaken in the 1980s and those repairs are now failing. If repairs are not undertaken there will be a progressive loss of historic fabric and a deterioration in the appearance and therefore understanding of the design of the Abbey Gate.

- The foundations of the Gate have become exposed on the east side due to traffic of people. The land should be regraded to conceal the foundations.

- The walls flanking the Abbey Gate require repair. The heras fencing around the wall to the north on the Angel Hill side has been there for over three years. This detracts from the appearance of the heritage assets and creates the impression that the site is not being adequately maintained.

- The roof of the Abbey Gate is asbestos. It would be desirable to replace this with a less hazardous material.

- The duckboards on the Abbey Gate roof are unstable in areas, especially at the apexes of the pitched roof. This is hazardous, particularly as the parapet is at its shallowest at the apexes.

- The Abbey Gate is the main gate into the Abbey Gardens. The interpretation on the wall is old and creates a poor impression. Some of the interpretation boards around the site that it refers to are no longer in position. There are also, just beyond the Abbey Gate, boards about the Abbey Gardens and the café. A donations box is located nearby. There are also A-boards advertising tours in the Abbey Gate. The proliferation of uncoordinated signage, lack of coherent interpretation and lack of lighting has a greater impact at the main entrance to the site.

- There was originally a floor in the Abbey Gate. There is potential for a contemporary floor to be inserted, provided it did not compromise the historic fabric. This could provide additional space for heritage interpretation or events, although it would need to be complemented by accessible interpretation at ground floor level. The potential to create level access or access for a significant number of visitors would need to be considered as part of any development of this opportunity.

7.3.3 Area Specific Recommendations

- Undertake a comprehensive programme of repairs to the Abbey Gate and flanking walls.

- Improve the roof access on the Abbey Gate.

- When developing an interpretation strategy for the whole site, consider the integration of practical information signs so that there can be a coordinated approach to signage.
7.4 SUB-AREA 3: ABBEY GARDEN FACILITIES

7.4.1 Summary Statement of Significance
The most significant element in the sub-area is the surviving precinct wall, which includes various blocked openings, though it is largely concealed by the Aviary and the planting. Demarcating the north boundary of the Abbey’s Great Court, the wall has medium aesthetic, high illustrative and medium evidential values.

Also of importance in the sub-area is the Garden Kiosk, a fine example of an early nineteenth century Regency Gothic garden building, localised in its design using flint. This is principally significant for its aesthetic value and its association with Abbey House.

The Aviary reflects the tradition of keeping birds and animals for display that dates from the 1830s when Nathaniel Hodson introduced a menagerie to his Botanic Gardens. As it is not the original building, its historic value is low and its aesthetic and evidential values are neutral. It is, however, a locally loved feature of the Abbey Gardens.

The landscape of this area retains some nineteenth century elements but is predominantly twentieth century or later in its arrangement and planting. As such, it is not amongst the more significant areas of the Abbey Gardens in terms of landscaping.
7.4.2 Area Specific Issues and Opportunities

- The neo-Gothic garden building is used as a café kiosk. There is no room for seating in the building and so the café is very seasonal and weather-dependent.

- The aviary has been part of the Abbey Gardens for many decades and once housed monkeys. The maintenance of the aviary is a considerable cost. Also whilst some visitors love the aviary, others do not like to see birds confined to cages. In terms of the heritage, the aviary conceals features of the scheduled precinct wall. However, the area on the north side of the wall was allegedly used as a temporary animal pen in the medieval period, so the use of this area for an aviary is not entirely inappropriate.

- Part of the aviary is used as a gardeners’ store. It is not attractive but does not seem to have been a cause of public complaint.

- The gardeners’ yard is important to the servicing of the Abbey Gardens. It is too small to house all the gardeners’ vehicles so some are parked on the grass outside, which detracts from the appearance of this area of the gardens. There is potential to reorganise the yard. The buildings in it are not of heritage value and the coniferous hedge around it does not contribute particularly positively to the Abbey Gardens.

- The path near the gardeners’ yard has sunk and water collects there. This could be a potential hazard to staff and visitors particularly in freezing conditions.

- The trees in this area were particularly badly affected by the 1987 storm and many of those existing today were planted after this.

7.4.3 Area Specific Recommendations

- Explore options for the aviary and gardeners’ yard area to improve these.

- Ensure that level paths are maintained.
**7.5.1 Summary Statement of Significance**

The predominantly open space of this sub-area is significant. Historically the site of the Abbey’s Great Court, the area has low illustrative value in relation to this use as little remains of it and the volume of the Court is obscured by tree planting. However, there is high evidential potential relating to buried archaeology not only relating to the medieval court but the older Anglo-Saxon town. The form of the main part of the sub-area derives from the layout of the Botanic Gardens in the 1830s although much altered during its use as a public park, most notably in association with the 1937 celebrations for George VI’s Coronation. The heritage significance of the landscaping comes from the form and layout of the area including the arrangement of paths and beds and the surviving specimen trees, at least three of which still have the white tags used by Nathaniel Hodson to label plants. The species used in the formal beds are not significant. Some of the trees are also relatively young, planted after the 1987 storm, and are not significant in heritage terms.

The difference in level up to the Bowling Green is historic and therefore of some heritage significance. The Bowling Green itself was one of the changes created as part of the site’s evolution as a public park but it echoes a historic bowling green nearby that existed from at least the eighteenth century. It therefore has low historic value. Similarly, the Rose Garden is a mid-twentieth century addition to the public park but its boundary walls are much earlier and reflect the site’s post-Dissolution division and development. It has high aesthetic and medium historical value. The Water Garden is a newer addition and has associations with the 1959 Magna Carta pageant, the profits from which funded the garden. Its historical and aesthetic values are low. All these elements have communal value, particularly the commemorative Rose Garden, which has high communal value.

All this sub-area has high communal value deriving from its role as a place of inward renewal through engagement with nature and as a place of contemplation, calm and tranquillity. It is also valued as a place where people meet, families enjoy time together and people develop memories. Historically the Abbey Gardens served as a place of recuperation for service personnel during the two world wars and a place for boosting local morale.

Near the remains of the Queen’s Chamber, the concrete slab created to display the ‘Kaffir’, a battle-scarred British tank that was presented to Bury in 1919 to reward the £2 million raised by the local War Savings committee. The first British tanks had been tested in the Brecks, not far from Bury St Edmunds. The slab itself is a modest reminder and has low historical and communal value.
7.5.2 Area Specific Issues and Opportunities

- The Ranger’s Shop is a utilitarian building that does not contribute positively to the Abbey Gardens. It is damp and needs refurbishment. There is potential to remove this structure to reveal the historic wall behind it, to replace it with a new structure or a higher design quality or enhance the existing building. This may be in conjunction with a project to open up the arch in the wall from the Pilgrims’ Kitchen Garden to the Abbey Gardens.

- The Memorial Tree was introduced to the Rose Garden to provide a focal point for those wanting to remember loved ones with a connection to the Abbey Gardens. It is a discrete addition but occasionally suffers from vandalism with the brass leaves being ripped off.

- The Bowling Green is no longer maintained as a true bowling green although it is possible to hire bowls to play on it. The area is used for temporary outdoor theatre and for family games. There has been a bowling green on the Abbey site for at least 200 years (though not always at the current location) but the main bowling green is now on the east side of the river. There is potential to redevelop this area of the gardens.

- The Water Garden is generally an attractive area but the two pavilions, though improved by the introduction of metal screens, are not positive contributors to the site. There has been some movement of the paving stones, which should be relaid as they are a trip hazard. The bins in the Water Garden could be enhanced with a design that echoes the metal screen rather than a conventional late twentieth century timber design.

- Whilst there is interpretation in this area relating to the Abbey, there is none explaining the Botanic Gardens and later park.

7.5.3 Area Specific Recommendations

- Explore the later history of the Abbey Gardens in heritage interpretation.

- Relay paving slabs that have moved in the Water Garden.
7.6 SUB-AREA 5: RIVER LARK VALLEY FLOOR

7.6.1 Summary Statement of Significance
The River Lark is the most significant feature of the sub-area in that it is the natural feature that determined the location and layout of the Abbey as well as potentially the earlier Anglo-Saxon monastery and possibly even the Anglo-Saxon town. There are remnants of both Anglo-Saxon and medieval bridges in the sub-area. The river’s illustrative value is high.

The heritage significance of the sub-area derives also from its upstanding medieval fabric, especially the north precinct wall, which is one of the finest surviving stretches, and the elegant dovecot, which has high aesthetic value. The low-lying, open space at the north end is indicative the medieval arrangement with the watermill set on the Linnet, though no visible evidence of either remains. Part of this sub-area was used as the Abbot’s garden, of which there is also no visible trace. The area has some historic significance also as part of the private gardens to the post-Dissolution property and later to Abbey House. Overall the illustrative value of the built fabric and landscaping is medium.

There is considerable potential for buried archaeology in this area, both relating to the medieval abbey, such as the lost watermill, and to the earlier Anglo-Saxon town. The evidential value is therefore high.

The sub-area is one that has particular communal value as a result of its use for popular local events, such as the Christmas Fayre. Whilst valued locally, features such as the play area, however, do not contribute to the heritage value of the sub-area.
7.6.2 Area Specific Issues and Opportunities

- Periodic flooding when the river bursts its banks.

- Low water flow and quality in the river during droughts.

- The large area of open grass is used for events. This can cause some wear to the grass although, particularly for the Christmas Fayre, decking is used to protect the grass.

- The scheduled elements within the events area are surrounded with protective fencing at the beginning of an event set up period and remain in place until it has been struck. This is necessary to protect the dovecot and rubble remains but does temporarily detract from their appearance.

- There is a limit on the number of events that can be held each year because of the noise impact on the residents of Alwyne House.

- Damage to trees as a result of events or event set up is very rare but can occur.

- There is an opportunity to either reinstate the lost footpath on the east bank or create a walk through the former Eastgate Nursery to form a circular walk incorporating the Abbot’s Bridge. Any incorporation of the Abbot’s Bridge, however, would require a carefully considered design and structural solution to maintain views of the Bridge and avoid impacting on the Bridge’s historic fabric whilst providing a safe route.

- The fencing along the river prevents direct access to it. This has some safety advantage for families using the park. However, it detracts somewhat from the appearance of the gardens and the understanding of the importance of the river to the Abbey site.

Currently the fencing is deemed necessary for preventing muntjac deer getting into the Gardens, although there is a gap near the north precinct wall.

- The Abbot’s Bridge should be inspected after every flood event.

- The continuation of the work of the Bury Water Meadows Group in carrying out works to enhance the river and its banks will continue to improve its appearance and the quality of natural habitat for flora and fauna.

- The ongoing development of Abbey Gardens as a public park in the twenty-first century and the management of the site to facilitate understanding of earlier historic forms, especially the Abbey layout, are not always reconcilable. For example, The play area is popular with families but does not contribute to the heritage value of the site. Its location is prominent although it is partially screened by hazel/willow fencing. Similarly, the introduction of a new seating and planting area near the footbridge is attractive and used by visitors, but it contributes to a municipal environment and does not enhance the heritage value of the gardens. However, these additions are reversible in the future.

- Water extraction further upstream means that the flow of the river here is slow and the level fairly low. There is an agreement between English Heritage and Anglian Water regarding the height of the river in relation to Abbot’s Bridge. Changes to the water level could impact on the fabric of the Bridge and also on its setting.

7.6.3 Area Specific Recommendations

- The Abbot’s Bridge should be inspected after every flood event.

- Ensure careful planning for event set up and events to prevent damage to the built heritage assets, trees and the designated landscape.

- Continue to carry out maintenance and enhancement works to the river and its banks.

- The tarmac surfaces of the paths on the east bank should be improved with a more attractive surface, such as bound gravel.

- The remains of a medieval bridge should be recorded and the record deposited with the Suffolk Historic Environment Record.
7.7.1 Summary Statement of Significance

Containing most of the centrally located standing remains of the Abbey, the high significance of this sub-area derives from the high illustrative and evidential values of the visible ruins and from the high evidential value of the buried archaeology. Apart from demonstrating the layout of many of the monastic buildings, the ruins of the Abbey Church convey a sense of its scale whilst analysis reveals the unusual design that evolved as the church was being constructed. The size and layout are also testimony to the importance of the site as a place of medieval pilgrimage. Although the location of St Edmund’s shrine no longer exists, the church ruins in particular remain a place of spiritual significance to some Christians. In the medieval period it was important not only as a shrine of England’s patron saint but also as a place where miracles occurred.

Amidst the ruins of the Abbey Church are plaques commemorating the creation of the internationally significant Magna Carta in 1214 by barons who met at Bury St Edmunds before presenting the charter to King John at Runnymede. The legacy of this document can be found in judicial legislation and national constitutions across the world. The historic value is high.

The below ground archaeology contributes to an understanding of the monastic layout and there is potential for the buried archaeology to enhance this understanding further. It also has the potential to reveal more about the historic development of the monastery and the Anglo-Saxon town that predated it.

The boundary of the sub-area reflects the medieval layout, hence the incorporation of the ruins of the Abbot’s Palace and east side of the Great Court in the rear wall of Alwyne House. However, the existing layout of the northern part of the sub-area in particular is more closely related to its later history with the creation of the Botanic Garden and Alwyne House in the 1830s and the former’s evolution into the public park of Abbey Gardens with the creation of additional paths. This layering may partially obscure the medieval layout but in so doing it reflects the post-Dissolution development of the site, which is part of the wider national story of the sale and repurposing of the dissolved monasteries. The illustrative value is deemed medium.
AREA ANALYSIS: PRECINCT SUB-AREAS

SUB-AREA 6: ABBEY RUINS (CONT.)

Abbey ruins from the Cathedral Tower

Refectory walls covered in vegetation growth

Alwyne House

One of the plaques commemorating the Magna Carta
7.7.2 Area Specific Issues and Opportunities

- There is a substantial backlog of maintenance works and repairs that are needed to the scheduled Abbey ruins. The growth of vegetation, including woody saplings is a concern as this causes the failure of the mortar that binds the flint rubble together. Some areas are fenced off with heras fencing or plastic fencing because of the risk of falling masonry. A chunk of masonry has fallen off one of the North Transept piers since the last Q&I in 2016. Whilst the ruins remain so unstable, the Q&I should be carried out more frequently, ideally every three years.

- High level elements are a particular concern because they are harder to monitor and pose a greater risk to the public and staff. There is no confidence in the patched repairs made to the Ministry of Works cladding of these elements. There is a need for an annual abseil survey to undertake a detailed inspection of the taller standing remains.

- People climbing on the ruins is a contributor to their deterioration. There is only one, graffiti-covered sign near the ruins that states the ruins should not be climbed on. This is reinforced by rangers when they are available. Although a proliferation of signage is not ideal and nor does there want to be an impression of heavy-handedness, it is an important issue to address. Increasing the number of signs, potentially fixed to the ruins themselves, would not only make the instruction clearer to visitors but would also give the rangers something to draw the public’s attention to when they are asking them not to climb on the ruins.

- The steps and paths, which are maintained by SEBC, are generally in fair condition although there are places where the soil has eroded behind the timber riser of the step and it therefore presents a trip hazard. There is an opportunity to improve access around the church ruins and particularly to the crypt once the tennis courts have been removed.

- A yew hedge has been planted to create a buffer zone between the Abbey ruins and the West Front houses. It impedes the understanding of the length of the Abbey nave and the connection with the West Front houses.

- The tennis courts detract from the Abbey ruins and the Abbey Gardens. There is consent for their removal.

- The walls of the Refectory are in poor condition due to lack of maintenance. The relationship of the medieval walls to the wider site is also not visually clear to visitors.

- Some of the Ministry of Public Works’ signs survive on the ruins. These are now of historic interest in their own right. However, some of them reflect dated interpretations of the Abbey site and may be confusing for visitors.

- There is considerable potential to improve the interpretation in this area. This ideally should include the earlier Anglo-Saxon buildings and evidence of the reuse of Anglo-Saxon stonework and the survival of a short section of what may have been the Anglo-Saxon embankment of the lost river channel.

- Whilst considerable excavations have been undertaken in the past to reveal much of the ruins that now stand above ground, there is more of this area that remains unexcavated. Any future intrusive investigations should be undertaken within the context of a justified research framework. There may be scope for a community archaeology project to be undertaken and this is greatest in the less complex and sensitive area of the nave where there appears to be unstratified demolition debris.

7.7.3 Area Specific Recommendations

- Undertake works to clear the backlog of maintenance works and repairs. Thereafter implement a programme of regular maintenance repairs and vegetation removal.

- Increase the number of signs discouraging visitors from climbing on the ruins.

- Implement the consent to remove the tennis courts.

- Improve access to the Crypt once the tennis courts have been removed and improve the existing steps where possible.
7.8  **SUB-AREA 7: NORMAN TOWER AND WEST FRONT**

7.8.1  **Summary Statement of Significance**

The sub-area encompasses two of the most important survivals on the site. The Norman Tower, although refaced in the nineteenth century, is an extraordinary survival of medieval stone building in East Anglia, facilitated by its ongoing use as the bell tower to St James’s church and then the Cathedral. Its historical and aesthetic values are high, and its medium communal value derives in part from its use as the Cathedral campanile, which contributes to the soundscape of the town, its prominence in views and its use for flag flying for key occasions.

The West Front houses are probably unique as survivals of post-Dissolution dwellings constructed within the ruins of a monastic building, which were not later removed. Their historical value is high. They also have medium illustrative value in indicating the scale of the lost Abbey Church.

The character of St Edmund’s Green is a relatively recent creation with its former use as part of the Great Churchyard being indicated by the survival of three tombs. The modern arrangement with Dame Elisabeth Frink’s statue of St Edmund forms a setting for the Cathedral, which is equally modern in terms of age of its Chancel and Tower. The prominence of the statue of St Edmund is a reminder of the wider site’s importance as a place of pilgrimage in the medieval period and of the saint who gave the town its name.
7.8.2 Area Specific Issues and Opportunities

- The West Front houses are a unique heritage asset but their irregular rubble walls are inherently unstable when subject to weathering. They were not designed to be exposed as originally they would have been faced with dressed stone. Flints and even chunks of masonry periodically fall from the houses, most commonly on the garden side. The unconventional shape of some of the roofs creates further challenges in maintaining the properties as watertight.

- The Norman Tower is generally in good condition. However, there is corrosion to at least one of the louvred panels, which is a concern. All the panels should be checked and repaired or replaced where necessary.

- There are deep gutters around the roof of the Norman Tower and no covers to the tops of the gutters. These need to be regularly cleaned of vegetation. A safety notice should also be put up for the benefit of those accessing the roof.

- The Norman Tower is the bell tower for the Cathedral and is regularly accessed by the bell ringers. It is therefore particularly important that the floor surfaces and steps are monitored and repairs or replacement of stones carried out to prevent safety hazards developing.

- The area around the Norman Tower within the raling is generally well maintained by the Cathedral’s volunteers. It is important that it remains clear of vegetation and litter as the setting of the Norman Tower.

- There is currently no interpretation about the Abbey in this area. It is one of the major points of entry to the site and more information would enhance the experience of visitors.

7.8.3 Area Specific Recommendations

- In addition to a regular QQI, the bell ringers should be encouraged to report any concerns regarding the safety of the steps of the Norman Tower.

- Conservation works should be undertaken to the louvred panels of the Norman Tower.

- Regular as well as prompt reactionary maintenance works should be undertaken to prevent damage or loss of historic fabric from the West Front houses.
7.9.1 Summary Statement of Significance
The Great Churchyard is of high significance as the town’s main churchyard until the nineteenth century and, although altered, retains its character as a churchyard with numerous notable monuments and tombs of different types, a large proportion of which are designated. The Chapel of the Charnel is a rare surviving example of an unconverted, surviving, free-standing medieval charnel chapel. Although part of the later development of the churchyard, the Victorian avenues of trees are an important contributor to its appearance and landscape value.

The sub-area also includes the Crown Street properties, which illustrate the late medieval and post-Dissolution construction of buildings around the periphery of the Abbey precinct. Other buildings further south have been demolished but archaeological evidence of them may survive below ground.
7.9.2 Area Specific Issues and Opportunities

• The condition of some of the memorials is poor with issues including deterioration of the stone, ivy, moss and other vegetation growth, and settlement or erosion of the ground. SEBC has a five-year cycle of inspection and prioritised repair of the memorials.

• There is considerable vegetation growth on the Chapel of Charnel, which should be carefully removed and any necessary repairs carried out.

• The bins at the rear of the Crown Street properties detract from the Great Churchyard. It is desirable that they should be screened. It is also desirable that garden furniture should not be stored outside if it is visible from the Churchyard.

• There has been a general improvement in levels of anti-social behaviour in the town. There is some occasional behaviour that is a cause for concern in the Great Churchyard.

• The main paths across the Great Churchyard are adopted public highways and are maintained by Suffolk County Council.

• The Memorial to the Martyrs is located in a prominent position in the Great Churchyard. It is important that it and its immediate surroundings are kept neat.

7.9.3 Area Specific Recommendations

• Ensure that regular inspections are undertaken of the memorials and that a record of inscriptions is retained. Ensure repairs are implemented where possible as required.

• Remove the vegetation and repair the Chapel of the Charnel.

• Create a discrete and in-keeping store for the bins behind the Crown Street properties.
7.10 SUB-AREA 9: ST MARY’S CHURCH AND HONEY HILL

7.10.1 Summary Statement of Significance
St Mary’s Church is amongst the finest surviving medieval buildings on the site (rivalled only by the Abbey Gate, Norman Tower and Abbot’s Bridge) and also one of the finest late medieval parish churches not only in Suffolk but in England. It is said to contain the largest west window of any parish church, which was a Victorian addition. The high quality of its medieval craftsmanship reflects the wealth of Bury St Edmunds’ merchants in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, some of whom, such as Jankyn Smith, are commemorated in the church. There are other important associations with the church including: Mary Tudor, Queen of France, who is buried in the church; Simon Clerk, the fifteenth century master mason who created the north and south aisles; HMS Birkenhead, the memorial to which is in the church and is said to have given rise to the practice of women and children leaving a sinking ship first; and the Royal Anglian Regiment (and former Suffolk Regiment), which has its chapel in the church.

Other important medieval buildings, such as the gate of St Margaret and the church of St Margaret that stood in this sub-area, have been lost though the name is preserved in St Margaret’s House. Surviving upstanding medieval fabric that indicates the fact that this area was part of the Abbey precinct survives in the form of stretches of the precinct wall, some now incorporated into later buildings. There is high potential for buried archaeology to survive relating to the medieval and the Anglo-Saxon periods, especially in the car park, which has not been built on. There is also some potential for post-medieval archaeological remains, such as relating to the lost public house, the Magpie.

The sub-area also derives some significance from its post-medieval buildings, which are designated heritage assets, and the unlisted former Magistrates’ Courts. The dwellings along Honey Hill are distinctive in their front elevations and contribute to the varied and high quality streetscape along Honey Hill. The heritage significance of 6 The Churchyard derives from its illustrative value in showing how the Abbey site was divided up after the Dissolution and from its appearance as a cottage. The Courts, by contrast, are clearly a grand civic building with high aesthetic value relating to its north façade and returns as well as to its historical and communal value as place for dispensing local justice, echoing one of the Abbey’s many roles in the medieval period. The modern pre-school and clinic buildings are not of heritage value whilst the large car park detracts from a wider understanding of the former Abbey site.
7.10.2 Area Specific Issues and Opportunities

Note: This commentary does not include issues and opportunities relating to private residences.

- St Mary’s Church is an exceptionally fine medieval parish church and whilst it maintains a good congregation of over 200 and is much used as the town’s church, the cost of maintaining the building is a constant cause for concern. The St Mary’s Church QQI identifies a number of repairs that are required to the built fabric. The movement of the south-east corner of the Lady Chapel is being monitored especially after the fall of the keystone from the chapel’s east window in 2017 (now repaired). An inspection of the angels in the nave ceiling by a conservation specialist is needed but this cannot be achieved using a conventional cherry picker as the last use of the cherry picker in the church caused movement of the floor. It is difficult to get scaffolding because of the unevenness of the floor and the fact that the church does not have any foundations.

- The activities of St Mary’s Church would be aided by provision of a communal space. This might require an extension to the church. Given the church’s boundaries and proximity to the street, the north side appears to offer the greatest scope. Any proposals would need to be carefully designed to a high standard and would be subject to statutory consents.

- The exact condition of the ground below the surface of the area north of St Mary’s Church is unknown but there are various vaults. In recent years, a large car fell into one of these when it tried to park in an undesignated area. There are six designated spaces for permit holders of the church. All other parking in the Great Churchyard should be discouraged.

- There is a severe shortage of storage in St Mary’s Church. The Lady Chapel is currently used to store staging and chairs. The PCC would like to create new storage spaces at the west end of the north aisle, where there is a sectioned off area, and also at the west end of the nave as part of a wider reorganisation to improve the welcome and the flexibility of the space.

- A section of railings to the north-east of the church is missing and currently infilled with rope and netting, which detracts from the setting of the church. The missing railings should be reinstated.

- The former Shire Hall and Courts are currently empty and therefore offer an opportunity for new use. If converted to residential use, consideration should be given to adequate parking provision and/or restrictions on residents to prohibit parking in the Great Churchyard or the St Mary’s Church’s spaces.

- The exterior of the former Shire Hall and Magistrates’ Courts is in a poor state of repair with vegetation growth, staining and damage to stonework, and joinery that requires repainting. Other features that detract from the building’s appearance include signs (especially the safety ones), rusting reinforcements in the concrete base on the south side, use of concrete render, vents in the windows and netting over the central area.

- The car park associated with the former Shire Hall appears a forlorn space with the vehicle barrier gate a detracting feature. There is an opportunity to enhance this area although it is likely to remain a car park associated with the former Shire Hall. Any definition of the car park should remain light touch to minimise its impact on the Great Churchyard and streetscape of Honey Hill.

- There is a disused tunnel near the car park which relates to the lost St Margaret’s Gate. This should be considered when any proposals are drawn up.

- Repairs to the brickwork of the chimneys of St Margaret’s House could be undertaken to improve their appearance. Previous poor quality repairs should be replaced.

- The precint wall to the south of the large car park has extensive vegetation growth.

- The setting of the south precint wall could be enhanced by relocating the grit bin.

- The large car park and cycle lane have a poor quality appearance. There is an opportunity to improve this in the short-term with the removal of weeds and in the long term with the refurbishment of the car park with a higher quality surface, such as brick sets incorporating the demarcations of the parking spaces. The surface of the cycle path would benefit from redressing.

- The modern buildings currently used as a clinic and a pre-school are of neutral value. They offer the opportunity for redevelopment if they were to become redundant in the future. Any new buildings should be of a similar scale as the existing to minimise their impact on the Abbey site.

- The former Shire Hall and car park of a similar scale as the existing to minimise their impact on the Abbey site.
7.10.3 Area Specific Recommendations

- The St Mary’s Church volunteers should continue to maintain the gardens around the church to their current high standard.

- A ground penetrating radar or other geophysical survey of the area north of St Mary’s Church could be undertaken to ascertain the structure of the ground.

- Reinstate the missing railings north-east of the church.

- The former Shire Hall and Courts building should be brought back into use. Its external elevations should be repaired and negative features removed. The Conservation Officer has indicated that the building will be treated as an undesignated heritage asset, for which the National Planning Policy Framework provides a similar degree of protection as a designated heritage asset.

- The Shire Hall car park should be carefully re-landscaped as part of any proposals.

- The large car park would benefit from resurfacing with a higher quality surface.
7.11.1 Summary Statement of Significance
Although united currently as Cathedral residences, the Deanery and 1-2 Abbey Precincts have very different histories and consequently heritage significances. Both, however, have low associative value with the Cathedral as a result of their current use.

The Deanery was built as the Clopton Asylum to provide poor relief in both the parishes of St Mary’s and St James’s, so has associations with both churches as well as with the donor, Dr Poley Clopton, whose family coat of arms is incorporated into the pediment. Of historical interest in its own right, it has further historical significance in illustrating the change in provision of poor relief between the time of the Abbey and the eighteenth century. It is representative of other, now lost, almshouses in Bury St Edmunds including those north of St Mary’s Church. Aesthetically, it is of high value for its external front and side elevations, which are typical of the well-proportioned vernacular classicism of the period executed in red brick typical of East Anglia. It is possible that it may have been designed by the architect James Burrough, whose sketches of the Abbey ruins survive. If this were to be confirmed it would further reinforce the high aesthetic value and enhance the associative value of the building. The division of the building is original, illustrating the separation of the asylum master’s dwelling from the asylum inmates. Internally, there are some surviving original and historic features, with the basement having a particularly well-preserved historic character. The high overall significance of the building itself is complemented by having retained its original area of garden and the fine gates and garden wall that are listed in their own right.

Abbey Precincts as a building is of considerably less heritage value, having been much altered. However, there has been a dwelling on the site since at least the early eighteenth century, which probably survives behind the nineteenth century front façade and west elevation alterations. These elements have medium illustrative value and evidential potential. The modern porch, substantial east extension and single storey north extension do not contribute positively to the heritage value of the building. The outbuildings, which are either altered or in poor condition, contribute to the historic setting of the house although are not unusual in their own right. The north, south and west boundaries of the Sacristy Garden lie on boundary lines of the same date even if some parts of the walls may have been rebuilt later. As such the plot boundaries have illustrative value in showing how the Abbey precinct site was carved up in the centuries after the Dissolution.

---

7.11.2 Area Specific Issues and Opportunities

- The Deanery is currently divided into two dwellings, the larger of which is bigger than is needed. Options could be explored for the further subdivision of the Deanery although it should be noted that the building was historically divided with Clpton Asylum on one side and the Master’s house in the smaller portion.

- The basement of the Deanery has a well preserved historic character but is in a poor state of repair.

- The porch to the Abbey Precincts houses is a mid-twentieth century replacement of the earlier porch. It detracts from the appearance of the building, which although not listed is in a Conservation Area. There is an opportunity to enhance the building’s appearance by replacing the existing porch with a porch of a higher quality design.

- The outbuilding used as a garage for the Abbey Precincts is historic although altered. It is important that it is kept in good condition as it is prominent in views across and from the Abbey ruins. It would benefit from some repairs to its roof.

- The other outbuildings are in poor condition but have some historic interest.

- The remains of St Andrew’s Chapel and the Sacrist’s yard buildings within the garden of Abbey Precincts are part of the scheduled monument. This area of the garden is overgrown with nettles, ivy and trees. The area should be carefully cleared and repairs undertaken to the scheduled ruins if necessary. However, the trees are protected by being in a conservation area and therefore consent will be required if their removal is needed. The trees, if retained, should be maintained.

- The overgrown east area of the Abbey Precincts garden should be brought back into use.

7.11.3 Area Specific Recommendations

- The scheduled remains of St Andrew’s Chapel and the Sacrist’s Yard should be repaired and a programme of regular maintenance implemented.

- The overgrown area in the east of the sub-area should be brought back into good order.

- The outbuildings of Abbey Precincts should be maintained.
7.12 SUB-AREA 11: THE CRANKLES AND NO MANS MEADOW

7.12.1 Summary Statement of Significance

The Crankles and No Mans Meadow are principally significant as part of an enduring green landscape setting, which incorporates the River Lark, to the medieval Abbey precinct and the subsequent evolution of the site.

The Crankles are said to have been the site of some of the Abbey fishponds, which would make them part of a rare surviving assemblage of monastic features. There is no visible surviving evidence of this use but there is potential for buried archaeological evidence.

These spaces have high communal value as green places where people can engage with nature.

---

04 It has also been suggested the fishponds were further north between the River Lark and the lost course of the River Linnet.
7.12.2 Area Specific Issues and Opportunities

- The Crankles has become overgrown with nettles since the removal of the cricket bat willows. The Bury Water Meadows Group is implementing, under the supervision of SEBC, a programme of cutting to discourage the nettles and encourage a more diverse range of species.

- The cricket bat willows were removed from the Crankles in 2016 and replaced with fruit trees. The appropriateness of the species both to the soil conditions and the heritage value of the site has been questioned.

- The channels of the fish ponds in the Crankles illustrated on Warren’s map are no longer discernible. Earlier illustrations suggest the medieval ponds may have taken a different form. The archaeology relating to the fish ponds may survive although the upper layer or layers are likely to have been damaged by tree planting. Archaeological investigations may reveal more information about the historical development and use of the Crankles.

- The existing interpretation board has useful information but is covered in mildew. It should be kept clean. Not only is this better for visitors but also indicates that the site is being actively managed and maintained. For visitors to Bury St Edmunds, the interpretation board does not make clear the physical relationship between the Crankles and No Man’s Meadow and the Abbey. As part of a wider interpretation strategy for the site, information on the historical significance of the site could be provided.

- The cycle path through the Crankles is part of a much used cycle network. The appearance of the cycle path could be improved, for example through the use of bound gravel.

- The River Lark Catchment Partnership is preparing a River Lark Corridor Strategy which could include proposals for the designation of ‘Local Green Space’ in various locally valued open areas and water meadows within the forthcoming West Suffolk Local Plan. This offers an opportunity to recognise the heritage significance of No Mans Meadow as a green space as well as part of the Abbey’s setting.

- The large electricity pylons and overhead power cables across No Mans Meadow detracts from its character. There are three different distribution networks. Two of these are lower voltage networks relating to the Moreton Hall area and there is potential that over time these may become redundant, in which case they should be removed. There is also potential for burying the cables underground and there is a particular opportunity with the addition of 5,000 new homes in Bury St Edmunds requiring major changes to electricity distribution in the town.

7.12.3 Area Specific Recommendations

- The Bury Water Meadows Group and SEBC should continue to improve the natural environment of the Crankles without undertaking works that might affect any buried archaeology.

- Use archaeological and palaeoenvironmental investigations to understand better the buried archaeology of the Crankles. Depending on the outcome of these investigations, it may be appropriate to consider extending the scheduling of the main site to include the Crankles.

- No Mans Meadow should remain a green space.

- No Mans Meadow should continue to be used for grazing to manage the site.

- Ensure regular cleaning of the existing interpretation board.

- Liaise with UK Power Network regarding the potential to remove or bury power cables, subject to any archaeological constraints.
**7.13 SUB-AREA 12: ABBEY VINEYARDS**

### 7.13.1 Summary Statement of Significance

The heritage significance of the sub-area lies in its historic association with the Abbey as part of its vineyards. Two stretches of precinct wall survive, albeit rebuilt along some parts, to reflect this association. Despite later development on part of it, the sub-area is part of the setting of the historic core of Bury St Edmunds and is important in views to and from it as well as views from the project area. The undeveloped areas of the site in particular have potential for buried archaeology of the medieval or even possibly the Anglo-Saxon period.

There is some lesser significance derived from the retention of part of the Victorian King Edward VI Grammar School building. The institution also has a slight link with the Abbey in that it was created supposedly to replace or continue the school that the Abbey had run. St James Middle School, until recently, had perpetuated the association of the wider Abbey site with institutions for education. The Haig Homes housing was built for war veterans and has medium communal value as a memorial to those who have fought.
7.13.2 Area Specific Issues and Opportunities

Note: the school site has not been accessed.

- There are sections of wall in this area that are scheduled with the rest of the site but they feel disassociated from the main Abbey site not only by distance but by the later development in this area. They are also in different ownerships and the maintenance regimes are not known.

- There is potential to increase understanding of this area through archaeological investigations.

- Aside from the street name and an undated photograph in Barker’s West Suffolk Illustrated, there is little indication of the site’s historic use and no information on the connection with the Abbey.

- The disused St James School site should be brought back into use to prevent the site falling into serious disrepair, detracting from the appearance of the site and potentially attracting criminal or antisocial behaviour. The extant buildings on the site are not of heritage value and so could be removed. The potential use of the site is likely to be limited by considerations such as ease of vehicular access and parking. Any new use on the site should ensure the maintenance of the scheduled walls.

- Although not listed, the former King Edward VI Grammar School building should be regarded as a building of local interest. It is not in the Conservation Area and therefore its exterior is not protected but it is desirable that change to it should be limited to preserve its character. The plaque should be maintained.

- A better quality bin store should be created for the apartments than the existing one. The current one has young leylandii on three sides, which will cause issues in the future. The side near the street is open so the bins are in no way concealed.

- The Martins and the sheltered housing accommodation buildings are not of heritage value. Were any replacement buildings proposed in the future, they should be of a modest scale and massing.

7.13.3 Area Specific Recommendations

- Structures abutting the scheduled wall within the former school site should be removed to enhance the visibility of the wall.

- The scheduled wall should be the subject of a regular maintenance routine to enhance its appearance and minimise loss of historic fabric.

- The exposed detached sections of the precinct wall should be surveyed and recorded.

- It is desirable that there should be interpretation to explain the association with the Abbey and the survival of the boundary wall of the vineyard.

- Any potential development in this sub-area should be mindful of the local policy BV25, which protects the setting and views of the conservation area.

- The area should be the subject of a desk-based archaeological assessment to confirm the assessment of the heritage values.
7.14.1 Summary Statement of Significance

The significance of this area today lies partly in its communal value as a green open space (Minden Close) and a sports facility (the Bowling Green). Although less obvious, the site has historic value as the location of medieval industries which may have been associated with the Abbey, with the west precinct wall being evidence of this. This pre-eminent historic value is overlaid with lesser layers of historic value deriving from the long connection with Abbey House including the Davers family and the Marquess of Bristol, in whose time Eastgate Cottage was created in its current form. A further layer of historical interest is the site’s use as a nursery, firstly a private one and later by the Borough Council. The site has high evidential potential value for its buried archaeology, some of which was encountered, but not recorded during the construction of the latest iteration of the nursery in the 1970s.\(^5\)

\(^5\) Meeting with Peter Tunnah, June 2018.
7.14.2 Area Specific Issues and Opportunities

- The former Eastgate Nursery is redundant and overgrown. There is considerable scope for redeveloping this area as a green amenity space. Historic England has already indicated that they do not deem the site suitable for built development. There is scheduled monument consent for the introduction of two tennis courts and some re-landscaping of the area which has yet to be implemented. Any works will need to take into consideration the electricity intake unit on the site. There is also one of the Millennium beacons on the site.

- The buried archaeology of the former Eastgate Nursery has not been explored in detail, although an evaluation report was prepared for the Borough Council, by SCC Archaeological unit, in June 2009. The work now proposed by the Borough Council will be subject to an archaeological watching brief which will help to inform the archaeological knowledge of this area.

- There is potential to enhance the setting of the Abbot’s Bridge with the removal of the leylandii hedge from the Eastgate Nursery.

- If in the future the Bowling Green should cease to be in its current location, the area of the Bowling Green should be reintegrated with the rest of the former Nursery area.

- Muntjac deer are prevalent in the former nursery area and are causing damage to the garden of Eastgate Cottage. The wire netting to the fence to deter the deer detracts from the setting of the cottage. By bringing the nursery more into the public domain and by securing its boundaries the Muntjac population will hopefully be deterred from the area.

7.14.3 Area Specific Recommendations

- Bring the former Eastgate Nursery back into use and ensure its future maintenance.

- Optimise any opportunities to understand the buried archaeology of the area and ensure it is fully recorded in the Suffolk Historic Environment Record (HER).

- Undertake a heritage appraisal of Eastgate Cottage to understand better its history, heritage significance and relationship with the Abbey Gardens.

- Maintain the green open space located at the end of Minden Close.

- To preserve the aesthetics of the area ensure that the established trees on the green space in Minden Close are suitably maintained.

- Ensure the ongoing maintenance of the Bowling Green as there has been a bowling green within the project area for at least two centuries.
7.15 SUB-AREA 14: ANGEL HILL AND MUSTOW STREET

7.15.1 Summary Statement of Significance
Angel Hill is one of the major urban spaces in the historic centre of Bury St Edmunds. It is both a market place and a civic space bounded by major buildings, such as the former Borough Offices, the Angel Hotel and the Athenaeum, and containing the war memorial. The predominantly nineteenth century classical façades illustrate how this square was a focal point of fashionable Bury St Edmunds at that time. Its importance dates back further as a meeting place as the site of fayres in the medieval period. Angel Hill was later important for its coaching inns. The unique twentieth century signpost is both of national significance for its design and a local landmark.

Of equal, if not greater importance, is Angel Hill’s relationship to the Abbey precinct. Part of the grid of streets laid out by Abbot Anselm, the open space enables appreciation of the impressive frontage of the Abbey Gate, the predecessor of which formed the terminus of Abbey Gate Street. The fact that the Abbey Gate no longer occupies this position illustrates the turbulent fourteenth century relationship between the Abbey and the town.

The Angel Hotel’s outward appearance conceals the presence of a thirteenth century undercroft, a structure that existed during the Abbey’s heyday and part of a small group of surviving medieval buildings in the town. Many of the buildings on Angel Hill are older than they appear and many have cores that date from the post-Dissolution period of the sixteenth century, reflecting the changes to the town in the wake of the Abbey’s fall.

Mustow Street and Eastgate Street formed part of the medieval approach into the town from the east. Several jettied timber-framed buildings not only contribute to the historic character, but also illustrate the type of historic fabric concealed by the later refrontings. The visibility of a long and tall stretch of the Abbey precinct wall and the Abbot’s Bridge over the river contribute to the unique character of this area of the town.
7.15.2 Area Specific Issues and Opportunities

Note: improvements to individual buildings have not been included.

- Car parking dominates the Angel Hill area. Although there are some small, stone-paved pedestrian areas, the overall impact is of a poor setting for the heritage assets.

- The nineteenth century railings on the south side of Eastgate Street are in poor condition and would benefit from conservation works to remove the rust and failing paint and to repaint them. Given that the railings have lead paint on them, any works to the railings will need to be carefully undertaken to avoid contaminating the river.

7.15.3 Area Specific Recommendation

- Undertake conservation works to the historic railings on Eastgate Street.
7.16 SUB-AREA 15: CHURCH GATE STREET AND CROWN STREET

7.16.1 Summary Statement of Significance

Crown Street has high illustrative value as part of the alterations to the street grid pattern instigated by Abbot Anselm in the twelfth century. Whilst it originally ran along part of the west boundary of the Abbey, of which a remnant of precinct wall near St Mary’s survives, the street changed considerably in appearance through the nineteenth century. Today the buildings along it predominantly reflect the eighteenth and nineteenth century improvements to Bury St Edmunds.

Churchgate Street is also of high significance as part of the earlier grid pattern of streets laid out by Abbot Baldwin. It was the ceremonial approach to the Abbey Church and the Norman Tower remains the focal point at the street’s terminus. Its significance lies in its illustrative value and its associative value with Abbot Baldwin.
### SUB-AREA 15: CHURCH GATE STREET AND CROWN STREET (CONT.)

#### 7.16.2 Area Specific Issues and Opportunities

*Note: improvements to individual buildings have not been included.*

- A project has been completed to rationalise the road signs at the Honey Hill junction to the minimum necessary and to present these as attractively as possible within a public art installation. Signage that was not part of that agreed strategy has already begun to reappear and it detracts from the setting of St Mary’s church and the views towards the project area.

#### 7.16.3 Area Specific Recommendations

- Continue to work with the Highways Authority to minimise signage at the junction of Honey Hill to maintain views of the west fronts of the Church and Cathedral and the Norman Tower.

- Ensure any future pedestrian crossings are sited to minimise their impact on the settings and views of the heritage assets within the project area as well as the impact of any associated noise. The materials should be high quality to reflect the quality of the historic built environment.
PART II: REVITALISING THE SITE OF THE ABBEY OF ST EDMUND

This part of Conservation Plan has been written specifically to inform the development of the Heritage Partnership and potential future projects by the Heritage Partnership and its constituent partners. It has a greater focus on the areas owned by SEBC, the Cathedral and St Mary’s Church, which might be deemed the more public areas of the site, though other parts of the site are still referenced in places.
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SECTION 8.0
CONSIDERING THE FUTURE

This section comprises two elements that provide further consideration on potential future change across the site. They are a progression of the statement of significance and the Conservation Framework set out in Part I. Specific consideration of the interior of private houses, private gardens and rivers are excluded.

Section 8.1 provides a high-level assessment of the capacity for change of different elements and areas across the site. It is not a masterplan for change. The purpose of this section is to indicate the relative likelihood of change being acceptable to a particular element or area although this does not mean that change will be acceptable or that all types of change will be acceptable in a particular area.

Section 8.2 sets out the six key objectives of the future work of the Heritage Partnership and identifies the works that could be done to further those objectives. The high-level recommendations to implement these works are delineated. Outline heritage assessments of some of the proposals that affect the built fabric are provided in Appendix B. Section 8.2 should also be read in conjunction with Section 9, Implementation.

8.1 CAPACITY FOR CHANGE

“The greater the range and strength of heritage values attached to a place, the less opportunity there may be for change, but few places are so sensitive that they, or their settings, present no opportunities for change.”

Conservation is the preservation and enhancement of the heritage significance of a heritage asset. Preservation does not mean ‘no change’ but instead ‘no harm’.

Change in heritage terms occupies a spectrum from minor repair through renewal of perished fabric to major alteration, addition to or demolition of an existing structure or a substantial part of it. Repair is necessary for the maintenance and long-term future as is periodic renewal. These types of change are not considered as part of this assessment.

On the subsequent pages is a plan showing the capacity for change in the project area followed by the same plan reproduced as four quadrants. Each quadrant is accompanied by more detailed explanatory notes.

The purpose of this assessment of capacity for change is primarily to provide a tool for future planning for the project area, rather than to identify areas where change should be carried out. The plan showing capacity for change indicates, at a high level, the likelihood of change being acceptable. Notes accompany the quadrant plans to identify the types of change to which the level of capacity for change refers. For example, a landscape area may be assessed as having medium capacity for change but that may be within a context of it remaining a landscaped area rather than indicating potential for new buildings in the area. It should be noted that more detailed assessments of heritage significance should be undertaken, particularly with regard to the interiors of designated buildings.

The capacity for change categorisation is assessed in relation to the heritage values of the site and should be cross referenced with the significance plans in Section 4.4. With the exception of the “desirable to change” category, the levels assigned do not indicate a necessity or desirability for change. For example, a landscape area assigned medium potential for change does not indicate that there is an issue with the landscape as it is nor that it should be changed. Instead it indicates that should change be considered in this area, the capacity for change in heritage terms is medium in reflection of the heritage significance of that area and the contribution it makes to the historical development of the site (specifically how important is the phase of development to which it belongs in relation to the principal heritage significance and most important development phases of the site).

The following have not been assessed:
- interiors of private houses or buildings;
- private gardens; or
- the rivers.

The assessment of capacity for change has been carried out using the following categories:

Avoid change: the high heritage significance and nature of the heritage asset combine to mean that change should be avoided with the exception of necessary repairs. In landscape areas, the installation of reversible minor additions, such as an interpretation panel, may be acceptable depending on their design and location and subject to the provision of a robust justification.

Low capacity for change: there is some capacity for minor alterations, such as reopening blocked openings, if a robust justification for the change is articulated. This justification should include an explanation of why the change is needed (including why all alternatives are unsuitable), an account of the historical development of the fabric to be changed, and any mitigation measures, such as recording, that are proposed.

Medium capacity for change: there is some capacity for sensitive change if a robust justification is provided.

High capacity for change: the low heritage significance offers substantial capacity for change. This change should be appropriate to its context and not harm the nearby heritage assets or their setting.

Desirable to change: a negative feature that could be beneficially altered to improve the setting of nearby heritage assets.

On the plans, to avoid confusion, general observations that are repeated across quadrants and within quadrants are identified by a letter. Observations that are specific to a feature are numbered.

Note: The capacity for change plans are provided for information for the Heritage Partnership to aid with their future planning. It is understood that Historic England and other statutory consultees will make their decisions regarding statutory consents based on the significance plans in Section 4.4, the Conservation Framework in Section 6 and the heritage impact assessment and justification specific to the proposal put forward for consent.

CONSIDERING THE FUTURE

PROJECT AREA
CAPACITY FOR CHANGE
- Avoid Change
- Low Capacity
- Medium Capacity
- High Capacity
- Desirable to Change

Note: Capacity for change in buildings is indicative. Greater analysis of capacity for change of individual layouts and spaces needed prior to works.

Plan showing high level capacity for change across the project area. This plan is not to scale.
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CONSIDERING THE FUTURE

Avoid Change
Low Capacity
Medium Capacity
High Capacity
Desirable to Change

A Historic boundary line should be maintained but fabric of boundary demarcation has potential for alteration.
B Historic path route should be maintained but fabric of path could be changed.
C Capacity for change in building is indicative. Greater analysis of individual layouts and spaces needed prior to any works.
D The original and historic Abbey precinct walls are an important scheduled feature. There is very limited potential for opening up blocked openings or enlargement of existing openings through the removal of later historic fabric if clear public benefits can be demonstrated.

01 The public WC block is not of heritage significance.
02 The route of the path in front of the WCs was altered when they were created. The path could beneficially be returned to its original route (shown on early OS maps) if the opportunity arose in the future.
03 The Aviary structure dates from the 1960s with numerous subsequent replacements and repairs. Its removal would better reveal the fabric of the scheduled wall behind. Alternatively, the Aviary’s neutral heritage significance means it could be replaced.
04 Within the historic boundaries that define the site, the gardener’s yard has the potential for replanning as the existing buildings are of neutral heritage significance.
05 The Abbey Gate is of very high significance but there is potential for justified change provided that the medieval fabric is preserved and mostly visible.
06 Although part of the history of the public park, the Park Keeper’s Hut is of low heritage significance. It has greater potential for change or even removal if the need can be justified and provided that any changes do not cause it to detract from the setting of the Abbey Gate or the Abbey Gardens.
| 07 | The Garden of Remembrance and the Pilgrim’s Herb Garden are relatively recent creations. There is potential for alternative garden arrangements in the future but they are limited in the Garden of Remembrance by the interment of human remains. The date and heritage significance of the balustrades and step near Abbey House should be ascertained if any works are proposed to remove or alter them. |
| 08 | The Cathedral car park and approach to it has considerable capacity for beneficial change. It should remain predominantly open space particularly in relation to the most significant elements of Abbey House as well as the scheduled wall. Any proposals should consider the impact on the setting of Abbey House as well as the scheduled wall and the Cathedral. |
| 09 | The heritage significance of the Cathedral Garth is a green space in relation to the Cathedral and historically as part of the gardens of Abbey House. It should remain a predominantly open space in relation to the Cathedral. |
| 10 | Any change in the garden by the Pilgrims’ Kitchen should preserve the fabric and visibility of the scheduled Abbey walls and should be mindful of the potential for buried archaeology. |
| 11 | The Ranger’s Shop appears to be a modern building of neutral heritage significance and therefore offers scope for removal or change that is beneficial to the nearby heritage assets. The 1823 plan shows that there were structures, possibly medieval, extant at that time. Any proposals should be mindful of this, particularly the potential for encountering surviving archaeology, either above or below ground. There is the gable of an early building preserved in the boundary wall which should be retained. |
| 12 | The medium capacity for change in this area (the Bowling Green) relates to the potential for a new garden. The north boundary especially should be retained as an earthwork is indicated on the 1823 plan and steps indicate a change of level on the earlier Warren map. It should be noted however, that there has been a bowling green on the site, though not in this location, since the late sixteenth century. |
| 13 | The Rose Garden’s essential layout and key features should be retained but there is capacity for changes to planting and very limited opportunities for additional memorials due to lack of space. |
| 14 | The Water Garden is a mid-twentieth century feature but one which has undergone substantial alteration since. There is therefore capacity for further change. |
| 15 | Within the confines of the scheduled walls of the Refectory, there is scope for change to re-present this area or alter the garden here. |
| 16 | There is potential for a carefully considered scheme in the area of the lost Abbey cloister that better reveals the heritage significance of the area by making its layout in reversible as a monastic cloister more visible. This does not necessarily involve revealing the buried archaeology. |
| 17 | The area around the scheduled remains of the Queen’s Chamber currently includes astroturf and some bare ground. There is potential to improve the setting of the ruins in this area. |
| 18 | East of the Abbey ruins, this is a relatively recently created path and there is therefore scope for its removal or rerouting, subject to the constraints of the buried archaeology. |
| 19 | West of the play area, this is a mid-twentieth century path and therefore has potential for removal or rerouting, subject to the constraints of the buried archaeology. |
| 20 | The play area is of neutral heritage significance and there is potential for its removal or alteration if this was considered desirable in the future. |
| 21 | The new seating area is of neutral heritage significance and, in terms of revealing the heritage significance of the historic park layout, could beneficially be removed. |
| 22 | The modern posts for an awning, in terms of the historic park layout, could potentially be removed. |
| 23 | The twentieth century fence along the river could be removed to re-establish the physical connection between the site and the river although this would be subject to a risk assessment. |
| 24 | The Anselm Building is disused and in a poor condition. Its exterior should be repaired with as little alteration as possible to allow a new use. There are historic features of interest internally, which should be retained if they are salvageable. |
| 25 | The avoidance of change in the vicinity of the Abbey ruins does not include carefully designed new interpretation, subject to an archaeological and heritage impact assessment. |
| 26 | The concrete base created for display of the WWI tank ‘Kaffir’ has low heritage significance relative to other features of the site but is of some local interest. It should be recorded and some demarcation of the site retained in the future. |
CONSIDERING THE FUTURE

NORTH-EAST QUADRANT
CAPACITY FOR CHANGE

- Avoid Change
- Low Capacity
- Medium Capacity
- High Capacity
- Desirable to Change

A Historic boundary line should be maintained but fabric of boundary demarcation has potential for alteration.
B Historic path route should be maintained but fabric of path could be changed.
C Potential for change in building is indicative. Greater analysis of individual layouts and spaces needed prior to any works.
D The original and historic(02) Abbey precinct walls are an important scheduled feature. There is very limited potential for opening up blocked openings or enlargement of existing openings through the removal of later historic fabric if clear public benefits can be demonstrated.

01 Historically there was a path in this area of the east bank south of Abbot’s Bridge so there is potential to reintroduce this. Generally the river bank should be managed as a green space but that management regime may change in response to changing climatic conditions.

02 Capacity for change in the former Eastgate Nursery area relates to the potential for landscaping and removal of the remains of the glasshouses.
03 Should the Bowling Green cease to be required here in the future, there is potential to reintegrate it with the former Eastgate Nursery site to enhance the heritage significance of the area.

04 Marking the northern edge of the vineyards, this is one of the oldest boundary divisions on the east bank.
05 There has been a bridge crossing at this location since at least the late nineteenth century. In terms of the Abbey Gardens as a park, the bridge has been in this location since before it was a public park and it is desirable it remains here. The bridge itself is not of particular heritage significance.
06 There has been a path in this area of the east bank south of the footbridge since at least the nineteenth century but the second path is a later addition. Part of one path has recently been altered near the former Eastgate Nursery. Potential to vary the paths therefore exists. Generally the river bank should be managed as a green space but that management regime may change in response to changing climatic conditions. As the archaeology of the east bank becomes better known, the capacity for change may reduce.
07 Capacity for change relates to alteration of St James Court rather than total removal of the building.
08 The area should remain a garden as a setting for Eastgate Cottage.

The term ‘historic’ is used to distinguish fabric that is old from the fabric that is original.
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SOUTH-WEST QUADRANT CAPACITY FOR CHANGE

- Avoid Change
- Low Capacity
- Medium Capacity
- High Capacity
- Desirable to Change

B Historic path route should be maintained but fabric of path could be changed.

C Capacity for change in building is indicative. Greater analysis of individual layouts and spaces needed prior to any works.

01 The Cathedral is a heritage asset of the highest category of listing but it is also a place that is occupied by a living tradition that continues to evolve. The overall continuing use of the Cathedral as a place of worship will always underpin its significance. Therefore sensitive change to enable this continuing use and to facilitate the evolution of St James’ parish church into the Cathedral Church may be possible provided there is a robust justification for the well-designed proposals.

02 The Norman Tower is of very high significance but there is potential for minor change to facilitate its continuing use as the Cathedral’s bell tower. There is also capacity for carefully designed change to the immediate setting of the Norman Tower and the access stairs adjacent to the Tower.

03 The yew hedge could be removed to the benefit of the understanding of the connection between the Abbey ruins and the West Front houses.

04 The steps into the crypt are not of heritage significance and could be removed or replaced in the future.

05 The Deanery is a Grade I listed building and change to particularly its front elevations, should be avoided to preserve the character and appearance of the building.

06 The building line of the boundary wall that defines the Deanery’s garden is almost certainly contemporary with the Grade I listed Deane. Although the wall shows evidence of partial rebuilding, it is an important part of the Deanery’s setting.

07 The Deanery outbuilding is modern and could be removed or replaced.

08 The gate is modern and of no heritage value.

09 The open-sided garages are sensitively designed and built. Any changes to these modern buildings, except total removal, should retain the integrity of their design and appearance.

10 The area immediately south of the Great Churchyard has potential for beneficial change to mediate between the setting of the listed buildings and the contemporary needs of the occupiers of the buildings.

11 St Mary’s Church is a Grade I listed building but it is also a place that is occupied by a living tradition that continues to evolve. The overall continuing use of the church as a place of worship will always underpin its significance. Therefore localised sensitive change to enable this continuing use will be possible provided there is a robust justification for the well-designed proposals.

12 The garden (former churchyard) around St Mary’s Church creates an attractive setting but is not historic and therefore has capacity for changes to the landscape within the constraints of the buried archaeology and human remains.
Railings have defined this boundary line of 3 Honey Hill since at least the late nineteenth century.\footnote{An 1898 photograph of the Magistrates’ Courts shows the railings in the distance. \url{https://www.francisfrith.com/bury-st-edmunds/bury-st-edmunds-shire-hall-1929-83958}, accessed 20 July 2018.} As part of the setting of the listed building, they should be retained.

Since the construction of the Magistrates’ Courts, this area has been open land. The capacity for change indicated here relates to the changing of landscaping rather than to development. There is low potential for a new building on part of this area, subject to a full heritage impact assessment of any proposals. Any works should be mindful of the potential buried archaeology relating to the lost St Margaret’s Gate.

The gates to St Margaret’s House are modern and therefore have capacity for change.

The low capacity for change in the vicinity of the Abbey Church does not preclude carefully designed new interpretation nor the installation of a public artwork, subject to an archaeological and heritage impact assessment.
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SOUTH-EAST QUADRANT
CAPACITY FOR CHANGE

- Avoid Change
- Low Capacity
- Medium Capacity
- High Capacity
- Desirable to Change

A Historic boundary line should be maintained but fabric of boundary demarcation has potential for alteration.

B Historic path route should be maintained but fabric of path could be changed.

C Capacity for change in building is indicative. Greater analysis of individual layouts and spaces needed prior to any works.

01 The tennis courts detract from the setting of the ruins. The area should remain predominantly open landscape.

02 The porch is of no heritage value and could be replaced. The house has probably always had a porch or at least an elaborate doorcase since its refronting and one should remain.

03 The historic wall may relate to the line of the earlier Sacrist’s Yard complex.

04 The historic outbuilding (garage) shared by 1 and 2 Abbey Precincts has been altered and there is capacity for these alterations to be changed. Given that 1 and 2 Abbey Precincts is not listed, there is potential for the demolition of the building, especially given its visibility from the ruins.

05 The historic outbuildings (sheds) shared by 1 and 2 Abbey Precincts are in poor condition but have some illustrative value. They form part of the setting of 1 and 2 Abbey Precincts, although the latter is not listed.

06 The garden building of 1 and 2 Abbey Precincts should be the subject of research and assessment prior to any major works.

07 The desirability for change relates to bringing this area of the Sacristy garden back into good maintenance and use. Potential for built development faces a number of constraints and would need careful consideration.

08 The modern buildings are not of heritage value and could be altered or replaced. Any changes should not compromise the sensitive design of the buildings.

09 The car park has not always been open space but any development would need to consider the impact on the heritage assets and buried archaeology.

10 The modern finishes of the building north-east of St Margaret’s House could be improved. There is capacity for the alteration or removal of this building.

11 There is capacity to change the surface finish of the path across the Crankles.

12 The avoid change categorisation applies to the whole of No Mans Meadow. However, the electricity pylons and cables should be removed or buried if the opportunity arises.

13 The remnants of the medieval bridge east of the Sacristy garden should be preserved and recorded.

Detail of the south-east quadrant of the project area showing capacity for change. This plan is not to scale.

© Crown Copyright and database rights 2018 OS 100019675 Use of this data is subject to <a ref='https://www.westsuffolk.gov.uk/disclaimer.cfm#maps'>terms and conditions</a>
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8.2 REVITALISING THE ABBEY OF ST EDMUND
8.2.1 Introduction
This section forms a thematic exploration of the work the Heritage Partnership and its constituent partners could undertake to revitalise the project area. It is organised according to six aims for the site and includes recommended actions to deliver these objectives.

Note: Where recommendations refer to the Heritage Partnership, this refers to the Heritage Partnership, its constituent partner organisations and any organisation that may evolve from the Heritage Partnership.

8.2.2 Project Objectives
The Abbey of St Edmund area contains much-loved and much-used places in Bury St Edmunds. At present, it is not understood as one site but, at best, a series of sites linked by their history rather than their modern ownership or use. The Heritage Partnership intends to unite public perceptions of this complex project area into an entity that is recognised as the 'Abbey of St Edmund' as part of a holistic approach to planning and management. It has drawn together many key stakeholders to make the most of the area's potential as a place of leisure, learning and spirituality as well as the subject of study.

The Heritage Partnership's Vision for the site is:

'The Abbey of St Edmund will be treasured and enjoyed by an increasing range of local people and visitors as the focus of our past history, our present culture and our future inheritance in the heart of Bury St Edmunds.'

Deriving from this Vision are the Heritage Partnership’s aims to protect and enhance the heritage significance of the project area and its setting; to conserve its heritage assets; and to improve its interpretation. Part I of the Conservation Plan has articulated the heritage significance of the project area historically and today. It has also identified various issues and opportunities that should be addressed in the future within the guidance provided by the Conservation Framework. Doing this will conserve the heritage assets and improve their presentation to preserve and enhance their heritage significance. The heritage contained within the project area will be made more accessible so that it is cherished now and passed on for the enjoyment of future generations.

Exploring the Heritage Partnership's Vision and aims afresh using the analysis provided in Part I of the Conservation Plan has generated six heritage objectives.

01 Re-present the project area to explore its history and inspire visitors through a range of interpretive techniques, particularly:
   a. To celebrate the story of St Edmund and his legacy in the town.
   b. To reveal the heritage significance of the medieval Abbey.
   c. To explore the varied narratives of the post-Dissolution history.
   d. To explain how what exists today came to be.

02 Facilitate safe and intuitive access across the project area and, where possible, engender greater understanding of the historic connections between different parts of the project area.

03 Showcase the heritage assets to a standard that reflects their heritage significance and to ensure they are passed on safely to future generations.

04 Augment the understanding of the project area at all periods of its history through research and investigation.

05 Maximise the use of under used heritage assets.

06 Ensure the sustainability of the project area overall, especially any introduced changes and benefit the wider local economy.

Establishing the primary target audience at an early stage is critical to future decision-making. Identifying a primary target audience does not mean that all other audiences will be excluded, but it will provide a basis for making decisions. The primary target audience might be local, regional, national or international. The selection of a primary target audience will affect the approach to the site's re-presentation. For example, the subject, tone and style of interpretation, types of events and types of publicity will all be affected by the identification of a primary audience as will the levels and types of funding. Regardless of the audience, the primary purpose of any work should be enhancing the heritage significance of the site through improving understanding of it. Exploring the story of St Edmund and the creation and dissolution of the Abbey will always be a fundamental part of this.

The subsequent sections discuss the works that could be undertaken and the decisions and surveys that should be undertaken prior to any works in order to achieve the six objectives.
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8.2.3 Re-presentation

Objective 1:
Re-present the project area to explore its history and inspire visitors through a range of interpretive techniques, particularly:

- To celebrate the story of St Edmund and his legacy in the town
- To reveal the heritage significance of the medieval Abbey
- To explore the varied narratives of the post-Dissolution history
- To explain how what exists today came to be.

This exploration should encompass as a minimum a questionnaire carried out over several days, both during the week and at weekends, of visitors to the project area including the Abbey Gardens, Cathedral and St Mary’s Church. This questionnaire could also be available online and advertised via local media and social media. Local schools and colleges could be encouraged to complete alongside members of the congregations of the Cathedral and St Mary’s and residents within and around the project area. Carrying out the survey during the Christmas Fayre would also capture a wider group of people.

The data collected should be analysed to identify the themes that would most appeal to visitors. The most popular theme or themes could form the basis of the fixed interpretation panels on the project area and a new guidebook whilst other themes could be translated into other forms of interpretation to form a layered menu of interpretation options for visitors (see below).

The data collected should be analysed to identify the themes that would most appeal to visitors. The most popular theme or themes could form the basis of the fixed interpretation panels on the project area and a new guidebook whilst other themes could be translated into other forms of interpretation to form a layered menu of interpretation options for visitors (see below).

The project area encompasses a site and a series of buildings with many fascinating associated stories and people, principal among these being St Edmund, the martyred Saxon king whose name the town still bears. These are not explored in the current on-site interpretation. Furthermore, the appearance and information available is dated, poor in appearance, difficult to read physically in the case of the panels and challenging to read intellectually in the case of the guidebook.

The project area needs a comprehensive re-presentation within the framework of an interpretation strategy. This sub-section explores the preparatory work required to understand the audience to inform the development of such a strategy, considers potential themes and topics, possible methods of interpretation and the practical considerations in delivering new interpretation.

It should also be noted that any interpretation strategy should be developed with reference to the interpretation provided in the Cathedral, St Mary’s Church, Moyse’s Hall and the Guildhall.

Understanding the Audience
The range of stories that could be told on the project area and the number of interpretive techniques available to share those stories are considerable. Any re-presentation of the site should be preceded by a significant investigation of what stories would most interest the target audience and which methods of interpretation they would be most likely to engage with.

These themes are explored in the following diagrams.

**Themes for Interpretation**
In terms of enhancing the heritage significance of the project area, it would be beneficial for the main on-site interpretation to explain what visitors can see and how the historical development of the site has led to the formation of what they see. This would combine an exploration of the built fabric of the medieval Abbey with the subsequent development of the project area.

There are, however, other themes that could be explored as part of interpretation or education options. This might include changing annual themes to encourage repeat visits by visitors from further afield.

These themes might include:
- The World Comes to Bury St Edmunds;
- England’s Original Patron Saint: Edmund;
- “Everything Beautiful in its Time”: Art and Literature;
- “A Spiritual House”: Place of Worship Past and Present;
- “A Time for War, A Time for Peace”;
- “No Small Disturbance: Riot and Rebellion”;
- “Many Women Do Noble Things”; and
- The People of This Place.

These themes are explored in the following diagrams.
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“A SPIRITUAL HOUSE”: PLACES OF WORSHIP – PAST AND PRESENT

- Abbey Church
- St Denis’ Chapel
- St Mary’s Church
- St Margaret’s Church
- St James’ Church
- Pilgrimage

“NO SMALL DISTURBANCE”: RIOT AND REBELLION

- 1327 Riot – Abbey Gate
- 1381 Revolt
- Links to Civil War/Glorious Revolution?
- Magna Carta
- Justice
- Abbey – Hall of Pleas
- Magistrates Courts
- Abbot Samson and Bishop of Ely
- Abbot Baldwin and Bishop Losinga of Norwich
- Martyrs Memorial (17 Protestant martyrs)

“A TIME FOR WAR, A TIME FOR PEACE”

- Link to Suffolk Regimental Museum at Gibraltar Barracks
- Royal Anglian Regimental Chapel
- WW1 use of Abbey Gardens
- Second World War use of Abbey Gardens
- Richard I and the Crusades – Abbot Samson
- HMS Birkenhead
- Holocaust Memorial Garden
- Memorials in the Great Churchyard
- Memoria in the Cathedral
- US Army Air Force – Rose Garden
- Major Richardson Pack – War of the Spanish Succession
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Further research may identify other individuals whose stories could form part of the interpretation.

"MANY WOMEN DO NOBLE THINGS"

Oswyn (holy woman who features in legend of St Edmund and whose remains were in a chest in the Abbey Church before the Dissolution)

Susannah (Cathedral window)

Mary Davers

Elisabeth Frink

Mabel of Bury (C13th embroiderer who met Henry III when he came to the Abbey and was commissioned to make a standard for Westminster Abbey)

Sybil Andrews

Mary Tudor, Queen of France

Queen Victoria – window in St Mary’s

THE PEOPLE OF THIS PLACE

Nathaniel Hodson

M.R. James

1st Marquess of Bristol

Mary Davers

The Davers baronets

Major Richardson Pack

St Edmund

Abbot Baldwin

Abbot Samson

Abbot Anselm

James Oakes

Jocelin of Brakelond

Jankyn Smith

Interesting individuals buried or commemorated in St Mary’s Church, the Cathedral or the Great Churchyard
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Other narratives or trails could explore:

- the life of a monk at the Abbey;
- the creation of the botanic garden;
- the destruction of the Abbey (possibly through the historic images);
- the archaeological investigation and rediscovery of the Abbey; and
- the symbiotic relationship between the Abbey and the town, which could involve a wider trail around the town.

Interpretation Techniques
There are a wide variety of interpretation techniques that are available and it is likely that a layered approach will enable the greatest number of people to engage with the site and to be inspired by it.

Subject to public consultation on the interpretation a system of fixed interpretation panels should form part of the interpretation strategy. The current interpretation panels will be replaced. Although options for a new heritage trail have been considered, a series of standalone panels is likely to be better suited to the site. This is partly because of the multiple points of entry. It is also because many people visit the project area as a through route or to use a specific part of it and so are unlikely to follow a trail. Standalone panels are also better suited to an audience that lives in a world of bite-size, readily available information. The panels could be complemented by layers of interpretation in the form of paper leaflets and trails that can be downloaded to smart devices.

For those who are visiting the site as a heritage attraction, a popular source of information and a souvenir is a guidebook. There are currently multiple guidebooks for different elements of the project area: the Abbey Ruins; the Abbey Gardens; the Cathedral; St Mary’s Church; the Great Churchyard; and the River Lark. Some of these guidebooks will remain in use, such as the Cathedral’s. A new guidebook however, could provide a broader overview of the whole Abbey precinct site and also consider the later history and evolution of the project area. It would form an overarching guide under which more detailed guides for the Cathedral and St Mary’s could sit. Following the Cathedral’s example, a suite of guidebooks could be produced with a main guidebook, a light version and a children’s edition. Alongside guidebooks, there could be a leaflet for each trail that is developed.

A new model of the Abbey would be beneficial. A physical model provides a useful interpretation tool both for people guiding themselves round the project area and for guides giving tours. It aids understanding of the ruins if the ruins can be seen from the location of the model.

There is also potential for a digital model to be created, which could be viewed on a screen or accessed through a terminal somewhere indoors on the site and also could be made available on a website. This would offer the opportunity to show visually how the Abbey site developed over time as the digital model need not be static.

Although not an immediate ambition, some form of interpretation or exhibition point would increase the opportunities to explore the site’s history. It would create the chance to have a permanent display that provides an overview of the site’s history. This could be a simple series of boards, rather than an exhibition that incorporates artefacts that require certain display standards. Alternatively the interpretation point house a small, changing exhibition relating to different aspects or themes of the site’s history. This would encourage repeat visits by people from outside the immediate local area and provide the opportunity to engage with different anniversaries or topics (which could have particularly funding streams associated with them). If free-to-enter, it may be possible to have an unmanned interpretation point that is monitored via CCTV and/ or relies on patrols by the Abbey Gardens rangers. The design and location of an interpretation point should be the subject of an options appraisal to identify the best location from a visitor perspective and the least intrusive position in terms of heritage impact. This may be in an existing facility, such as the Ranger’s Shop.

There are an array of interpretive techniques that could be introduced in the Abbey Gardens, from carvings in benches to glass panels that have outlines that show what the form of the buildings would have looked like when viewed from that point. A public artwork relating to the lost shrine of St Edmund within the ruins of the Abbey Church might mediate between the secular historic interest in and the Christian engagement with the site. These should be explored as part of a comprehensive interpretation plan for the project area. Intrusive elements should be avoided or carefully located to minimise their impact. Given the scheduling of the project area, items that require power or digital cabling should be avoided or carefully designed to minimise impacts on buried archaeology.

There are various digital techniques that would further enhance engagement with the project area and its history. These include downloading themed trails to personal devices and augmented reality points that enable the viewer to see a digital reconstruction of a building or project area. Technology is constantly evolving and new opportunities emerging.

Providing information as illustrated webpages, videos or virtual tours online would enable visitors to access more information. It would also allow people unable to visit the project area in person to learn about the project area.

As well as digital tours on personal devices, guided tours would continue to be provided. Options for thematic tours based on the themes identified above could be developed alongside a general tour of the project area that reflects the existing and emerging knowledge of the project area.

Creating the Interpretation
New interpretation should be physically and intellectually accessible as well as visually appealing. There is an array of important factors that should be considered including:

- font style and size;
- contrast between text and the background;
- height of interpretation panels;
- physical accessibility of the locations of accessibility panels; and
- intellectual accessibility of written and spoken information.

In addition there are practical considerations for interpretation including:

- location of interpretation panels in relation to the buried and upstanding archaeology;
- robustness and durability of interpretation panels; and
- resistance to fading and weathering; and
- transferability of format of any digital media including visualisations, modelling and online digital content.

English Heritage Trust has its own in-house interpretation team who may be available to advise and review interpretation relating to the Abbey ruins and the guidebook. The Town Guides are trained to Guiding Institute standards and may be able to advise on trails and talks.
Developing and Delivering an Interpretation Strategy

Alongside the interpretation considerations, any interpretation strategy will seek to integrate the provision of practical information, such as site maps, access information and closing times, into a holistic scheme. The development of a unified signage strategy across the different parts of the project area would reinforce the Heritage Partnership’s unified approach.

Whilst the interpretation strategy or plan should be developed as a single study, albeit one capable of adaption and expansion, the delivery of the strategy could be phased. Different layers of the strategy could be implemented at different times according to funding availability.

Education

Schools

The project area’s long and diverse history means that there is considerable potential for educational engagement. For educational institutions, any visits to the site or in-classroom projects need to be targeted to meet the curriculum. This may extend beyond history to a range of subjects from science and geography (particularly with the river) to literacy and numeracy.

To attract schools, it is essential that the potential links between the curriculum and the project area are articulated. This means developing for each relevant topic and age-range, a programme for a site visit and materials, such as worksheets, that children can use. This is also necessary for in-classroom projects, which might involve using digital resources supplied by the Heritage Partnership and/or a talk by a guide. As the curriculum frequently changes, programmes will need to continue to be developed in response to these changes. Liaising with education staff in local museums would aid the development of programmes that are complementary to existing ones in the town or region. It may also offer opportunities to create combined education programmes, for example with Moyse’s Hall. In the long-term, the Heritage Partnership may wish to employ an Education Officer to manage the education programme.

As well as being provided with educational programmes, schools may require specific facilities, such as a classroom/workshop space, a lunch room and specific education toilet facilities in line with safeguarding best practice.

The project area may also offer opportunities for engagement with those who are not in education, for example through the apprenticeship scheme in the Abbey Gardens or volunteering on the site. In this way, young people could learn key life skills as well as potentially developing specialist knowledge to enable them to gain employment.

Engagement with colleges and universities in terms of research projects is considered in Section 8.2.5.

Life Long Learning

 Provision of learning opportunities could include people of all ages. The site’s history could provide the basis for regular series of talks or lectures on different aspects or themes. These could be developed as general interest lectures or alternatively could be part of a paid-for course of study, along the lines of the courses run by the Victoria and Albert Museum in London.

Alongside intellectual courses, a wider programme of courses could be offered relating to traditional crafts and skills. Some of these could potentially be run by existing volunteers, such as courses on flower-arranging.

The existing opportunities to learn new skills through volunteering or apprenticeships that exist already in the project area should be continued and where possible expanded.

Recommendations

• The Heritage Partnership, potentially aided by a consultant, undertakes a visitor survey to understand the preferences amongst the public for the themes and stories of interest and also for the techniques of delivery.

• The Heritage Partnership commissions an interpretation strategy that will provide a comprehensive and holistic approach to interpretation across the project area.

• The Heritage Partnership develops the themes identified.

• The Heritage Partnership identifies funding sources for the implementation of the interpretation strategy.

• The Heritage Partnership develops a signage strategy for the project area.

• The Heritage Partnership in conjunction with partners, such as the Bury St Edmunds Town Guides, delivers the interpretation strategy.

Recommendations

• The Heritage Partnership explores potential funding to develop an education programme, which may include a fixed-term or part-time education officer.

• The Heritage Partnership liaises with other local museum education providers to understand the potential for complementary or co-ordinated education provision.

• The Heritage Partnership develops an education programme for schools based on the curriculum. This will include both an onsite and an in-classroom offer.

• The Heritage Partnership explores and develops opportunities for young people to engage with the project area who are not currently in education.

• The Heritage Partnership makes knowledge and research about the site’s history available to all through lecture series.

• The Heritage Partnership, in the longer term, explores opportunities for practical learning opportunities for people of all ages that bring to life the traditional crafts and skills that have been and continue to be practised within the project area.

Where recommendations refer to the Heritage Partnership, this refers to the Heritage Partnership, its constituent partner organisations and any organisation that may evolve from the Heritage Partnership.

04 Where recommendations refer to the Heritage Partnership, its constituent partner organisations and any organisation that may evolve from the Heritage Partnership.

05 Safeguarding relates to the protection of children and preventing them from suffering harm. Provision of specific education facilities in museums and heritage attractions is recognised as a way of protecting children when they are on school visits.

06 Where recommendations refer to the Heritage Partnership, this refers to the Heritage Partnership, its constituent partner organisations and any organisation that may evolve from the Heritage Partnership.
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8.2.4 Access

Objective 2:

Facilitate safe and intuitive access across the project area and, where possible, engender greater understanding of the historic connections between different parts of the project area.

The Abbey Gardens is a popular green space for local people and visitors to visit, walk in or walk through. There are opportunities to make it more accessible. There are also opportunities to facilitate movement within the project area. These are illustrated on the adjacent plan.

A There is a blocked door in the scheduled wall adjacent to the Pilgrims’ Kitchen. This could be opened to provide a pedestrian route between the Abbey Gardens and the Cathedral area. There may be other options along the wall to create an opening as the changes in level on either side of the wall may make reopening the arch challenging. With any option, care should be exercised to retain the gable of an early building preserved in the boundary wall. Creating an access in this vicinity would have several advantages including:

- Providing a more visible and intuitive access than the existing one to the north-west.
- Providing an alternative to the awkwardly narrow path around the Cathedral car park.
- Re-establishing the connectivity between the old Abbey House garden and the Abbey Gardens.

B Associated with opportunity B, a new path could be created across the Bowling Green to the Water Garden, possibly through a new garden. This would facilitate a greater sense of integration between the different areas of the smaller gardens in this area.

C There is an existing vehicular access gate that is kept locked. It could be altered to provide a pedestrian access (with potential for restricted vehicular access) to connect the Abbey Gardens and the Great Churchyard. This would greatly improve the accessibility of the Abbey Gardens from the south of the town. It would also reduce anti-social behaviour in the ‘cul-de-sac’ in Abbey Gardens adjacent to Abbey Precincts.

D Another means to improve access from the south might be to create a new access path along the River Linnet to connect with the existing path in the Abbey Gardens. It would bring the disused area of the Cathedral’s land and the underused south-east corner of Abbey Gardens into use. However, the viability of a path along the bank near the pre-school would need to be considered.

E With the removal of the tennis courts, there is an opportunity to create a new path to link the existing one that leads to the tennis courts with the Crypt. This would create a circular route through the Abbey ruins. It might be possible to create a sloping path that would remove the need for steps to the Crypt.

F The proposed redevelopment of the former Eastgate Nursery will extend Abbey Gardens as Public Open Space on the east side of the river. A new access route will be created from Eastgate Street to the existing river path. This not only provides a new route into the Abbey Gardens from the north, but also is part of a project to provide a continuous river path along the River Lark. Another path could be added to link to the Vinefields.

G There used to be a path across the Abbot’s Bridge, which was closed on safety grounds. It may be possible to reopen this if safety concerns can be met without harm to the scheduled bridge. With the reinstatement of a lost path along the east river bank, it would create a circular walk and also reinforce the connectivity between the two parts of the Abbey precinct on either side of the river.

H The undulating paths around the south-east corner of the Refectory and the set of steps to the east of the Refectory do not facilitate easy north-south access in the middle of Abbey Gardens. There is potential to explore options to improve this with due consideration being given to the constraints of the nearby Abbey ruins.

An outline heritage impact assessment for most options is provided in Appendix B. It is noted that there was a path created from the Samson Tower to the nave of the Abbey Church ruins as part of the 1994 heritage trail. It is no longer in use as the Samson Tower is a private residence. It also caused anti-social behaviour as some people climbed on the walls of the gardens of the West Front residences and the Deanery. It is therefore not recommended that this should be reopened.
In addition to the access into the project area, there are some other improvements that would enhance accessibility within the public areas of the project area:

- level access to the Crypt, which should be investigated;
- the maps at the entrance to Abbey Gardens should show where steps are located; and
- provision of 360° views from the Norman Tower and the Abbey Gate as well as a virtual tour of the Cathedral Tower for visitors with mobility impairments. These could also be made available online or downloadable as an app.

A full access audit of the site would identify further areas to improve compliance with the Equality Act or simply make the site easier for the diverse range of visitors to use.

Recommendations

- The Heritage Partnership considers the options for improving circulation into and through the project area and liaises with the relevant owners.
- The Heritage Partnership leads discussions with Historic England regarding access changes and obtain the necessary consents.
- The Heritage Partnership commissions a full access audit of the public areas of the project area with a view to considering them holistically.
- The Heritage Partnership considers the recommendations of the access audit and implements changes where possible.
- The Heritage Partnership enhances accessibility as part of the interpretation strategy.

8.2.5 Showcasing the Heritage Assets

Objective 3: Showcase the heritage assets to a standard that reflects their heritage significance.

The medieval ruins, precinct walls (including the southernmost walls and the walls on the east bank), Abbey Gate, Abbot’s Bridge, Chapel of the Charnel and, to a lesser extent, the Norman Tower require remedial works to consolidate the historic fabric and enhance their appearance. The repairs will also enable the removal of the temporary safety barriers from various areas of the site.

In addition, there are other heritage assets that would benefit from repairs, including the railings on Eastgate Street.

The Heritage Partnership should also champion the protection of the heritage assets on the site. As recommended in the Heritage Assessment, the scheduling of the project area should be reviewed and consideration given to whether areas such as the Crankles should be included in the scheduling. The Heritage Assessment also recommends a review of the way in which different parts of the upstanding medieval archaeology is listed.

In addition, as research is carried out on individual listings, there may be an opportunity to contribute information to the current listing descriptions via Historic England’s ‘Enriching the List’ programme or through official amendments to the listing descriptions.

The works should be costed and, if necessary, phased packages of work developed. The works should be carried out by an experienced contractor. During the works, at least one interpretation panel should be provided to explain the conservation works to visitors.

Recommendations

- For the scheduled fabric within the English Heritage guardianship area, the 2016 Condition Survey should be reviewed and updated. A high level survey should be undertaken of the Abbey Church to augment the ground level survey. The short lengths of wall that are contiguous with the guardianship area but outside it, namely the walls near Abbey House, should be surveyed at the same time as it would be sensible for works to be carried out to these at the same time.
- The works should be costed and, if necessary, phased packages of work developed. The works should be carried out by an experienced contractor. During the works, at least one interpretation panel should be provided to explain the conservation works to visitors.
- Owners of other sections of scheduled walls should be encouraged to undertake similar programmes of survey, vegetation removal and repairs.
- Repairs to the Eastgate Street railings and bridge could be undertaken as part of the works to the former Eastgate Nursery.
- The Heritage Partnership liaises with Historic England regarding reviews of the designations of the heritage assets to ensure that they are appropriately designated and protected.

8.2.6 Research and Investigation

Objective 4: Augment the understanding of the project area at all periods of its history through research and investigation.

There is much still to be learnt from existing sources about the project area’s history, which stretches back over more than a millennium. There is also more to be discovered from the buried archaeology of the site, especially in relation to its various phases of Anglo-Saxon and medieval use. The discoveries from excavations undertaken to date and future research and investigations should be made known through publication and through archiving of information.

A priority for the project area should be the development of a comprehensive research strategy. This should encompass the whole project area and all phases of its historical development. It should be prepared by a suitably qualified consultant or consultants.

An important part of the overall research strategy will be a strategy for the archaeology of the project area.

The Heritage Assessment made several recommendations regarding research and investigation:

- Completion of the post-excavation analysis and publication of the excavation of the Queen’s Chamber 1976–1980.
- Completion of the post-excavation analysis and publication of the excavations relating to the Cathedral Centre.
- Publication of smaller pieces of fieldwork, either individually or collectively, such as the excavation of the five abbeys in 1902/1903, Biddle’s sewer trench across the site of Bradfield Hall and Duffty and Radford’s excavations outside the west front in 1957.

Where recommendations refer to the Heritage Partnership, this refers to the Heritage Partnership, its constituent partner organisations and any organisation that may evolve from the Heritage Partnership.

Where recommendations refer to the Heritage Partnership, this refers to the Heritage Partnership, its constituent partner organisations and any organisation that may evolve from the Heritage Partnership.
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• Preparation of an archaeological monograph discussing all past excavations, following the precedent of Glastonbury Abbey.

• Enhancement of the Historic Environment Record to fill in gaps and omissions relating to the project area.

• A GIS-based analysis of the project area, using Whittingham’s plan as the basis, including a topographic survey, detailed LIDAR survey, geo-physical survey, study of parch marks and architectural analysis of the upstanding remains. Laser scanning and multi-spectral imaging surveys could also be undertaken.

It is possible that the aforementioned projects or the development of an academically-justified research project result in a proposal for intrusive archaeological excavations. The Handy Guide to Heritage Consents in Appendix C identifies the justification required in accordance with Historic England’s Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance (2008). In addition, there will be ongoing opportunities for archaeological monitoring and investigation presented by development arising from the routine management of the site.

There are further research projects that could be undertaken to illuminate the post-Dissolution history of the site, especially:

• Identifying and using sources to understand what happened to the site in the 21 years between the dissolution of the Abbey and its sale to John Eyre. Of particular interest would be to understand how the buildings were dismantled, by whom, how were materials sold and how long did the dismantling take.

• Using the deeds held in the Suffolk Record Office and elsewhere to understand the way in which the project area was gradually split up and partially reassembled over the last 500 years.

• Using documentary sources held at the Suffolk Record Office to augment the understanding of the development and disappearance of buildings across the project area that has been derived from map analysis.

• Using sources at the Suffolk Record Office and elsewhere to understand who were the individuals or families who lived on the site and how they fitted into Bury St Edmunds society.

Recommendations

• The Heritage Partnership appoints a suitably qualified consultant to develop a research strategy, including an archaeology strategy, for the project area.

• The Heritage Partnership explores options to enable the updating of the Historic Environment Record to reflect all research and investigation undertaken to date and to ensure the ongoing updating as new information emerges.

• The Heritage Partnership liaises with funders for previous archaeological excavations regarding the completion of the reporting for these. If necessary, the Heritage Partnership will seek new funding to publish previous archaeological investigations.

• A suitably qualified consultant, in consultation with the Heritage Partnership, identifies future research priorities for the project area based on the recent studies and on existing and emerging national and regional research frameworks. The identification of priorities will not preclude interested parties undertaking desk-based research separately from the Heritage Partnership’s priorities.

• Should, in the future, any intrusive investigation proposals emerge outside the strategy and priorities identified, the Heritage Partnership or a consultant should review current research frameworks to understand whether the proposed research projects coincide with these.

• The Heritage Partnership employs a consultant to develop a costed survey strategy (in liaison with the statutory stakeholders) for the archaeological investigations identified.

• The Heritage Partnership identifies potential funding sources for discrete research projects.

• The Heritage Partnership liaises with local universities regarding potential researchers (students or academics).

• The Heritage Partnership develops a local and other volunteer group who could undertake archival research at the Suffolk Record Office.

• The Heritage Partnership liaises with local history groups, such as the Bury Society and Bury Past and Present, as well as Bury St Edmunds Town Guides, to pool knowledge and identify local research projects that would be mutually beneficial.

• The Heritage Partnership encourages archaeological monitoring and investigation to be undertaken and recorded when development occurs as a result of routine management of the site. Where there are options regarding future development, the potential for archaeological research will be factored into decision-making.

Where recommendations refer to the Heritage Partnership, this refers to the Heritage Partnership, its constituent partner organisations and any organisation that may evolve from the Heritage Partnership.
8.2.7 Maximising Use

Opportunities to bring underused or disused areas into use will improve the heritage assets and their settings, it will ensure the future maintenance of the areas. Furthermore, local people and visitors will benefit from access to areas that are currently not accessible.

Opportunities to maximise the use of heritage sites include:

- **The eastern aviary:** this is currently used for storage but could be rebuilt as a visitor facility such as a shop or as an exhibition space. Alternatively, the western aviary could be made available instead for an extension to the garden kiosk. Any works to the aviary offers the opportunity for archaeological review and investigation.

- **The Anselm Building:** is in poor condition and has the potential for being refurbished. This area of the site should be brought back into sustainable use.

- **The outbuilding and garden at the rear of the Cathedral shop:** These are not used and in a poor state of repair. This area of the site should be brought back into sustainable use.

Any works to the Anselm Building and the outbuilding and garden at the rear of the shop should be undertaken as part of a comprehensive review of the Cathedral’s facilities, particularly those in the Nos. 31–33 Angel Hill and Abbey House.

There are other areas within the project area that are not in use but which are unlikely to form a core part of the Heritage Partnership’s focus. Nonetheless, the Partnership should monitor proposals for these areas and comment when any formal planning application is made. These include:

- **On the east bank:** the Diocesan Board of Education are currently reviewing options for the site of St James’ School.

- **In the south-east corner of the site:** 6 The Churchyard is the process of being sold to a private owner. It is part of the Shire Hall Development Area identified by SEBC.

- **Outside this development area is the former Magistrates’ Courts,** which are awaiting sale and redevelopment.

---

**Recommendations**

- The Heritage Partnership undertakes a study to understand the areas required for the initial interpretation and education proposals.

- The Cathedral undertakes a comprehensive review of its space requirements and current use of space.

- A member of the Heritage Partnership is made responsible for checking planning and listed building applications within the project area. The same member will also undertake to comment on the applications on behalf of the Partnership.

---

10 Where recommendations refer to the Heritage Partnership, this refers to the Heritage Partnership, its constituent partner organisations and any organisation that may evolve from the Heritage Partnership.
8.2.8 Creating a Sustainable Future

**Objective 6:**
Ensure the sustainability of the project area overall, especially any introduced changes, and benefit the wider local economy.

The Heritage Partnership has instigated a new collective approach to considering the future of the project area. As it continues its work, it would be beneficial to consider a long-term collaborative approach to the management of the publicly accessible parts of the site. The purposes of this approach would be to make more efficient the management of the site and to enable a sustainable future for the site. One option that might be explored is a trust that would be responsible for the management of the site collectively on behalf of SEBC, English Heritage, Suffolk County Council and possibly the Cathedral (excluding the Cathedral itself).

The Cathedral’s holdings across the site are fairly disparate and not necessarily optimal for purpose. There is potential to achieve a more sustainable future for the Cathedral through a review of housing provision for clergy and staff, together with a review of ancillary accommodation, especially under utilised or unused spaces. This is turn may present opportunities for the enhancement of the visitor experience or the sustainability of the wider site.

The south-east area of the west bank of the project area is identified as an area for potential development and is subject to an existing Development Brief. The former Magistrates’ Courts nearby are not included in this but are also available for redevelopment. Any development on these sites should avoid pressure on the sustainability of the wider project area’s future. Equally, there may be potential for change that would benefit the aims for the project area’s future.

---

**Recommendations**

- The Heritage Partnership\(^1\) champions the exploration of a long-term model for the management of the public areas of the site with the key stakeholders.

- The Cathedral reviews the housing provision for clergy and staff and commission an options appraisal to understand the potential for enhancing its sustainability.

- The Heritage Partnership monitors the potential development areas in the south-east of the project area. It should also consider opportunities to use these areas to further the aims outlined above.

---

\(^1\) Where recommendations refer to the Heritage Partnership, this refers to the Heritage Partnership, its constituent partner organisations and any organisation that may evolve from the Heritage Partnership.
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SECTION 9.0
IMPLEMENTATION

9.1 ENDORSEMENT AND REVIEW OF THE CONSERVATION PLAN
This Conservation Plan should be endorsed by the Heritage Partnership and its constituent partner organisations as the basis for future decision-making regarding the site. It should be made publicly available via a website. It should also be deposited in the local branch of the Suffolk Record Office and with the Suffolk Historic Environment Record.

The Conservation Plan should be reviewed every five years or after major change has occurred. This review should be undertaken by a suitably qualified consultant in consultation with the Heritage Partnership and other stakeholders.

9.2 IMPLEMENTING RECOMMENDATIONS

9.2.1 Introduction
To implement a coherent programme of improvements to the project area and to ensure its future upkeep, there are four major tasks that should be undertaken. Two are finite and two are ongoing. These are:

- Investigate the merit of developing a management organisation: whether a constituted coalition of partners or a formal new structure, such as a trust, a new form of management arrangement could be developed to drive the project forward.
- Investigating funding sources: an ongoing task but one that also needs considerable time spent on it early on so that a strategic plan of funding applications for different tasks can be developed.
- Creating an overarching plan: a framework of proposals planned out on a map of the site will enable a phased but coherent approach to change on the site. It will also enable the development of a strategic funding plan.
- Securing consents: most changes to the site will need some form of statutory consent to allow them to proceed. It may be possible to develop a standing agreement for maintenance tasks and also to get consent for a number of bigger changes that may be delivered in phases.

9.2.2 Investigating Scope for a Management Organisation
As outlined in Section 7.2, a wise first step in developing the potential of the site is to agree the management arrangements, potentially through the creation of an organisation that is a vehicle for collaborative and coordinated running of the site as a visitor attraction. As part of this, it will be essential to understand definitively the ownership of the structures and land and who currently holds responsibilities for maintenance tasks.

What is known is that the ownership and management circumstances of the site are unusual, if not unique. However, it would be worth exploring existing precedents. One channel that may illuminate these is to understand how English Heritage manages some of its other sites. For example, at Chiswick House in Middlesex, English Heritage and the London Borough of Hounslow, who are owners of Chiswick Gardens, have devolved the running of both elements to a single trust. Both organisations are represented amongst the trustees. The Abbey of St Edmund site is more complex with more organisations involved and it would be essential to define what the purpose and responsibilities of any future trust would be. For the trust to manage the site in a self-sustaining way, it would be necessary to consider how the revenues from events would be managed.

9.2.3 Investigating Funding Sources
Securing funding is critical to the realisation of the Heritage Partnership’s vision. For larger projects, funding will likely need to be drawn from several sources, which may include some of the Heritage Partnership organisations. When seeking funding for a specific project, consider the other projects at the Abbey for which funding may be sought in the short-to-medium-term as most funders do not fund multiple applications from the same organisation. As there are often specific requirements for application and different organisations are more likely to fund certain types of projects, it is essential to consider which funder is best suited to a particular project.

There may already be people employed by SEBC and Suffolk County Council, by the Cathedral or the Diocese, and by EHT who could advise the Heritage Partnership on potential sources of funding. The Diocese of St Edmundsbury provides advice on funding for a range of different projects:


In recent years, the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) has been a major source of funding for heritage projects of all sizes but the HLF’s funds have diminished and so seeking other sources of funding will be essential. This is also true of the Big Lottery Fund.

There are a large number of funding organisations but many have specific criteria and often an application process with fixed deadlines. Some of the major non-state sources of funding for heritage projects include:

- Esmée Fairbairn Foundation
- Garfield Weston Foundation
- The Wolfson Foundation
- The Headley Trust.

Local industry may also be a source of funding.

Given how competitive heritage funding has become, it is often necessary to think creatively about how the proposed projects may benefit the local community and specific groups within this. Projects that provide a service to a particular group within the local community may be eligible for funding that a typical heritage project would not be.

9.2.4 Creating an Overarching Plan
There are many potential projects that could be undertaken on the site. An overarching plan (a drawing of the site showing where change is proposed) should be commissioned to review in a holistic framework the projects that are likely to be taken forward. This will allow locations for projects to be identified and reduce the risk of abortive work by ensuring that the different projects fit together. The overarching plan will provide a clear strategic approach for the Heritage Partnership and will facilitate the planning of fundraising.

9.2.5 Securing Consents
To implement almost any type of change in the project area will require one or more forms of statutory consent. The main types of consents are:

- Scheduled Monument Consent
- Listed Building Consent
- Planning Consent.

Scheduled monument designation takes precedence over listed building designation therefore a heritage asset that is both scheduled and listed requires scheduled monument consent and not listed building consent. Planning consent may be necessary in addition to either scheduled monument or listed building consent where proposed works constitute development (creation of new usable floor area). Key differences between scheduled monument and listed building consent are shown in the table overleaf.

03 Conservation Area Consent has been abolished as a separate consent. Any demolition in a conservation area now requires planning consent. (Outside a conservation area, demolition up to 50sqm does not require consent.)
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Consultation
When developing any proposal for works to a significant heritage asset, it is advisable to engage in discussion with the local planning authority, particularly the Conservation Officer and/or Historic England and/or Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service from the outset. This will help to avoid costly abortive work and gives the best chance of developing a solution that is likely to be granted consent.

Archaeology
Any proposals for works are also likely to offer an opportunity for increasing archaeological knowledge. As a minimum, any request for consent is likely to need a desk-based review of existing archaeological evidence relating to the particular part of the project area affected by the proposed works. More extensive archaeological investigations may be required as part of the application submission. In other cases, a condition may be added to a consent requiring further archaeological investigation or recording before or during works taking place.

Further Information
For more information about different types of consents, justifications for different types of works and the application in the project area, see Appendix C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheduled Monument Consent</th>
<th>Listed Building Consent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who determines the application?</td>
<td>Decided by the Secretary of State and administered by Historic England.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is consent needed for?</td>
<td>Any changes above or below ground.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any exclusions relevant to the project area?</td>
<td>Digging to a depth of 300mm in gardens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do I need heritage consent for works near the heritage asset?</td>
<td>No – but impact on the setting of a scheduled monument will still be a material consideration for any planning consent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WHAT IS CURTILAGE LISTING?
There is no specific definition of the extent of a listed building but broadly any structure that existed at the time of the listed building’s designation may be deemed to be curtilage listed. A curtilage listed structure may not be physically attached to a listed building so a detached shed or garden wall may be curtilage listed.

Ecclesiastical Exemption
Anglican places of worship have a parallel system of consent for change to the building fabric. Therefore changes to the buildings owned by the Cathedral and St Mary’s Church will require Faculty consent. If those changes are external to the building or affect the scheduled monument further statutory consents will be required in addition.

The Great Churchyard is deemed to still be consecrated and Bishop’s Faculty consent is also required for works here.

Gaining Consent
There is a different application process for each type of consent. Applications for scheduled monument consent are made to Historic England. Applications for planning and listed building consents are made to the local planning authority.

The justifications required to obtain listed building consent varies depending on the type of work proposed. Guidance can be found in Historic England’s publications including:

- Seeing the History in the View (2011)

The National Planning Policy Framework (2018, NPPF) also sets out the tests for the acceptability of change to heritage assets. It should be noted that the NPPF was written as guidance by central government to local government and similarly Conservation Principles was written as guidance for Historic England inspectors. These documents provide the criteria for assessing change, rather than guidance on how to justify change.

02 Currently the Secretary of State for the Department of Digital, Culture, Media and Sport.

03 For further information, see Ecclesiastical Exemption from Listed Building Consent, https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/hpg/consent/ecclesiasticalexemptions/
9.3 SHORT-TERM, COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

The project area encompasses spaces that are much used and much loved by local people, who are consequently very interested in the work of the Heritage Partnership. Whilst some of the projects outlined in Section 7 may take years to deliver, there is a need to demonstrate that the Heritage Partnership is sharing its work and engaging with the local community.

To build on the engagement already undertaken, such as the Heritage Workshop held in February 2018, the Heritage Partnership could:

- Invite a group of volunteers to undertake research on Mary Davers and the Davers baronets to feed into the interpretation strategy and also to another potential lecture series.
- Host a stall at the Bury St Edmunds Christmas Fayre to raise the profile and possibly raise funds for the Partnership’s work.
- Depending on costs and fundraising, undertaking the LIDAR or geo-physical survey recommended in the Heritage Assessment could potentially be achieved more quickly than most other projects and provide substantial new information about the site without, for example, undertaking any intrusive investigation. Any archaeological investigations should be undertaken within the framework of an archaeological strategy for the site.

A conference is already planned for early 2019 to share the work undertaken for the Heritage Assessment and the Conservation Plan.

It is vital that the Heritage Partnership develops a strategy for continuous engagement with the local community and the wider public. Given the significance of the site to the community, any projects that are undertaken will be enriched by local support, participation and celebration.

- Develop a social media presence through Twitter, Instagram and other platforms to share not only events and news but interesting facts as they emerge through research.
- Implement the visitor survey for the development of the interpretation strategy.
- Undertake a short study of the parch marks that have appeared in the exceptionally dry summer of 2018 and publish an article online and in a local paper or journal.
- Run a short lecture series of four to six lectures that focus on the archaeological excavations of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. These could be held every three to four weeks. The series could draw on the findings of the Heritage Assessment. The lectures could be given by members of the Partnership, the archaeologists who undertook the excavations or Richard Hoggett as author of the Heritage Assessment.
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APPENDIX B
OUTLINE HERITAGE ASSESSMENTS
B.1 ASSESSING HERITAGE IMPACT
Heritage impact is the impact of any proposed change on the heritage significance of any heritage assets affected by the proposed change. A heritage asset may be deemed to be affected by a change if the change is directly to the fabric of the asset, but also if it affects any structure associated with the heritage asset (deemed to be curtilage listed), the setting of a heritage asset or key views of or from a heritage asset.

In a place where there is a dense concentration of heritage assets, work on one heritage asset will necessitate an assessment of impact on several heritage assets. For example, works to Abbey House might require an assessment of impact on:

- Abbey House, its setting and views
- The adjacent stretches of scheduled wall
- The setting of Abbey Gate
- The setting of 31, 32, 33 and 34 Angel Hill
- The setting of the Cathedral
- The setting of listed buildings nearby on Angel Hill, such as the Athenaeum
- The scheduled monument
- The registered park
- The conservation area.

Heritage impact can be positive or negative and impact is typically assessed on a scale such as this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAGNITUDE OF IMPACT</th>
<th>DEFINITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Beneficial</td>
<td>The alterations considerably enhance the heritage asset or the ability to appreciate its heritage significance values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Beneficial</td>
<td>The alterations enhance to a clearly discernible extent the heritage asset or the ability to appreciate its heritage significance values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Beneficial</td>
<td>The alterations enhance to a minor extent the heritage asset or the ability to appreciate its heritage significance values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>The alterations do not affect the heritage asset or the ability to appreciate its heritage significance values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Adverse</td>
<td>The alterations harm to a minor extent the heritage asset or the ability to appreciate its heritage significance values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Adverse</td>
<td>The alterations harm to a clearly discernible extent the heritage asset or the ability to appreciate its heritage significance values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Adverse</td>
<td>The alterations severely harm the heritage values of the heritage asset or the ability to appreciate its heritage significance values.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The heritage impact of any proposal is greatly influenced by the detail of the design, scale, massing and location of the proposed works. Given the scheduled status of much of the site and very high potential for buried archaeology, the degree to which a proposal requires below ground work, including for services, will also have a high degree of influence on the heritage impact.

As such, it is not possible to assess in any detail the heritage impact of the types of works outlined in Section 7.2. The outline impact assessments therefore indicate the considerations and justifications that might be required.

If a proposal will cause an adverse impact on the heritage significance of a heritage asset, then it needs to be assessed in terms of the level of harm identified in the NPPF. The NPPF refers to “substantial harm” and “less than substantial harm”. If a proposal will cause harm to the significance of a heritage asset, it is at this point that it is appropriate to weigh up that harm against any public benefits. For further explanation, see the How Consent is Determined section in Appendix C Statutory Heritage Consents Handy Guide (pages 165 and 166).
B.2 OUTLINE HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENTS

This section considers the potential options for change outlined in Section 8. In some cases, a very outline heritage impact assessment is provided in note form. In other cases, there are many unknown factors regarding the proposal (such as the design, scale, massing, materials, and so on), notes are provided as to what a future heritage impact assessment would need to address. This information can be used by the Heritage Partnership, its constituent partners or any consultants they may employ as guidance in developing a brief for proposed works and for developing design solutions.

B.2.1 INTERPRETATION

Fixed Interpretation Panels
- The existing interpretation panels are not of heritage significance. Their removal will have a negligible impact on the heritage significance of the heritage assets on the site.
- Each proposed interpretation panel will need to be assessed individually depending on its location and the panel’s design. For each panel, the following should be assessed:
  - Impact on the scheduled monument in terms of impact on the setting and views of the upstanding built fabric and on the buried archaeology. The latter should be related to Whittingham’s plan of the medieval abbey’s likely layout and be referenced against previous archaeological investigations.
  - Impact on the nearest listed building(s), which may be the same as the scheduled monument.
  - Impact on the registered park. The impact on the park is likely to be negligible provided that boards do not intrude on the Formal Central Beds or on the roots of any trees.
  - In addition, the cumulative impact of multiple panels will need to be assessed on the heritage assets in the project area.
  - Where there is an adverse impact, it will need to be explained how this is the only suitable site for that panel and how other sites would have a greater adverse impact. The adverse impact may be mitigated by the enhancement of the understanding of the site’s heritage significance engendered by the introduction of the panel.

Visitor Facilities
As noted in Section 8, there is no immediate proposal for a visitor facility to be created. The impact of a new interpretation point or visitor facilities will depend entirely on its location and design. Whether it is located in an existing building that requires alteration to accommodate the proposal or in a new building, the new facility should be assessed against the criteria in paragraph 138 of Historic England’s Conservation Principles, Policies and Frameworks which provides a good framework for developing a robust justification.

Any Heritage Impact Assessment for a visitor facility will need to consider:
- the impact on any heritage asset directly affected;
- the impact on the setting and views of any nearby heritage asset;
- the impact of any below grounds works including service trenching;
- the impact of any associated landscaping, such as new paths or planting; and
- the impact on the conservation area.

B.2.2 ACCESS

New Link to the Water Garden
- The Bowling Green was probably created soon after the creation of the public park as it is not shown on the 1904 OS map but does appear on the 1926 OS map.
- Creating a path across the Bowling Green will change the character of this space. However, if the path is part of a new garden, it could be argued that it is part of the ongoing development of the public park and a significant addition of a new garden as others have been added throughout the twentieth century. A Bowling Green on the east bank of the river ensures the long tradition of a Bowling Green within the Abbey precinct continues.
- The impact of any proposed new garden would need to be assessed in terms of its impact on the setting of the scheduled walls of the Pilgrims’ Kitchen Garden and the Refectory, the impact on the setting of the Cathedral and the sundial as well as the impact on the registered park.
- The impact on the buried archaeology would need to be assessed depending on the depth of the new path.

Opening the Vehicular Access Gate
- The existing vehicular access gates are not of heritage significance. They could be replaced with gates that provide the option of limiting access to pedestrians only, if required.
- The more significant issue to consider is the route of any associated new path past the Abbey ruins. This needs to meet minimum accessibility requirements and ideally should have sufficient clearance from the ruins to minimise the risk of damage to the ruins from buggies, prams, bicycles, etc.
- The opening of the south gate to pedestrians would enable better public access from the south of the site. It would also discourage anti-social behaviour from this part of the site.
- It would be preferable in terms of heritage impact to provide screening to the windows of Abbey Precincts (e.g. through film applied to the windows, blinds or net curtains) than physical screening added outside the property, which may negatively impact on the setting of the ruins and/or compromise the below ground archaeology. However, it may be possible to plant a hedge or install a fence to provide screening if required subject to archaeological considerations and an assessment of the specific proposals on the setting and views of the Abbey ruins.
B: OUTLINE HERITAGE ASSESSMENTS

Path along the River Linnet
- A new path would open up this part of the project area to the public and improve the accessibility of the Abbey Gardens from the south.
- The northern boundary of the Sacristy garden at the east end is a modern fence and its removal and partial replacement with a more in-keeping boundary demarcation would have a negligible impact on the heritage significance of the scheduled monument.
- The southern boundary of the Sacristy garden would need to be examined to determine whether it is historic and the impact of creating an opening in it.
- The plot of the Sacristy garden has existed since at least the eighteenth century and it should remain demarcated as part of any proposals.
- The creation of a path in this area would potentially make the ruins of St Andrew’s Chapel visible to the public, which they are not currently. It would be desirable if the ruins were repaired at the same time.
- The creation of the path would bring the disused area of the Sacristy garden back into good maintenance, especially if the whole disused area was landscaped as a public area.
- The impact on the buried archaeology would need to be assessed depending on the depth of the path and any other new features proposed.

Redevelopment of the former Eastgate Nursery
As this already has scheduled monument consent, this proposal has not been assessed.

New Path Connecting to the Crypt
- Scheduled monument consent has already been granted for the removal of the tennis courts.
- The depth and route of the new path will need to be considered, especially if it is intended to use the path to create level access to the Crypt. The impact on below ground archaeology will need to be assessed.
- The new path and the associated turfing of the former tennis courts are likely to have a negligible impact on the setting of the Abbey ruins.
- The new path would complete a circular visitor route through the Abbey ruins, which would enhance circulation around the ruins and the wider site.

Access over the Abbot’s Bridge
- There was a path until relatively recently over the Abbot’s Bridge. It was closed due to safety concerns. A survey of the Bridge would need to be undertaken to assess the condition of the Bridge and any repairs or alterations required to accommodate a path.
- The impact of any proposed changes or fixings would need to be assessed and a methodology agreed as part of the scheduled monument consent.
- The reinstatement of the path on the east bank of the river would bring back a lost feature that appears on historic OS maps. The impact of the detail of the path’s design would need to be assessed on the scheduled monument. The impact on the setting of the Abbot’s Bridge would also need to be assessed.
- The access route would improve circulation between the two sides of the precinct and enhance understanding of the connection between the two during the medieval period.

Path Alterations East and South-east of the Refectory
- The arrangement of paths in this area and particularly the steps and path east of the Refectory are a relatively recent creation. It was made possible by the removal of the railings around the Abbey ruins.
- The creation of any new form of path will need to be mindful of the constraints of the physical surviving fabric of the Refectory, the buildings on the east side of the cloister and the row of trees at the top of the bank.
- The impact of any new path arrangement would need to be assessed on the registered park, the setting of the Abbey ruins and the setting of the Cathedral.
- The impact of any proposed works on the scheduled monument, including the impact on buried archaeology, would need to be assessed and a methodology for works agreed as part of the scheduled monument consent.
- The alteration of the path arrangement has the potential to improve accessibility across the site.

B.2.3 SHOWCASING THE HERITAGE ASSETS

Repairs
Like-for-like repairs are those in which the materials and techniques replicate exactly what exists currently or, if this is a later, unsympathetic repair, what existed historically. Listed building consent is not usually required for such repairs on a small scale. However, consent is required if the structure is a scheduled monument. It will be necessary to describe what is proposed in terms of materials and methodologies and the area affected. The works will be justified by need and the appropriateness of the repairs in response to the need.

Where like-for-like repairs are undertaken on a larger scale or renewal of an element such as the roof is required, consent is required for listed buildings and for scheduled monuments. As previously, it will be necessary to describe the proposals, why the works are needed and the appropriateness of the materials and techniques selected.

Where like-for-like repairs are not possible or where it is desirable to change what was done historically because it was fundamentally flawed, for example the size or design of rainwater goods, consent is required for listed buildings and for scheduled monuments. For Grade II* or Grade I listed buildings, it is usually necessary to discuss the proposals with Historic England and with the Conservation Officer for Grade II listed buildings. It will be necessary to describe the proposals and explain why the works are needed and how the design solution has been developed.
B.2.4 MAXIMISING USE

The Eastern Aviary

- The aviarises were moved to their current location in the 1960s and have been much repaired since. It is thought unlikely that much of the extant fabric dates from the 1960s.

- Although the aviarises are valued locally for the birds displayed in them and the aviarises have some historical value in continuing the tradition started by Nathaniel Hodson of displaying birds to the public in the 1830s, the eastern aviary is currently empty and used as a store. The other aviarises remain full of birds so maintain the limited heritage values of the aviarises.

- The removal of the eastern aviary may give the public a better chance to appreciate part of the scheduled northern precinct wall, which is currently concealed. This depends on the design of any replacement structure and whether the scheduled wall remains visible. (It is desirable that the wall remains visible.)

- The impact of any proposed design should be assessed in terms of impact on the scheduled wall, the registered park and the settings of Alwyne House and the Garden Café kiosk. Important considerations will be the materials, scale and massing (the new structure should not be larger in height than the kiosk), design details and reversibility.

- The impact on the setting of the listed buildings on the north side of the scheduled wall will be negligible provided that any new structure is not visible above the wall.

- Any new structure will be concealed from the street and will have a negligible impact on the conservation area.

- If the birds were moved into the eastern aviary and western aviary redeveloped, the same considerations as listed above for the eastern aviary would apply although the impact assessment would need to consider the impact directly on the kiosk as well as on its setting.
APPENDIX C
ABBAY OF ST EDMUND
STATUTORY HERITAGE
CONSENTS HANDY GUIDE
The Abbey of St Edmund and its environs are of considerable heritage significance and this is reflected in the designation and registration of many heritage assets. These are buildings, monuments, sites, areas and landscapes identified as having a degree of heritage significance meritling consideration in planning decisions, because of their heritage interest. In the case of the Abbey, many heritage assets have more than one designation.

These assets are protected by legislation intended to retain the special interest of heritage assets from damage and destruction. When change is proposed to designated heritage assets, a process of approval for those changes is required to take place; this is called consent or permission.

This guide provides an easy reference to what heritage designations exist across the site, what those designations broadly mean and how the individual consent processes work. Further and more detailed information about applying for relevant consents is also provided.

There is already a considerable amount of guidance around designations and the consent process available through Historic England and other bodies; this guide does not replace or predominate that guidance. Rather, it simplifies the understanding of the process into easy to understand terminology.

HOW TO USE THIS GUIDE

This guide is organised by heritage designation type. Each designation has an associated colour which appears both on the map adjacent and in the subsequent sections. There are three ways to use the guide:

01 As a general guide to managing change to heritage assets. In this way, it can be read from start to finish and then referred to as necessary.

02 If you do not know the designations of the site or area you are looking at, first reference the map to see if there are any applicable designations. If there are, look to the accompanying section(s) relating to relevant designation(s).

03 If you do know the existing designations of the site or areas you are looking at, look to the relevant designation sections within the guide.

Included within this guide is information on the following:

01 Managing Change
02 Scheduled Monuments
03 Listed Buildings
04 Conservation Areas
05 Additional Designations: Registered Park and Garden; Ecclesiastical Exemption
06 Setting and Views
07 Examples of Consents
08 Types of Work

Note that much of the information in this guide has been summarised from and references existing guidance available from Historic England, the gov.uk website and the National Planning Policy Framework. It should be reviewed on a regular basis to ensure that all references are up-to-date and continue to be relevant.
01 MANAGING CHANGE

The process for ensuring that change is carried out sensitively and with respect to heritage is grounded in having a clear understanding of what makes that heritage asset significant. The diagram below shows the process for managing change.

**CHANGE IS PROPOSED**

**UNDERSTANDING**
Use the Conservation Plan to understand the history, designations, heritage significance and capacity for change of the building, structure or area.
Carry out further research if necessary. Historic England or Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service may be able to assist with identifying research needs.

**DEVELOP PROPOSALS**
Develop proposals with sensitivity to heritage significance.
Employ specialist advice if necessary.
Carry out early discussions with Historic England and the local Authority. This may be a formal pre-application.

**HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT**
Carry out the Heritage Impact Assessment process for the proposals. Consider:
- Will significant built fabric be destroyed or removed?
- Will heritage significance be lost or negatively affected?

Will the proposals result in adverse impact or substantial harm?

- **Yes**
  - Apply for relevant consent(s)
- **No**

03

04

**HOW CONSENT IS DETERMINED**

When local authorities and Historic England are reviewing proposals for change and deciding on consents, there are two pieces of overarching guidance against which they make their judgements: the National Planning Policy Framework (2018) and Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance (2008) (both outlined below). Whilst it is not necessary to utilise this guidance on a regular basis, understanding the principles contained within them is important, particularly when justifying proposed works within the consent process.

**National Planning Policy Framework 2018 (NPPF)**

This is a document which sets out the government’s planning policies for England and details how they should be applied by local authorities. Chapter 16 - Conserving and enhancing the historic environment specifically outlines how change to heritage assets should be managed.

There is an underlying presumption in the NPPF that works to a heritage asset will be acceptable if they do not cause harm to the significance of the heritage asset. As a first approach, therefore, justification for works to heritage assets should aim to demonstrate that proposals cause no harm.

When considering the impact that proposed changes may have on heritage, the NPPF describes impact in categories of less than substantial harm or total loss (to significance), though there is no set definition for these categories (see information box overleaf).

Where proposals would cause less than substantial harm justification for the proposals needed to demonstrate public benefits of the proposed works, which may include, for example, benefits to the heritage asset overall or to other heritage assets, the local economy or providing greater accessibility. Any claims may need to be supported by further studies.

Where a proposal would cause substantial harm or total loss, it can only be justified if:

- “the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:
  a) the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site;
  b) no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium-term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation;
  c) conservation by grant-funding or some form of not-for-profit, charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and
  d) the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use”.

This means that the proposal can either be justified in terms of public benefits as described above or alternatively by meeting all the criteria set out. Currently it seems unlikely that there is any part of the project area where circumstances would meet these criteria. Therefore any proposals that cause harm would need to be balanced by substantial public benefits.
01 MANAGING CHANGE

What is substantial harm?

There is no set definition for this, though guidance prepared by the Department for Culture, Media and Sport has stated:

Substantial harm is a high test, so it may not arise in many cases. For example, in determining whether works to a listed building constitute substantial harm, an important consideration would be whether the adverse impact seriously affects a key element of its special architectural or historic interest. It is the degree of harm to the asset’s significance rather than the scale of the development that is to be assessed. The harm may arise from works to the asset or from development within its setting.

While the impact of total destruction is obvious, partial destruction is likely to have a considerable impact but, depending on the circumstances, it may still be less than substantial harm or conceivably not harmful at all, for example, when removing later inappropriate additions to historic buildings which harm their significance. Similarly, works that are moderate or minor in scale are likely to cause less than substantial harm or no harm at all. However, even minor works have the potential to cause substantial harm.

Given the lack of clarity around how harm is defined, it is extremely important to have early conversations with the local authority and Historic England about potential for harm and to employ a specialist consultant to both minimise harm within proposals and to fully assess the potential level of harm.

Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance

This is a set of guiding principles to aid Historic England in decision-making around heritage assets. Within Conservation Principles is a framework for justification for different types of work:

- Repair
- Works to increase knowledge of the past (this would include archaeological excavations)
- Restoration
- New works or alterations
- Works that are acceptable in terms of benefit to the public

These types of work and the associated justification for them are described in greater detail in Section 08 of this guide.

Heritage Impact Assessment

The impact (e.g. substantial harm or less than substantial harm) that proposed changes will have to heritage assets can be determined by carrying out a Heritage Impact Assessment. This is a process that can be carried out informally at any point in development proposals and which will be required as a formal part of heritage consents.

Heritage Impact Assessment is a process of identifying what is historically and architecturally important about a heritage asset, to be able to assess whether proposed changes will have a positive, negative or no impact on the heritage values of the place. Advice is usually given by a specialist heritage consultant and the resulting conclusions presented in a report, which should include:

- identification and description of the proposals site and its setting;
- identification of any designations, such as listing, which the site is subject to or which are within the setting of the site;
- description of the history of the property;
- identification of the ‘significance’ of the site, i.e. its historic and architectural interest; and
- assessment of the impact the proposals will have on the heritage significance of the site, as well as recommendations for any changes to the scheme that will reduce any negative impacts that are identified.

A formal Heritage Impact Assessment, either included as part of a Design and Access Statement or as a standalone exercise, will be necessary for any applications affecting designated heritage assets including:

- Listed Building Consent
- Scheduled Monument Consent
- Planning permission for:
  - development attached to a listed building;
  - development within the setting of a listed building or scheduled monument;
  - development inside or within the setting of a Conservation Area or Registered Parks and Gardens; or
  - demolition inside a conservation area.

For proposals affecting below ground archaeology, fieldwork may be necessary to complete the impact assessment.

Relevant guidance

02 SCHEDULED MONUMENTS

A scheduled monument is a nationally important historic building or archaeological site included on the Schedule of Monuments. There are two Scheduled Monuments within the project area.

SCHEDULED MONUMENTS WITHIN THE PROJECT AREA

Chapel of the Charnel
(List Entry Number 1003763)

Inclusive of the standing remains and ground below these.

Bury St Edmund's Abbey
(List Entry Number 1021450)

Included within the Scheduling

• Precinct wall
• All open ground and upstanding remains of the Abbey of St Edmund within the Abbey precinct to the north and east of St Edmundsbury Cathedral
• The area to the south-east of the Abbey Church containing St Andrew's Chapel and the monks' cemetery.
• Part of an outer precinct to the north-east, south of Eastgate
• The wall around the Abbey vineyard to the east of the River Lark
• Isolated sections of the precinct wall to the north and west
• Two entrances: Norman Tower and the Abbey Gate to the west and the site of a third, St Margaret's Gate, to the south

Excluded from the Scheduling

• All post-medieval buildings and structures (but not the ground beneath them)
• All modern surfaces of paths, roads and pavements (but not the ground beneath them)
• The West Front of the Abbey Church and dwellings within it
• The Garden of Remembrance.

LEGISLATION AND GUIDANCE

Scheduled Monuments are designated and protected under the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979. This is the legislation that defines what the schedule is, how it is made and managed and how to apply for consents to make changes and carry out works to sites on the Schedule. The Ancient Monuments (Class Consents) Order 1994 is an amendment to the Act which outlines various exemptions from consent (this is discussed in more detail on page 10).

The Act is a complex piece of legislation that can be difficult to navigate. Therefore, various guidance documents and websites exist to help understand in greater detail scheduling and Scheduled Monument Consent (SMC) when necessary. These include:

- Historic England website: Scheduled Monument Consent [https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/planning/consents/smc/]

DESIGNATION OVERVIEW

• Listed Building status can only be applied to above ground structures, meaning that scheduling is the only legal protection available to archaeological sites.
• Unlike listed buildings, there is no grading system for scheduled monuments.
• Scheduling cannot be applied to an ecclesiastical building in ecclesiastical use.
• Scheduling cannot be applied to a building in use as a dwelling, unless the person living there is employed as a caretaker of the site.
• The Principles of Selection are defined by the Secretary of State for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport and include: Period; Rarity; Documentation/Finds; Group value; Survival/condition; Fragility/vulnerability; Diversity; and Potential. These form the basis for decision making when considering granting consent.
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THE CONSENT PROCESS

Key Facts:

- If a scheduled monument is also a listed building, Listed Building Consent is not necessary.
- It is illegal to use a metal detector or remove an object found at a scheduled monument without a licence from Historic England.
- Any works to the upstanding elements or any activity below the ground surface requires Scheduled Monument Consent, regardless of the reason for the works being proposed.
- Where works to a scheduled monument involve development (for example a new building or the creation of new floor area), planning consent is also required.
- Most of the upstanding remains of the Abbey, including the gatehouses, sections of inner and outer precinct walls, ruins of the church, claustral ranges and associated structures are also Grade I listed. For these structures Listed Building Consent would not be needed in addition to Scheduled Monument Consent.

If you want to carry out any works to a scheduled monument, you will need to obtain Scheduled Monument Consent (SMC) in advance of these works. ‘Works’ are defined as demolishing, destroying, damaging, removing, repairing, altering, adding to, flooding or tipping material onto a monument. Application for SMC is made to Historic England who review the application on behalf of the Secretary of State for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport.

Changes to scheduled monuments are usually only approved if they are for the repair, maintenance, improvement or general enhancement of the monument. Proposals which alter the form, character or setting of the monument, which remove historic fabric or deposits, or which damage any part of the monument are strongly objected to.

If SMC is granted, it may be subject to conditions intended to ensure the works carried out are done in a sensitive and appropriate way. These may specify methods of working, or arrangements for archaeological investigation and recording.

There are some exemptions from obtaining SMC, mainly related to agriculture and gardening, which are covered by Class Consents (see The Ancient Monuments (Class Consents) Order 1994). Within the site, the following may apply (note that these have been paraphrased from the legislation).

Class Consent 1
Agricultural, Horticultural and Forestry Works allows the digging in the planted areas of the gardens to a depth of 300mm. Any digging below this depth or any planting or uprooting of trees, shrubs and hedges is not permitted nor is the laying of paths or erection of fences or other barriers.

Class Consent 5
For works urgently needed for safety and health, which should be done to the minimum levels necessary and followed up with written justification.

Class Consent 7
Works of archaeological evaluation being carried out as part of an existing SMC application that are necessary for determination of that application. It would need to be carried out under supervision of and to specifications by an appropriate body such as Historic England.

Class Consent 8
For works carried out as part of a formal agreement, such as Standing Clearance.

Class Consent 9
For works carried out utilising grant aid from Historic England.

Class Consents 6 and 10
For works carried out by Historic England and for works carried out in areas under the guardianship of English Heritage. Note that Consent 10 relates to carrying out survey works.

It is recommended that the boundaries of English Heritage guardianship are clearly defined as this may affect the need (or lack thereof) for SMC.
A building, object or structure that has been placed on a statutory list maintained by Historic England. They are deemed to be of national importance.

LISTED BUILDINGS WITHIN THE PROJECT AREA

There are 21 Grade I listed buildings within the project area including 12 separate designations relating to the Abbey precinct wall, gates and churches and seven designations relating to the ruins of the Abbey. There are three Grade II* listed buildings and 115 Grade II listed structures, of which over 100 relate to memorials in the Great Churchyard. This unusually high number of listed structures does not downgrade their individual importance, as they should be considered as singularly significant as well as part of a wider group.

GRADE I LISTED BUILDINGS

- Precinct wall to north of the Former Abbey of St Edmund
- Precinct wall to north of the Abbey Gate
- North wall of the Great Court
- Alwyne House and Alwyne Cottage
- Abbots Bridge and adjoining East Precinct wall
- Abbey Gate and Gatehouse
- Ruins of Abbey Dovecote and part of wall
- Precinct wall to south of the Abbey Gate
- Ruins to the north of the Cloister
- Ruins of Hall of Pleas and south wall of Great Court
- Ruins to east and north of Abbey Church
- Cathedral Church of St James
- Norman Tower
- 1—3 West Front
- Ruins of Abbey Church of St Edmund
- Provost’s House (The Deanery)
- Church of St Mary and attached wall and railings

GRADE II* LISTED BUILDINGS

- Abbey House
- 31, 32 and 33 Angel Hill
- St Margaret’s House

GRADE II LISTED BUILDINGS

- Sworders
- Crescent House
- The One Bull Pub
- Richard Green and Partners
- 24 Angel Hill
- 22, 22a and 23a Angel Hill
- 19, 19a and 21 Angel Hill
- 26, 28 and 29 Mustow Street
- Lark House
- Garden House
- Eastgate Cottage
- 34 Angel Hill
- Tower House
- Tower Cottage

LEGISLATION AND GUIDANCE

Listed buildings are designated and protected under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. The criteria set out to determine what structures should be listed is defined here, stating that they should be of Architectural and Historic interest. The legislation also outlines the process for applying to make changes to listed buildings, known as Listed Building Consent (LBC).

Various guidance documents and websites exist to help understand in greater detail how the listed building consent process works. These include:

- West Suffolk Council website: Listed Building Consent [https://www.westsuffolk.gov.uk/planning/planning_applications/lbc11.cfm]
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DESIGNATION OVERVIEW

- Even though scheduling is considered the preeminent designation, this does not downgrade the importance of listed buildings that sit within the boundaries of the scheduled monuments within the site. These are significant in their own right.
- All buildings constructed before 1700 which survive in anything like their original condition are listed, as are most of those built between 1700 and 1840. Particularly careful selection is required for buildings from the period after 1945. Usually a building must be over 30 years old to be eligible for listing.
- There are different grades of listed buildings:
  - Grade I—buildings of exceptional interest (approximately 2% of listed buildings)
  - Grade II*—particularly important and more than special interest (approximately 4% of listed buildings)
  - Grade II—buildings of special interest, warranting every effort being made to preserve them (approximately 94% of listed buildings). Although the most prolific grade of buildings, there are still fewer than half a million Grade II listed buildings in England, meaning they are of great cultural significance.
- The designation of listed buildings applies to:
  - The building, structure or object itself
  - Any object or structure fixed to it
  - Any object or structure within its curtilage

- Key Facts:
  - If a scheduled monument is also a listed building, listed building consent is not necessary.
  - Ecclesiastical buildings currently used for worship or now vacant (and never having had any other use) are exempt from listed building consent under Ecclesiastical Exemption (see page 19).
  - Most but not all works to listed buildings require listed building consent (see below).
  - Listed building consent is required for works to associated structures or buildings that are also deemed to be listed as part of the curtilage of the listed building.
  - Listed building consent is not required for works that only affect the setting or view of a listed building. However, a heritage impact assessment will be required as part of the planning application.
  - Listed building consent is valid only if all the conditions of the consent are discharged within the required time frame.
  - Liability for works carried out without listed building consent transfer from one owner to the next.

This means that when a building is listed, it is listed in its entirety. Even if the list description held by Historic England describes only the exterior, it nonetheless includes the interior as well.

THE CONSENT PROCESS

Listed Building Consent (LBC) is needed for any works involving demolition, extension or alteration of a listed building that would affect its character as a building of special archaeological or historic interest.

It is not possible to give a definitive list of works that do or do not require listed building consent as it varies from building to building. For example, generally it is acceptable to replace decorative finishes in a listed building but not if they are of historic interest. Similarly, consent is not usually required for small scale repairs that are carried out using the same materials and techniques as the original/historic existing fabric; this is known as like-for-like repair (see information box on following page). If there is any uncertainty as to whether listed building consent is required, advice should be sought.

Having early discussions with the relevant key stakeholders is important, and for more complex and detailed applications – especially those that include demolition – it is suggested that a pre-application process is carried out. Whilst approval of applications is always granted by the Local Authority, consultation with Historic England is also necessary for Grade II* and Grade I listed buildings.

Part of the process of applying for LBC is to understand the impact that changes will have on the heritage significance of the listed building. This typically means that a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) will need to be submitted as supporting evidence with the consent application. There is no standard format for these so it is beneficial to speak to the Local Authority and/or Historic England about their expectations and to work with a heritage professional.

If LBC is granted, it may be subject to conditions intended to ensure the works carried out are done so in a sensitive and appropriate way. These may specify methods of working, or arrangements for archaeological investigation and recording.

Curtilage and Consent

There is no specific definition of the extent of a listed building but broadly any structure that existed at the time of the listed building’s designation may be deemed to be curtilage listed. A curtilage listed structure may not be physically attached to a listed building so a detached shed or garden wall may be curtilage listed. Anything that is considered curtilage listed will be subject to LBC; it is therefore recommended that early discussions are held with Historic England to clarify the extent of the listing. This may require an historic assessment of the site.

For more information see the Historic England guidance Listed Buildings and Curtilage.
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**Like-for-like repair**

This is the repair, generally minor in scale, of built fabric utilising the same materials and techniques to maintain overall appearance, character and heritage significance. Sometimes this is not appropriate, for example where previous repairs used inappropriate materials, such as cement mortar, that are causing harm to the significant historic fabric. In these cases, discussions should be had with Historic England or the Local Authority about how to repair in a more appropriate way.

**Examples of like-for-like repair**

- Replacement of a small number of slate tiles on a roof
- Painting an interior wall or exterior wall the same colour and with same paint type
- Replacement of a window pane with same type of glass and retaining the mullions

**Examples where like-for-like repair is not appropriate**

- Re-painting a wall or room with lead paint
- Re-pointing a brick wall using cement mortar

**Examples of what is not like-for-like repair**

- Replacement of an entire door or window with a replica
- Rebuilding an entire chimney stack, even in same style with re-used materials

**CLARITY FOR LISTED BUILDINGS**

There are some legislative measures in place that can help clarify listed buildings and in doing so clarify the LBC process. These are outlined below.

**Certificate of Immunity from Listing**

A legal document certifying that a building is not at present listable and will not be listed or subject to a Building Preservation Order for a period of five years. Application requires research and justification and is made to Historic England. More information can be found here: [https://content.historicengland.org.uk/content/docs/listing/applications-coi-from-listing.pdf](https://content.historicengland.org.uk/content/docs/listing/applications-coi-from-listing.pdf)

**Certificates of Lawfulness for Proposed Works**

This provides formal confirmation that proposed works will not require LBC as they do not affect the character or special interest of the listed building. Application requires information about the proposed works and details of the listed building and is made to the Local Authority. More information can be found here: [https://ecab.planningportal.co.uk/uploads/1/app/guidance/guidance_note-lawful-development_certificates.pdf](https://ecab.planningportal.co.uk/uploads/1/app/guidance/guidance_note-lawful-development_certificates.pdf)

**Enhanced Listing Description**

This provides a more detailed listing description including what is and is not included within the listing. It is helpful for buildings that lack clarity around curtilage, have modern extensions or have been majorly altered on the interior. Application requires historic research and justification and is made to Historic England. More information can be found here: [https://historicengland.org.uk/services-skills/our-planning-services/enhanced-advisory-services/listing/enhancement/](https://historicengland.org.uk/services-skills/our-planning-services/enhanced-advisory-services/listing/enhancement/)

---

**04 CONSERVATION AREAS: PLANNING CONSENT**

A conservation area is an area of special architectural or historic interest, the character of which is desirable to preserve or enhance. A large part of the project area is within the Town Centre Conservation Area.

**THE TOWN CENTRE CONSERVATION AREA**

Much of the project area is part of the Town Centre Conservation Area. Within the site, the area excluded from the conservation area is the site of some of the former Abbey vineyards, now occupied by the vacant St James School, a care home and terraced housing. The conservation area also extends beyond the boundaries of the project area; the full conservation area extents can be found here: [https://www.westsuffolk.gov.uk/planning/Conservation/upload/Bury-St-Edmunds-Town-Centre-Conservation-Area.pdf](https://www.westsuffolk.gov.uk/planning/Conservation/upload/Bury-St-Edmunds-Town-Centre-Conservation-Area.pdf)

There is a Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan which outlines the history, development, character and management policies of the conservation area, which was adopted in 2007. This can be accessed here: [https://www.westsuffolk.gov.uk/planning/Conservation/upload/ConservationAreaAppraisalBury080309.pdf](https://www.westsuffolk.gov.uk/planning/Conservation/upload/ConservationAreaAppraisalBury080309.pdf)
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THE CONSENT PROCESS

Conservation areas are governed under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, which sets out the overarching requirement for local authorities to identify and protect areas of special architectural or historic interest. The specific consent for works in a conservation area was abolished in 2013, meaning that works in a conservation area are now covered by Planning Permission.

More detailed guidance about works to conservation areas can be found here:

- Conservation Area https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/hpg/consent/cac/
- Planning Order and require permission from the council.
- Further information can be found here: https://www.westsuffolk.gov.uk/planning/Conservation/upload/Guide-to-Article-4-Directions-August-2016-2.pdf
- More information about this Article 4 Direction can be found here: https://www.westsuffolk.gov.uk/planning/Conservation/upload/Guide-to-Article-4-Directions-August-2016-2.pdf

Exemptions

Some exemptions from permission for demolition within a conservation area exist, based on size of building and height of fence, but in the case of the Town Centre Conservation Area these exemptions do not apply as they have been superseded by an Article 4 Direction (see next paragraph). One exemption that remains, which is for the demolition of any non-designated building erected since 1 January 1914 and in use, or last used, for the purposes of agriculture or forestry.

04 CONSERVATION AREAS: PLANNING CONSENT

Permitted Development and Article 4 Direction

Certain types of work to buildings and sites are sometimes exempt from planning permission if they are considered part of permitted development rights. Whilst these do still exist in conservation areas, they are reduced. Furthermore, the Local Authority have put in place an Article 4 Direction for the Town Centre Conservation Area which restricts permitted development rights. An Article 4 Direction is a legal statement allowing the council to further preserve the character of the conservation area. It does not preclude the ability to make changes, but instead requires more careful consideration of change.

The Article 4 Direction requires that original materials and features such as doors and windows are retained and repaired or replaced with a replica where repair is not possible. Where unsympathetic alterations have previously been carried out, original materials and features should be reinstated when possible.

Within this Article 4 Direction the following changes which are typically covered by permitted development will instead require planning permission:

- Any building operation consisting of the demolition of the whole or any part of any gate, fence, wall, or other means of enclosure.
- The painting of the exterior of any building.
- Works to any dwellinghouse, including:
  - enlargement, improvement or other alteration;
  - alteration to the roof of a dwellinghouse;
  - construction of a porch outside any external door;
  - provision of a hard surface or the replacement of such as surface;
  - installation, alteration (including removal) or replacement of a chimney, flue or soil vent pipe on any elevation;
- erection, construction, maintenance, improvement or alteration of a gate, fence, wall or other means of enclosure;
- installation, alteration or replacement of an electrical outlet mounted on a wall for recharging electric vehicles; or
- installation, alteration or replacement of solar PV or solar thermal equipment.

Note that any applications for planning permission required only because of the Article 4 Direction are free of charge.

More information about this Article 4 Direction can be found here: https://www.westsuffolk.gov.uk/planning/Conservation/upload/Guide-to-Article-4-Directions-August-2016-2.pdf

Trees in a Conservation Area

Any works to a tree in a conservation area requires six weeks’ notice given to the council, provided in writing. This notice will need to include what type of tree it is, where it is and what type of work is to be done. Some trees may also have a Tree Preservation Order and require permission from the council.

Further information can be found here: https://www.westsuffolk.gov.uk/planning/trees.cfm
**REGISTERED PARK AND GARDEN**

Historic England holds a ‘Register of Historic Parks and Gardens of special historic interest in England’. This identifies sites (there are currently over 1600) which are considered to be of particular heritage significance. This registration applies to an area identified as the Abbey Gardens and precincts within the project area.

Registered Parks and Gardens do not require their own consent or permission for works. Rather, registration is a ‘material consideration’ in the planning process. This means that the local authority must consider the impact of proposed development on special character and heritage significance. Therefore, when any works are proposed within the boundaries of the registration and other consents or permissions are required, an assessment of the impact on the gardens will be necessary.

**ECCLESIASTICAL EXEMPTION**

As established by the Ecclesiastical Exemption Order 2010, church buildings within the project area which are currently used for worship are exempt from listed building consent. For the Church of England, exemption applies to the following, which require faculty consent rather than listed building consent:

- any church building within the faculty jurisdiction;
- any object or structure within such a building;
- any object or structure attached to the exterior of the building; and
- any object or structure within the curtilage of such a church building although not fixed to the building.

However, the exemption does not apply to an object or structure attached to the building or within the curtilage if it is independently listed.

Exemptions from the requirement for faculty are known as de minimis works and include:

- maintenance and cleaning of churchyards;
- introduction or removal of moveable items; and
- the repair and maintenance of certain areas of church fabric and boundary walls so long as the appearance and structure is not affected and the costs are minimal.

Further information about ecclesiastical exemption and faculty can be found here: [http://www.churchcare.co.uk/churches/guidance-advice/making-changes-to-your-building/permissions/faculty-jurisdiction](http://www.churchcare.co.uk/churches/guidance-advice/making-changes-to-your-building/permissions/faculty-jurisdiction)

Despite this exemption, Historic England will often be consulted on certain proposals for change.

---

As outlined in the Care of Churches and Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction Measure 1991, all works, alterations and additions to parish churches, their churchyards and contents require faculty consent. It is the duty of the minister and churchwardens to obtain a faculty before carrying out any alterations. Therefore, changes to the buildings owned by the Cathedral and St Mary’s Church and any other elements related as per the above list will require Faculty consent. The Cathedral Chapter must apply for consent at a national level from the Cathedrals Fabric Commission for England and from the local Fabric Advisory Committee. Although not owned or managed by the Church of England, the great Churchyard is still deemed consecrated ground and works to it require faculty consent.

Note that if proposed changes are external to the building or affect the scheduled monument, further statutory consents will be required in addition.
06 SETTING AND VIEWS

As well as the different types of works that directly affect a heritage asset, works that are carried out in the vicinity of a heritage asset need to be assessed in terms of their impact on the setting and views of a heritage asset as part of the planning consent process.

SETTING

Setting is the surroundings in which a place is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the heritage asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the heritage significance of a heritage asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral. There is no limit on the size or extent of a heritage asset’s setting.

The setting of a heritage asset may be affected by changes such as:

• alterations to the landscape, including design, materials and planting;
• alterations to the boundary, either the line of the boundary or the type of boundary demarcation;
• removal of buildings or structures; and/or
• addition of buildings or structures.

In terms of assessing the impact of the change on the setting of a heritage asset, it is important to consider the setting of the heritage asset at the time when the heritage asset was created in its extant form and the way in which the setting has been altered, positively or negatively, since then.


VIEWS

Views contribute to the understanding and appreciation of heritage assets, collectively and individually. Views may have been deliberately planned or evolved as part of the process of the development of a place. Assessing the impact on views does not only relate to what can be seen today and whether a proposed change will hide a heritage asset or alter the frame for it. It also involves understanding how the view has evolved, or not, over time since the heritage asset was created.

Historic England provides guidance on assessing the impact of views in Seeing the History in the View (2011).

07 CONSENT EXAMPLES

Due to the sometimes complex nature of multiple designations within a single site or structure, it is helpful to see a set of examples demonstrating what consents may be necessary.

On the following page is a table that sets out the consents required for several different buildings or areas within the project area as examples to illustrate the types of consent needed for different types of heritage assets. It also lists heritage elements that are material considerations to a planning application but which do not require an additional consent. Note that listed building consent is not required for certain types of works, such as internal decoration (see page 14).

The location of the examples is shown on the plan below.
### 07 CONSENT EXAMPLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type of Heritage Asset</th>
<th>Consent(s) Required</th>
<th>Material Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 01 St Mary’s Church | Ecclesiastical listed building in a conservation area | No, No | Only for external additions or demolition | External works only:  
- Impact on setting of nearby listed buildings  
- Impact on registered park  
- Impact on conservation area |
| 02 Deanery | Post-medieval listed building, scheduled below ground, in a conservation area | Only for below ground works | Yes | Only for external additions or demolition |
| 03 Deanery Garden Wall | Post-medieval listed structure, scheduled below ground, in a conservation area | Only for below ground works | Yes | Only for external additions or demolition |
| 04 Abbey Church Ruins | Medieval upstanding and below ground scheduled monument, listed building in a conservation area | Yes, No | Only for additions or demolition |

### 07 CONSENT EXAMPLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type of Heritage Asset</th>
<th>Consent(s) Required</th>
<th>Material Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05 Abbey Precincts</td>
<td>Unlisted building with scheduled monument below ground, in a conservation area</td>
<td>Only for below ground works</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 St Margaret House</td>
<td>Listed building in a conservation area</td>
<td>Only for below ground works</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07 Former Eastgate Nursery</td>
<td>Part of scheduled monument in a conservation area</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08 St James’s Middle School</td>
<td>Unlisted modern building in the setting of a conservation area</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09 Wall near St James’s School</td>
<td>Scheduled wall, not in a conservation area</td>
<td>Yes, No</td>
<td>No (apart from additions)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Additions or demolition only:  
- Impact on setting of nearby listed buildings  
- Impact on registered park  
- Impact on conservation area  
- External works only:  
- Impact on setting of nearby listed buildings  
- Impact on registered park  
- Impact on conservation area  
- For works not covered by permitted development  
- External works only:  
- Impact on conservation area
08 TYPES OF WORK

Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance outlines various types of work, which form part of the process of determining if an application and the level of potential harm within the proposals are acceptable. These types of works are included below, along with an understanding of how impact and justification can be assessed.

It should be noted that Conservation Principles is about to be reissued and the draft of the revision omitted the criteria for different types of work, the criteria in the 2008 version nonetheless provide a useful framework to navigate assessing heritage impact. They appear in an expanded form in Historic England Advice Note 2: Making Changes to Heritage Assets (2016).

Repair
Repair necessary to sustain the heritage values of a significant place is normally desirable if:

- there is sufficient information comprehensively to understand the impacts of the proposals on the significance of the place;
- the long-term consequences of the proposals can, from experience, be demonstrated to be benign, or the proposals are designed not to prejudice alternative solutions in the future; and
- the proposals are designed to avoid or minimise harm, if actions necessary to sustain particular heritage values tend to conflict.

As a result of the inevitable decay of built fabric, repairs will be necessary to prolong the life of a heritage asset. Repairs should generally be carried out on a like-for-like basis in terms of materials and techniques. This means using the same materials and techniques as were used historically. This will ensure that the repairs should be benign and will not cause harm.

Unfortunately, sometimes repairs have been undertaken in the past using inappropriate materials, which have caused harm or expedited the deterioration of the surviving historic fabric. For example, the use of cementitious mortar to repoint brickwork instead of lime mortar causes the failure of the brickwork because the cement is harder than the brick and so water becomes trapped in the brick, resulting in deterioration of the brick. In such cases, like-for-like repairs are not appropriate. Reverting to the historic materials will usually overcome this and once again, the repairs should then be benign and not cause harm.

Sometimes the original materials or techniques used were poor or have not stood the test of time. In such circumstances, there may be a case for using a different material or technique to effect a repair. However, the proposed alternative material or technique needs to be known to be benign or at least to be reversible so that in the future an alternative solution can be implemented if necessary.

On other occasions, for example, where a small area of stone or brick has failed, it is better to carry out a small repair than repair the entire piece of stone or brick. In such a case, a lime mortar may be used to carry out the repair. This would be using a different material but one that is known to be benign and not cause harm.

Works to Increase Knowledge of the Past
Intervention in significant places primarily to increase knowledge of the past, involving material loss of evidential values, should normally be acceptable if:

- preservation in situ is not reasonably practicable; or
- it is demonstrated that the potential increase in knowledge
  - cannot be achieved using non-destructive techniques;
  - is unlikely to be achieved at another place whose destruction is inevitable; and
  - is predicted decisively to outweigh the loss of the primary resource.

If acceptable, an intervention demands:

- a skilled team, with the resources to implement a project design based on explicit research objectives;
- funded arrangements for the subsequent conservation and public deposit of the site archive, and for appropriate analysis and dissemination of the results within a set timetable; and
- a strategy to ensure that other elements and values of the place are not prejudiced by the work, whether at the time or subsequently, including conservation of any elements left exposed.

This sets out the justification required for works that are for research and investigation purposes, such as archaeological excavation, when there is no other reason for undertaking the works other than to understand what is or might historically have been in a place. A proposal for such work needs to show either that the historic material cannot be preserved in situ or that it will give a significant increase in understanding that cannot be delivered by other, less intrusive means at the site in question or elsewhere and that that the knowledge gained will outweigh the loss of historic fabric.

The justification also requires a demonstrably skilled team to carry out the work, sufficient funding for the work and the subsequent analysis and a strategy for preserving the heritage significance of the site including the future conservation of any discovered fabric that is left exposed.

Restoration
Restoration of a significant place should normally be acceptable if:

- the heritage values of the elements that would be restored decisively outweigh the values of those that would be lost;
- the work proposed is justified by compelling evidence of the evolution of the place, and is executed in accordance with that evidence;
- the form in which the place currently exists is not the result of an historically-significant event;
- the work proposed respects previous forms of the place, and/or
- the maintenance implications of the proposed restoration are considered to be sustainable.
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The important points to consider when seeking to justify proposed restoration are:

- any loss of historic fabric or heritage significance deriving from accumulated layers of historical development can demonstrably be outweighed by the heritage significance of the restored asset;
- there is a thorough and complete understanding of the historical development of the heritage asset or the part affected that accounts for the creation of the asset up to the historic period that the asset is to be restored back to and for the changes that have led to the asset being as it is currently. The changes that have been made since the period to which the asset is to be restored must not be historically significant. For example, the Dissolution of the Monasteries is a historically significant event as is the destruction of the Abbey of St Edmund that resulted from it therefore the restoration of the Abbey would not be considered acceptable. The loss of the first floor of the Abbey Gate, by contrast, was not the result of the Dissolution or another significant event and therefore it might be possible to develop a case for its restoration.
- restoration must not result in a form of the heritage asset that has not existed historically. For example, if restoring a historic interior, the walls should not be taken back to an earlier decorative scheme and the fireplace would not have been seen together.
- it will be affordable to maintain the proposed restoration in the future. For example, sometimes historic landscapes are lost because they were too expensive to maintain and recreating that historic landscape will create an unsustainable cost of maintenance in the future that will ultimately result in its deterioration and loss again.

Restoration is incredibly difficult to justify and in most circumstances, it is better not to call proposed works a restoration and to justify them as an alteration.

New Works and Alteration
New work or alteration to a significant place should normally be acceptable if:

- there is sufficient information comprehensively to understand the impacts of the proposal on the significance of the place;
- the proposal would not materially harm the values of the place, which, where appropriate, would be reinforced or further revealed;
- the proposals aspire to a quality of design and execution which may be valued now and in the future; and
- the long-term consequences of the proposals can, from experience, be demonstrated to be benign, or the proposals are designed not to prejudice alternative solutions in the future.

New works and alterations cover a considerable array of potential work to a heritage asset from minor alterations to entirely new buildings in the setting of a heritage asset. The following provides a very brief indication of what is required by each criterion.

- There is sufficient information comprehensively to understand the impacts of the proposal on the significance of the place: This means providing sufficient information on the historical development and significance of the affected heritage asset and its setting and key views to understand the significance of what is being impacted.

The proposal would not materially harm the values of the place, which, where appropriate, would be reinforced or further revealed: This means demonstrating that there is no harm to the heritage significance of the heritage asset as a result of the proposals and, if possible, the significance would be made more obvious. To demonstrate there is no harm, the impact of each component of the work should be assessed, inter alia, in terms of:

- the significance of the fabric being removed (fabric being removed might be the fabric of part of a wall or roof, a partition, a door, a window, structural elements of a floor or ceiling, floorboards or floor covering, wall and ceiling plaster and finishes)
- the impact on the historic layout or plan form of an existing building of removals or additions
- the visual impact of any additions.

The proposals aspire to a quality of design and execution which may be valued now and in the future: This means that the changes or additions have been designed to a high standard and also will be constructed to a high standard in terms of materials and techniques used. The requirement for valuing in the future implies durability.

The long-term consequences of the proposals can, from experience, be demonstrated to be benign, or the proposals are designed not to prejudice alternative solutions in the future: This means that either the proposals can be fully reversed with little or no difficulty because there has been little or no loss of historic fabric or that permanent changes have been tested elsewhere or trialled here and can be shown not to cause harm to retained historic fabric.
APPENDIX D

TABLE OF LISTED MONUMENTS IN THE GREAT CHURCHYARD
This table is based on the information in the listing descriptions for the monuments. The information has been tabulated to provide an understanding of the large number of listed structures in the Great Churchyard and to enable it to be used as the basis for potential interpretation projects. There is a more detailed study of all the monuments, including the unlisted ones and the ones removed, which was prepared in the 1970s and is available in the Suffolk Record Office.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List Entry Number</th>
<th>Area (N, NW, E, C, W)</th>
<th>Type (e.g. coffin stone, headstone, box tomb)</th>
<th>No. of monuments</th>
<th>Name(s) of Commemorated</th>
<th>Date(s)</th>
<th>Notable Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1021924</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Headstone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1791</td>
<td>Decorated with an urn and foliage, with pilasters at the sides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1021925</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Head and foot stone; box tomb</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Unknown; Edward Thomas, Ann, Frederick William Charles, Hester, Anna, Charles and Hester Blomfield</td>
<td>C18, 1822, 1822, 1833, 1806, 1800, 1871, 1844</td>
<td>Headstone has a cartouche with 3 winged angel heads; Egyptian style box tomb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1021926</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Coffin tomb with head and footstone x2; coffin stone; box tomb</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Susannah Ely; Edward Ely; John Chatten; John, William, Albert, Harry, George, Sarah and Ellen Portway</td>
<td>1799, 1801, 1847, 1833, 1895, 1844, 1880, 1833, 1868, 1881, 1911</td>
<td>Headstone has a winged angel head and foliage; headstone with an urn in an oval over palms; small tombstone for 2-year old child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1021927</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Coffin tomb with head and footstone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1747</td>
<td>Headstone has a winged angel head and foliage with eggshell festoons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1021929</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Tombstone with head and foot stone x2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>John and Robert Pizey; Robert and Mary Pizey</td>
<td>1790 and 1837; 1794, 1787 and 1771</td>
<td>Headstone with an open book flanked by winged angel heads; headstone with an open book flanked by winged angel heads and trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1021931</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Box tomb</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>James, Mary, Mary, Elizabeth, Rebecca, James, William, James, Rebecca, and James Paulett</td>
<td>1782, 1805, 1775, 1775, 1775, 1837, 1846, 1769, 1772, 1769</td>
<td>Large Egyptian style box tomb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1021932</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Coffin stone with head and footstone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Elizabeth Harvey</td>
<td>1820</td>
<td>Headstone with an inscription in a circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1021933</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Box tomb</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Martha, Frances Ann, Thomas, and Mary Frances Hockley</td>
<td>1813, 1845, 1804, 1830</td>
<td>Unusual whirling circles on the side panels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1021935</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Coffin tomb with head and footstones</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Headstone with crossed palm and olive branches, rays and drapes enveloping winged angel heads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1021936</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Chest tomb</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rebecca, Maria, William, Rupert and Ann Maria Prigg</td>
<td>1836, 1822</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1021937</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Coffin tomb with head and footstone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S.P.</td>
<td>1776</td>
<td>Headstone with a winged angel head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List Entry Number</td>
<td>Area (N, NW, E, C, W)</td>
<td>Type (e.g. coffin stone, headstone, box tomb)</td>
<td>No. of monuments</td>
<td>Name(s) of Commemorated</td>
<td>Date(s)</td>
<td>Notable Features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1021938</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Headstone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Henry and Hannah Calfe</td>
<td>1818</td>
<td>Angel's head with ornate collar and no wings. Flanked by hearts over crossed arrows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1021939</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Coffin stone with head and footstone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S. and E. Rogers</td>
<td>1747, 1791</td>
<td>Headstone with Eye of God in clouds, flanked by winged angel heads and flowers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1021940</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Headstones</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Martha Crane; Robert Thompson; Mary Mazaber; Robert, Sarah, and Sarah Ann Thompson; William James Mostram; Mary and John Fulcher; H.B.; William Day; John Reckling and Mary Scott; James and Martha Hoy; Mrs Herbert; Issac Chesson; Mary; Ster? Scott; William Ster?; Thomas and Ann Cockedge; Unknown; Bernard, Elizabeth and Alice Mills; Robert Hayward; William and Mary Pizey; Sarah Pizey; Susan; Henry Miller; Elizabeth and George Challis; children of John and Elizabeth Smith; John Edward Cockedge; John, Ann and John Garnham; John Dooley; Sarah Dooley; William Buck; Mary Fish</td>
<td>1740; Unknown; C19; 1833, 1831, 1853; c.1873; 1807, 1827; 1757; 1741; 1714; 1711; 1690, 1846, 1828, 1835; 1710; 1826; 1724, 1755; unknown; C19; 1784, 1771; 1800; 1710, 1685, 1706; 1744, 1761; 1791; 1719; C19; 1837; C19; 1877; 17??; 17??, 1821, 1838; 1817; C19; 1832; 1710</td>
<td>Headstones set against a wall. Decoration featuring winged angel heads, flowers, draped urns, skull and cross-bones. John Reckling and Mary Scott's monument a palimpsest reused for Scott at a later date with her inscription on the reverse. Monument of John Edward Cockedge evidences a mason's error as the name 'Edward' has been carved over 'Frederick'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1245043</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Coffin with head and foot stones; headstone; headstone; headstone; headstone; headstone; coffin-shaped ledger; headstone; headstone</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>John and Ann Bull; Richard ?; Frances Daniel; Thomas ?; George Griggs; Elizabeth Griggs</td>
<td>1809; 1707; C18; 1786; 1807; 1818</td>
<td>Flat coffin; top with two tulips; open book in tondo; old style plumb line carved on south side, possibly for trade or freemason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1245044</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Headstone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>OBE</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>Cherub resting left elbow on skull in tondo and another cherub blowing a trumpit and holding a scroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1245045</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Headstone; coffin-shaped ledger; flat coffin-shaped ledger; coffin shaped ledger; box tomb; flat ledger slab; headstone; headstone</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Susan Craske; ? Craske; unknown; unknown; Sarah and Thomas Wilson; Robert and Ann Beeps</td>
<td>1699; 1715; C18; c.1715; c.1711; 1789, 1809 ; 1752, 1748</td>
<td>Winged angel head flanked by draped skulls; identically carved winged angel heads; broken headstone; Rococo panel at east end; bold skull decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List Entry Number</td>
<td>Area (N, NW, E, C, W)</td>
<td>Type (e.g. coffin stone, headstone, box tomb)</td>
<td>No. of monuments</td>
<td>Name(s) of Commemorated</td>
<td>Date(s)</td>
<td>Notable Features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1245046</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Headstone x3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Unknown; Samuel King; Samuel King</td>
<td>C18; 1736; 1702</td>
<td>Three winged angel heads and drapes; Samuel King was local collar maker; winged angel head flanked by skulls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1245047</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Headstone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Elizabeth Macro</td>
<td>1703</td>
<td>Bold cartouche with skull and cross-bones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1245048</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Coffin stone x3; box tomb; flat stone; slab tomb; headstone; flat tomb ledger; oval tomb; flat stone</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mary and William Steggles; William Elven; Humphrey William and Humphrey Richard Steggles; Sophia, William, Maria, James Frederick, William Henry, William, June Helen, Zachariah, Maria, Mary Ann, Frederic, and Mary Ann Steggles; Humphrey Steggles; Richard Marshall; Hannah Newbury; Ursula, Matthew, Mary Annie, Thomas, Fanny Elizabeth, Catherine Alice, Mary, and William Thomas Jackson de Carle; Johan and Alice de Carle; Charles William de Carle</td>
<td>1832, 1834; 1836; 1856, 1859, 1851, 1815, 1843, 1840, 1841, 1822, 1885, 1820, 1829, 1829; 1819; 1823; unknown; 1822, 1841, 1852, 1863, 1867, 1874, 1881; 1828; 1822</td>
<td>Box tomb was formerly railed and has round pillows in each corner; Richard Marshall inscription reveals he was a Quarter Master who served with Suffolk Militia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1245049</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Box tomb</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ann, John, William and Margaret Cooke</td>
<td>1799, 1799, 1779, 1825</td>
<td>Bat-winged skull and palms at the east end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1245050</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Pedestal tomb; coffin stone; headstone</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mary and Robert Nunn and their five children; John and Catherine Twinn; James Thomson</td>
<td>1846, 1865; 1834, 1844; 1837</td>
<td>Thomson's inscription reveals that he was a painter from Haddington, East Lothian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1245051</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Flat stone; box tomb</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Marmaduke and Isabella Beand; Edward Bourne</td>
<td>1820, 1850; 1635</td>
<td>Mummy-stone' shaped and rounded body-stone between head and footstone; old tomb with thick ledger slab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1245091</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Tomb x5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Edward Bourne; John and Philip Bourne; R.S.; Rev. William and Rebecca Lincolne</td>
<td>1635; 1638, 1639; C18; 1758; 1792, 1782</td>
<td>Old box tomb with thick ledger x2; tomb restored 1992; Rev. Lincolne was the Pastor of his Presbyterian Congregation for 35 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1245092</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Box tomb</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alice , John and Sarah Brown, Timona Fox, Caroline Matilda and Thomas West</td>
<td>1796, 1831, 1776, 1844, 1850</td>
<td>Console-type box tomb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1245093</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Box tomb</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Thomas Moore and family; John Steele an family; Hannah Moore McLeroth and family</td>
<td>1811, 1762, 1894</td>
<td>Square box tomb with a pointed top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List Entry Number</td>
<td>Area (N, NW, E, C, W)</td>
<td>Type (e.g. coffin stone, headstone, box tomb)</td>
<td>No. of monuments</td>
<td>Name(s) of Commemorated</td>
<td>Date(s)</td>
<td>Notable Features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1245094</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Headstone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Matthew Paine</td>
<td>1719</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1245095</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Headstone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Susanna Pentony</td>
<td>1709</td>
<td>Plain early design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1245096</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Coffin stone with head and footstone; headstone</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>C18; early C19</td>
<td>Elaborate headstone with a skull surmounting a coat of arms; square headstone with skull over crossed branched and winged angel heads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1245097</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Headstone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>C18</td>
<td>Skull and cross bones with winged angel heads and a round bellied cartouche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1245098</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Tombstone; box tomb</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Unknown; Isabella Browne</td>
<td>Early C18; early C19</td>
<td>No visible detail; tomb with coat of arms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1245099</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Coffin stone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Elizabeth Porter Rivett</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>Triangular coffin stone with round ends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1245100</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Headstone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>C18</td>
<td>Winged angel heads flanking a bell shape, on each side of the inscription a full length skeleton with cross-bones and an hourglass on its head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1245101</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Box tomb; head and footstone; headstone</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Prudence, Stephen, Thomas and James Hailstone; unknown; John, Thomas and Henry Mils; George and Elizabeth Candler</td>
<td>1806, 1807; 1660, 1661, 1689, 1695, 1696; 1752, 1727</td>
<td>Candler tomb is elaborate with angel heads, skulls, drapes, urns and pilasters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1245102</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Headstone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Early C18</td>
<td>Coat of arms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1245103</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Tombstone; headstone; coffin-shaped ledger</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>John Parkerson and Ann de Carle; James, Ann, James, Ann, Mary and Elizabeth Irwin; Joseph and Ann Manning and five de Carle children; unknown</td>
<td>1829; 1756; 1794, 1817; 1825</td>
<td>Portland and York stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1245104</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Headstone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>C18</td>
<td>Winged angel head and winged skull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1245106</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Headstone x4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Unknown; Philip Steckles; John Cooke; Martha and Martha Darby</td>
<td>C18; 1701; 1701; 1832</td>
<td>Cartouche with winged angel heads and side lacing; words 'Remember your latter end'; winged angel head and skull; winged angel head and ribbon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List Entry Number</td>
<td>Area (N, NW, E, C, W)</td>
<td>Type (e.g. coffin stone, headstone, box tomb)</td>
<td>No. of monuments</td>
<td>Name(s) of Commemorated</td>
<td>Date(s)</td>
<td>Notable Features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1245107</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Box tomb x3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>John, John, Rebecca, John and Simon Cumberland, Samuel and Robert Buck; Samuel and Sarah Cumberland, Ann Robinson, John, Sarah, John and Ann Crosbie, William, John, William and Sarah Buck; Mary, Thomas, Elizabeth, Thomas, Thomas, Henry, Mary, Thomas, Henry, Crabb, Elizabeth, Thomas Henry, Caroline Anne, and Emily Mary Robinson, Henry Hutchinson</td>
<td>1755, 1781, 1793, 1809, 1852, 1860; 1760, 1768, 1781, 1796, 1787, 1838, 1854, 1838, 1839, 1818, 1804, 1765, 1777, 1790, 1797, 1815, 1826, 1860, 1867, 1803, 1841, 1829, 1836, 1856</td>
<td>The Buck family were local maltsters and brewers, coat of arms on top of the ledger. Henry Crabb Robinson was a diarist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1245108</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Headstone x3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>G. A. Rayment; Elizabeth Abbott and five of her children; Samuel, Susannah, Mary and Elizabeth Neagus</td>
<td>1769; 1846; 1833, 1845</td>
<td>Palimpsest with two winged angel heads flanking a crown; palimpsest with a skull and palms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1245109</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Headstone; tombstone; coffin stone; coffin stone; headstone; coffin stone; coffin stone; coffin stone</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Robert Ely, William Smith and children; Thomas Jacob; Marianne and Henry Shadow Young; Amelia Lockwood; Mary Anne and John Cambridge; Thomas and Ann Young and children; Ann and John Clemence</td>
<td>1844; unknown; 1831, 1846; 1847; C18; 1824, 1857; 1821, 1826; 1818, 1850</td>
<td>Reused palimpsest with original inscription for William Smith now upside down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1245111</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Headstone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>John Howe</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>Winged angel head flanked by skulls; cartouche with a cat-like head at the top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1272035</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Coffin stone; box tomb</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mary, Thomas, Josiah, Thomas and Martha Powell; Will, William, Martha and Christopher Johnson</td>
<td>Early C19, 1836, 1836; 1816, 1820, 1835, 1845</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1272036</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Tomb and headstone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Frances Robinson, Joseph, Emma and Henry Mayhew</td>
<td>1837, 1846, 1836, 1847</td>
<td>Rounded, barrelled and inscribed body-stone, only example of this in the churchyard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1272037</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Head and foot stone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>William Middleditch</td>
<td>1834</td>
<td>Verse epitaph to the Sergeant Major in the West Suffolk Grenadier Guards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List Entry Number</td>
<td>Area (N, NW, E, C, W)</td>
<td>Type (e.g. coffin stone, headstone, box tomb)</td>
<td>No. of Monuments</td>
<td>Name(s) of Commemorated</td>
<td>Date(s)</td>
<td>Notable Features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1272038</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Headstone x2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Unknown; Mary Wicks</td>
<td>Late C18/early C19; 1829</td>
<td>Winged angel head flanked by skulls; good cartouche with a winged angel head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1272039</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Headstone x3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Elizabeth and Samuel Head; unknown; Samuel Head</td>
<td>1778; late C18/early C19; 1781</td>
<td>Decorated with winged angel heads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1272040</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Head and footstone; headstone</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1767; C18</td>
<td>Decorated with winged angel heads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1272041</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Headstone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Early C19</td>
<td>Decorated with a winged angel head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1272042</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Monument</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1738</td>
<td>Winged skull and partly legible inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1272043</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Headstone x4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Early C19; early C19; early C19; 1799</td>
<td>Winged skull with crossed palms and an hourglass; large winged angel heads; flower festoons and winged angel heads flanking an Eye of God; winged angel heads flanking a pyramid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1272044</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Headstone x2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ann Chilver; Richard H...</td>
<td>1777; 1769</td>
<td>Winged angel heads and foliage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1272045</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Headstone; coffin stone; headstone x2; coffin-shaped ledger</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hannah and Fanny Hayward; Hannah and Robert Hayward; Lockwood family; W. and Ann Debenham; unknown</td>
<td>1798, 1816, 1840; C18; 1802, 1803; early C19</td>
<td>Debenham monument has winged angel heads with clerical tabs flanking the tomb with a skull, scythee and hourglass on top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1272046</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Coffin stone with head and footstone; headstone</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>M. W. and I. W.; unknown; William Holywood</td>
<td>1789, 1800; 1803</td>
<td>Head and footstones with fluted tops; batwinged skull; sword and scabbard crossed under a plumed shako with a pistol underneath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1272047</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Headstone x2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Unknown; P. Peppen</td>
<td>Late C17/early C18; C18</td>
<td>Bellied cartouche, winged angel head and crude skull; delicate winged angel head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1272048</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Head and footstone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mary Risebrow</td>
<td>1784</td>
<td>Flying cherub, naked, with his back turned, holding a trumpet in his right hand, pointing to an open book with his left hand and looking over his left shoulder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1272049</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Coffin tomb</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>James, Mary and Mary More</td>
<td>1818, 1833, 1893</td>
<td>Pilasters decorated with eggshell festoons and headstone with urb and winged angel heads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List Entry Number</td>
<td>Area (N, NW, E, C, W)</td>
<td>Type (e.g. coffin stone, headstone, box tomb)</td>
<td>No. of monuments</td>
<td>Name(s) of Commemorated</td>
<td>Date(s)</td>
<td>Notable Features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1272066</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Tombstone with head and foot; headstone</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rev. Thomas and Sarah Waldegrave; Anne Waldegrave</td>
<td>1813, 1804; early C19</td>
<td>Cherub sitting on a tomb and holding a festoon across a large urn, a scythe and a winged hourglass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1272067</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Box tomb</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Susannah, John and Susannah Rackham</td>
<td>1798, 1821, 1823</td>
<td>Box tomb with pillars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1272068</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Headstone x3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Thomas Cook and wife; Joshua Cook; unknown</td>
<td>1806, 1802; 1802; 1695</td>
<td>Cherub weeping beside a large urn bearing a portrait medallion of the deceased; woman reading with drapes; good skull flanked by winged angel heads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1272069</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Head and footstone x2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mary, John and Stephen Woodroffe; William Steele, Jane Wade</td>
<td>1806, 1800, 1832; 1801, 1824</td>
<td>Large cherub, draped urn, scythe and hourglass; headstone scene depicting the sacrificing of Isaac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1272070</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Head and footstone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1809</td>
<td>Headstone with scene depicting the Good Samaritan, a man tending a fallen figure with a donkey on the right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1272071</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Chest tomb</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Robert Harry, Harry, Jane Tylney, Jane, John and John Jackson Wayman</td>
<td>1843, 1861, 1851, 1810, 1836, 1832</td>
<td>Portland stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1272072</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Tombstone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>John, Elizabeth, Jonathan Evans, George, William and Martha Steele</td>
<td>1865, 1861, 1833, 1843, 1881, 1890</td>
<td>Portland stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1272073</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Tombstone; coffin stone</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Alice Anderson, Sophia, Mary, Mary and Benjamin de Carle; Maria Holden and Mary Smith</td>
<td>1847, 1840, 1848, 1870, 1864; 1842, 1850</td>
<td>de Carles were members of a local family of stonemasons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12702074</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Coffin stone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>John Utting</td>
<td>1852</td>
<td>Good railings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1272075</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Tomb with head and footstones</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Early C19</td>
<td>Pilasters with raised panels and headstone hs a cherub holding a scroll over a crossed olive and palm branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1272076</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Box tomb</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rev. J. W. and Mildred Eleanor Donaldson</td>
<td>1861, 1849</td>
<td>Portland stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1272077</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Pedestal tomb</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Henry Reed and his five children Matilda, Henry, Thiza, George and Jane</td>
<td>1864, 1842, 1866, 1839, 1845, 1848</td>
<td>Fine tomb for local stonemason and his family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List Entry Number</td>
<td>Area (N, NW, E, C, W)</td>
<td>Type (e.g. coffin, stone, box tomb)</td>
<td>No. of monuments</td>
<td>Name(s) of Commemorated</td>
<td>Date(s)</td>
<td>Notable Features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1272078</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Coffin tomb; box tomb; chest x3; box tomb</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hannah Browne; Mary, Frederick, Henry and John Cooke; George, Susan and Jane Hubbard; Katherine Wheelwright, George Prettyman, Mary Elizabeth; Mary, Henry, John and Ann le Grice; John Worlidge and wife; John and Elizabeth Frost</td>
<td>1828, 1853, 1841, 1842, 1877; 1821, 1854, 1844, 1872; 1831, 1888, 1835, 1885; 1819, 1852, 1877, 1830</td>
<td>Chest tomb delicate with feet set on a low box tomb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1272079</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Coffin tomb; chest tomb</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>E. S.; Joshua, Harriet, Catherine-Hannah-Ann-Mary; Harriet-Hannah; Edward Henry; John; Ann Martha, and Robert Smith</td>
<td>1787; 1815, 1805, 1877; 1810, 1830, 1833</td>
<td>Winged angel head decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1272080</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Coffin tomb</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>John, Martha, Mary, Edward and Ann Thompson</td>
<td>1817, 1815, 1871, 1869, 1810</td>
<td>A palimpsest, recently broken. Headstone has a winged angel head and a double inscription panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1364034</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Headstone x2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1710 or 1719; C18</td>
<td>Skull with date; draped skull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1364035</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Headstone x9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Unknown; unknown; Simon and Sarah Manning; William Byham; unknown x5</td>
<td>C18; C18; 1821; 1810; C18 x5</td>
<td>Byham monument has a winged angel head over a crossed upturned trumpet and downturned flaming torch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1364036</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Headstone x7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Elizabeth and William Guyas; unknown x3; John and Susan Bradbrook; unknown x2</td>
<td>1837; C18 x3; 1830, 1823; C18, C19</td>
<td>Finely shaped stone with winged angel head and flowers; winged angel heads with festoons of flowers; winged skull; Father Time with scythe in right hand and broken houglass in his left pours the sand over a portrait medallion of the deceased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1364037</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Box tomb</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Richard and Ann Robbrook</td>
<td>1767, 1785</td>
<td>Winged angel heads, skulls in corners and drapes round inscription; bold draped skull and bellied cartouche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1364038</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Headstone x3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Unknown; Thomas Nunn; Sarah Nunn</td>
<td>1811; 1799; 1786</td>
<td>Winged angel heads, skulls in corners and drapes round inscription; bold draped skull and bellied cartouche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1364039</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Headstone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>C18</td>
<td>Large stone scroll and foliage with a slightly bellied cartouche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List Entry Number</td>
<td>Area (N, NW, E, C, W)</td>
<td>Type (e.g. coffin stone, headstone, box tomb)</td>
<td>No. of monuments</td>
<td>Name(s) of Commemorated</td>
<td>Date(s)</td>
<td>Notable Features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1364040</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Headstone x4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mary Carpenter and William and Ann Hammong; John Warren; unknown; Thomas, Sophia, Sophia and Elizabeth Charlotta Warren</td>
<td>1754, 1794, 1789; C18; C18; 1815, 1789, 1768, 1767</td>
<td>Decorated with winged angel heads, scrolls and a winged hourglass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1364041</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Headstone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>C18</td>
<td>Tall, interestingly shaped stone, winged angel head and skulls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1364042</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Headstone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>C18</td>
<td>Winged angel head with skulls under the wing-tips, crossed bones and leaves at the sides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1364043</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Headstone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>C18</td>
<td>Winged angel heads flanked by skulls and crossed bones, bow and drapes at the sides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1364044</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Headstone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Andrew...</td>
<td>C18</td>
<td>Skull with drapes and scrolls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1364045</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Box tomb</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>George and Mary Anne Martin, and Mrs Hamie Burroughs</td>
<td>1825, 1846</td>
<td>Top ledger slab bears a coat of arms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1364046</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Coffin stone with head and footstones</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Early C19</td>
<td>Headstone bears figure of a flying angel blowing a trumpet and carrying a ribbon banner. Flanked by palms. Originally had a rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1364047</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Headstone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>John and Mary Gall..?</td>
<td>Early C19</td>
<td>Double headstone decorated with 2 urns and a double inscription panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1364048</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Head and footstone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>James Stedman</td>
<td>1817</td>
<td>Verse inscription celebrating him as husband and father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1364049</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Headstone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>C18</td>
<td>Winged angel head with skulls, shield and drapes. Good cartouche</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E
PLAN OF BURY ST EDMUNDS ABBEY BY WHITTINGHAM
Figure 77: The plan of Bury St Edmunds Abbey published by Arthur Whittingham in the Archaeological Journal in 1952. (© Royal Archaeological Institute, reprinted by permission of Taylor & Francis Ltd on behalf of Royal Archaeological Institute.)
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APPENDIX H
SUMMARY OF CONSERVATION POLICIES, ACTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
### H.1  CONSERVATION POLICIES AND ACTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY NO.</th>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| CP1        | Undertake the development and implementation of new works or procedures within a coherent and integrated approach that preserves and enhances the heritage significance of the project area as a whole. | a  Use the Conservation Plan as a basis for decision-making.  
   b  Develop an overarching plan for the project area.  
   c  Ensure continued dialogue between the constituent partners of the Heritage Partnership. |

#### A: MANAGING CHANGE USING BEST PRACTICE

| CP2 | Use the Conservation Plan to guide change. | a  Use the Conservation Plan as the basis of decision-making regarding the site.  
   b  Update the Conservation Plan when major change occurs or at least every five years.  
   c  Collect information between updates for inclusion in the Conservation Plan as new information becomes available. |

| CP3 | Ensure that the heritage significance of heritage assets and their setting is understood and considered when planning change, including repairs. | a  Use the heritage significance section in the Conservation Plan to provide a baseline understanding.  
   b  Carry out further research on specific heritage assets if a more detailed understanding is required.  
   c  Carry out a heritage impact assessment prior to implementation of any works. |

| CP4 | Ensure the long-term good condition and appearance of the heritage assets. | a  Undertake regular condition surveys and implement the recommendations of the surveys.  
   b  Implement planned and co-ordinated programmes of repairs and maintenance.  
   c  Carry out conservation and repair works on a ‘like for like’ basis.  
   d  Ensure works are planned and carried out by skilled and experienced staff, consultants and contractors.  
   e  Ensure that minor accretions and alterations are carried out with careful thought to avoid gradual erosion of character.  
   f  Ensure procedures and protocols for events protect the historic fabric and that these protocols are followed for all events.  
   g  Consider zoning activities across the Abbey Gardens.  
   h  The location of any proposed new tree planting will be developed with due consideration of both upstanding and buried archaeology. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY NO.</th>
<th>POLICY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retain in-situ as much significant historic fabric and landscape features as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP5</td>
<td>a Prioritise retention of historic fabric in repairs or periodic renewals of built fabric.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b Where possible, avoid the relocation of historic fabric to off-site locations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c Proactively record the significant historic fabric so that its location and condition is known.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP6</td>
<td>Bring disused or vacant areas into good repair and regular use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a Identify disused, vacant or underused areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b Identify uses for these areas and maintain these areas in use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP7</td>
<td>Ensure minor additions and alterations cumulatively will not erode the historic character of the heritage assets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a Consider the impact of any minor additions or alterations both on the heritage asset or part of a heritage asset most immediately affected and on the wider context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b Evaluate each proposal; it will not be presumed that because a minor change has been acceptable previously that it will be acceptable repeatedly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c Add new memorials (built or horticultural) to individuals to the Abbey Gardens only through the schemes already in place, namely the Memorial Tree and the benches, and any other such scheme SEBC may develop in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d Add new memorials (built or horticultural) commemorating groups of people or anniversaries to the Abbey Gardens only when such an addition enhances the heritage significance of the Abbey Gardens by making its history better known.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP8</td>
<td>When developing proposals for any part or element of the site, consider their impact on the site as a whole.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a Consider the site and its heritage significance holistically even when working on a particular area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b Consider whether there are enhancements that could be made to adjacent areas to the part of the site under consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP9</td>
<td>Maintain records of maintenance and major works carried out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a Document, record and archive changes to built fabric and landscaping and also record ‘as is’ prior to change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b Develop a maintenance log for maintenance works for each of the main areas of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP10</td>
<td>Ensure a high standard of design in all new works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a Give due weight to the longevity of the proposed works and the heritage significance of the heritage assets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b Employ suitably qualified and experienced consultants and contractors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c Remedy any existing poor works or remove negative features when the opportunity arises.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY NO.</td>
<td>POLICY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| CP11      | When planning any change, ensure compliance with statutory procedures relevant to the designation level. | a Understand which parts of the site are covered by the guardianship agreement.  
 b Obtain all relevant consents in advance of carrying out works.  
 c Explore the potential of establishing a Heritage Partnership Agreement and/or standing scheduled monument consent for certain types of works to reduce the need for repeat applications.  
 d Ensure all relevant staff understand the designations and requirements for consents for the heritage assets for which they are responsible.  
 e Seek pre-application advice prior to developing proposals at an appropriate point in the design development process. |
| CP12      | Carry out archaeological assessment and evaluation prior to any below ground works commencing or prior to any development works. | a Liaise with the Suffolk County Council Archaeological Unit and Historic England regarding the appropriate level of investigation.  
 b Employ a consultant with relevant expertise to carry out the archaeological investigation and to report and analyse the results.  
 c If necessary, amend the proposals in response to the archaeological findings in liaison with Suffolk County Council Archaeological Unit and Historic England.  
 d Undertake non-invasive archaeological investigations to enhance understanding of the archaeology within the project area.  
 e Where there is an appropriate opportunity or need, undertake targeted intrusive archaeological investigations as agreed with Historic England and Suffolk County Council Archaeological Unit. |
| CP13      | Ensure the full recording, archiving and publication of archaeological investigations. | a Carry out the works recommended in the Heritage Assessment to record and analyse the findings from past excavations and make these publicly available.  
 b Ensure that any future archaeological investigations are followed with full reporting and subsequent archiving of the report.  
 c Ensure that the impacts, and costs, of any archaeological investigations is considered well in advance. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY NO.</th>
<th>POLICY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B: OWNERSHIP AND COMMUNICATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP14</td>
<td>Ensure a clear understanding of ownership and responsibilities for each aspect of every built and landscape element.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Review the ownership deeds and ascertain who owns what on the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Review any lease or guardianship agreements to ascertain the areas affected and associated responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Produce a document that sets out the ownership, management and responsibilities clearly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Seek legal advice if any areas are unclear or in dispute.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Update the document when changes in ownership or management responsibilities occur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP15</td>
<td>Develop and maintain good working relationships between stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Continue the Heritage Partnership and ensure that all key parties are involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Explore the potential for a combined management approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Maintain a good working relationship with the Historic England inspectors, local Conservation Officer and County Archaeologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Convene an annual meeting of key stakeholders to share knowledge and proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP16</td>
<td>Engage with the wider community regarding major proposals for change and development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Engage with the local community and visitors regarding what they would like to see for the public areas of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Consult with the public regarding proposals at an early stage in the design process and incorporate public feedback where possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY NO.</td>
<td>POLICY ACTION(S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP17</td>
<td>Encourage increased understanding of and education about the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Develop a co-ordinated heritage interpretation strategy for the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Consider new ways to interpret the site through digital media.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Continue to provide tours that facilitate individual engagement by visitors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Explore successful heritage and education approaches through engaging with other institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. Facilitate school visits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. Develop packages co-ordinated with the curriculum for schools either visiting the site or learning in the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g. Encourage educational institutions to undertake research about the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>h. Encourage the production of publications about the site and its history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. Develop contacts at relevant heritage sites and museums to promote the exchange of knowledge and information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>j. Explore opportunities for exhibitions or displays relating to the site in other places.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>k. Consider developing a programme of lectures or talks about the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>l. Explore options for life long learning programmes based at or related to the site and its history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP18</td>
<td>Improve accessibility across the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Undertake an access audit or utilise an existing access audit for each of the public areas/buildings of the project area to identify key improvements that are required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. When projects are undertaken, look to incorporate key access improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Ensure that any obstacles to level access are made clear on visitor maps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY NO.</td>
<td>POLICY ACTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: MANAGING RISK</td>
<td>Ensure the safety and security of visitors and staff with minimal impact on the heritage significance of the site or individual heritage assets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP19</td>
<td>Ensure a co-ordinated approach to disaster preparedness planning for all areas to which the public have access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP19</td>
<td>Promote environmental sustainability and resilience to climate change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
H.2 SUB-AREA SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS

Sub-area 1: St Edmundsbury Cathedral
- Bring the Anselm Building area back into good repair and a sustainable use.
- Review the arrangement of the shop, including back of house areas and improve both the organisation and the appearance of these spaces.
- Ensure a regular maintenance programme for ‘hidden’ green spaces within the sub-area.
- Improve the appearance and quality of surfacing and signage of the entrance area to the Cathedral Office.
- Improve the appearance of the Cathedral car park and if possible lessen its visual impact on the surrounding heritage assets, particularly the Cathedral.
- Explore options to improve connectivity between this sub-area and other subareas.

Sub-area 2: The Abbey Gateway
- Undertake a comprehensive programme of repairs to the Abbey Gate and flanking walls.
- Improve the roof access on the Abbey Gate.
- When developing an interpretation strategy for the whole site, consider the integration of practical information signs so that there can be a coordinated approach to signage.

Sub-area 3: Abbey Garden Facilities
- Explore options for the aviary and gardeners’ yard area to improve these.
- Ensure that level paths are maintained.

Sub-area 4: Formal Gardens and Amenity Area
- Explore the later history of the Abbey Gardens in heritage interpretation.
- Relay paving slabs that have moved in the Water Garden.

Sub-area 5: River Lark Valley Floor
- The Abbot’s Bridge should be inspected after every flood event.
- Ensure careful planning for events set up and events to prevent damage to the built heritage assets, trees and the designated landscape.
- Continue to carry out maintenance and enhancement works to the river and its banks.
- The tarmac surfaces of the paths on the east bank should be improved with a more attractive surface, such as bound gravel.
- The remains of a medieval bridge should be recorded and the record deposited with the Suffolk Historic Environment Record.

Sub-area 6: Abbey Ruins
- Undertake works to clear the backlog of maintenance works and repairs. Thereafter implement a programme of regular maintenance repairs and vegetation removal.
- Increase the number of signs discouraging visitors from climbing on the ruins.
- Implement the consent to remove the tennis courts.
- Improve access to the Crypt once the tennis courts have been removed and improve the existing steps where possible.

Sub-area 7: Norman Tower and West Front
- In addition to a regular Q&I, the bell ringers should be encouraged to report any concerns regarding the safety of the steps of the Norman Tower.
- Conservation works should be undertaken to the louvred panels of the Norman Tower.
- Regular as well as prompt reactionary maintenance works should be undertaken to prevent damage or loss of historic fabric from the West Front houses.

Sub-area 8: The Great Churchyard
- Ensure that regular inspections are undertaken of the memorials and that a record of inscriptions is retained. Ensure repairs are implemented where possible as required.
- Remove the vegetation and repair the Chapel of the Charnel.
- Create a discrete and in-keeping store for the bins behind the Crown Street properties.

Sub-area 9: St Mary’s Church and Honey Hill
- The St Mary’s Church volunteers should continue to maintain the gardens around the church to their current high standard.
- A ground penetrating radar or other geophysical survey of the area north of St Mary’s church could be undertaken to ascertain the structure of the ground.
- Reinstate the missing railings north-east of the church.
- The former Shire Hall and Courts building should be brought back into use. Its external elevations should be repaired and negative features removed. The Conservation Officer has indicated that the building will be treated as an undesignated heritage asset, for which the National Planning Policy Framework provides a similar degree of protection as a designated heritage asset.

Sub-area 10: The Cathedral Residences
- The scheduled remains of St Andrew’s Chapel and the Sacrist’s Yard should be repaired and a programme of regular maintenance implemented.
- The overgrown area in the east of the sub-area should be brought back into good order.
- The outbuildings of Abbey Precincts should be maintained.

Sub-area 11: The Crankles and No Mans Meadow
- The Bury Water Meadows Group and SEBC should continue to improve the natural environment of the Crankles without undertaking works that might affect any buried archaeology.
- Use archaeological and palaeoenvironmental investigations to understand better the buried archaeology of the Crankles. Depending on the outcome of these investigations, it may be appropriate to consider extending the scheduling of the main site to include the Crankles.
- No Mans Meadow should remain a green space.
- No Mans Meadow should continue to be used for grazing to manage the site.
- Ensure regular cleaning of the existing interpretation board.
- Liaise with UK Power Network regarding the potential to remove or bury power cables, subject to any archaeological constraints.
SUMMARY OF CONSERVATION POLICIES, ACTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Sub-area 12: Abbey Vineyards

- Structures abutting the scheduled wall within the former school site should be removed to enhance the viability of the wall.
- The scheduled wall should be the subject of a regular maintenance routine to enhance its appearance and minimise loss of historic fabric.
- The exposed detached sections of the precinct wall should be surveyed and recorded.
- It is desirable that there should be interpretation to explain the association with the Abbey and the survival of the boundary wall of the vineyard.
- Any potential development in this sub-area should be mindful of the local policy BV25, which protects the setting and views of the conservation area.
- The area should be the subject to a desk-based archaeological assessment to confirm the assessment of the heritage values.

Sub-area 13: Medieval Industries (Eastgate)

- Bring the former Eastgate Nursery back into a use and ensure its future maintenance.
- Optimise any opportunities to understand the buried archaeology of the area and ensure it is fully recorded in the Suffolk Historic Environment Record (HER).
- Undertake a heritage appraisal of Eastgate Cottage to understand better its history, heritage significance and relationship with the Abbey Gardens.
- Maintain the green open space located at the end of Minden Close.
- To preserve the aesthetics of the area ensure that the established trees on the green space in Minden Close are suitably maintained.
- Ensure the ongoing maintenance of the Bowling Green as there has been a bowling green within the project area for at least two centuries.

Sub-area 14: Angel Hill and Mustow Street

- Undertake conservation works to the historic railings on Eastgate Street.

Sub-area 15: Churchgate Street and Crown Street

- Continue to work with the Highways Authority to minimise signage at the junction of Honey Hill to maintain views of the west fronts of the Church and Cathedral and the Norman Tower.
- Ensure any future pedestrian crossings are sited to minimise their impact on the settings and views of the heritage assets within the project area as well as the impact of any associated noise. The materials should be high quality to reflect the quality of the historic built environment.

H.3 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE HERITAGE PARTNERSHIP

- The Heritage Partnership, potentially aided by a consultant, undertakes a visitor survey to understand the preferences amongst the public for the themes and stories of interest and also for the techniques of delivery.
- The Heritage Partnership commissions an interpretation strategy that will provide a comprehensive and holistic approach to interpretation across the site.
- The Heritage Partnership develops the themes identified.
- The Heritage Partnership identifies funding sources for the implementation of the interpretation strategy.
- The Heritage Partnership develops a signage strategy for the site.
- The Heritage Partnership in conjunction with partners, such as the Bury St Edmunds Town Guides, delivers the interpretation strategy.
- The Heritage Partnership explores potential funding to develop an education programme, which may include a fixed term or part time education officer.
- The Heritage Partnership liaises with other local museum education providers to understand the potential for complementary or co-ordinated education provision.
- The Heritage Partnership develops an education programme for schools based on the curriculum. This will include both an onsite and an in-classroom offer.

The Heritage Partnership explores and develops opportunities for young people to engage with the site who are not currently in education.
- The Heritage Partnership makes knowledge and research about the site's history available to all through lecture series.
- The Heritage Partnership, in the longer term, explores opportunities for practical leaning opportunities for people of all ages that bring to life the traditional crafts and skills that have been and continue to be practised within the project area.
- The Heritage Partnership considers the options for improving circulation into and through the project area and liaises with the relevant owners.
- The Heritage Partnership leads discussions with Historic England regarding access changes and obtain the necessary consents.
- The Heritage Partnership commissions a full access audit of the public areas of the project area with a brief to consider them holistically.
- The Heritage Partnership considers the recommendations of the access audit and implements changes where possible.
- The Heritage Partnership enhances accessibility as part of the interpretation strategy.
- For the scheduled fabric within the English Heritage guardianship area, the 2016 Condition Survey should be reviewed and updated. A high level survey should be undertaken of the Abbey Church to augment the ground level survey. The short lengths of wall that are contiguous with the guardianship area but outside it, namely the walls near Abbey House, should be surveyed at the same time as it would be sensible for works to be carried out to these at the same time.

Where recommendations refer to the Heritage Partnership, this refers to the Heritage Partnership, its constituent partner organisations and any organisation that may evolve from the Heritage Partnership.
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• The works should be costed and, if necessary, phased packages of work developed. The works should be carried out by an experienced contractor. During the works, at least one interpretation panel should be provided to explain the conservation works to visitors.

• Owners of other sections of scheduled walls should be encouraged to undertake similar programmes of survey, vegetation removal and repairs.

• Repairs to the Eastgate Street railings and bridge could be undertaken as part of the works to the former Eastgate Nursery.

• The Heritage Partnership liaises with Historic England regarding reviews of the designations of the heritage assets to ensure that they are appropriately designated and protected.

• The Heritage Partnership appoints a suitably qualified consultant to develop a research strategy, including an archaeology strategy, for the project area.

• The Heritage Partnership explores options to enable the updating of the Historic Environment Record to reflect all research and investigation undertaken to date and to ensure the ongoing updating as new information emerges.

• The Heritage Partnership liaises with funders for previous archaeological excavations regarding the completion of the reporting for these. If necessary, the Heritage Partnership will seek new funding to publish previous archaeological investigations.

• A suitably qualified consultant, in consultation with the Heritage Partnership, identifies future research priorities for the project area based on the recent studies and on existing and emerging national and regional research frameworks. The identification of priorities will not preclude interested parties undertaking desk-based research separately from the Heritage Partnership’s priorities.

• Should, in the future, any intrusive investigation proposals emerge outside the strategy and priorities identified, the Heritage Partnership or a consultant should review current research frameworks to understand whether the proposed research projects coincide with these.

• The Heritage Partnership employs a consultant to develop a costed survey strategy (in liaison with the statutory stakeholders) for the archaeological investigations identified.

• The Heritage Partnership identifies potential funding sources for discrete research projects.

• The Heritage Partnership liaises with local universities regarding potential researchers (students or academics).

• The Heritage Partnership develops a local and other volunteer group who could undertake archival research at the Suffolk Record Office.

• The Heritage Partnership liaises with local history groups, such as the Bury Society and Bury Past and Present, as well as Bury St Edmunds Town Guides, to pool knowledge and identify local research projects that would be mutually beneficial.

• The Heritage Partnership encourages archaeological monitoring and investigation to be undertaken and recorded when development occurs as a result of routine management of the site. Where there are options regarding future development, the potential for archaeological research will be factored into decision-making.

• The Heritage Partnership undertakes a study to understand the areas required for the initial interpretation and education proposals.

• The Cathedral undertakes a comprehensive review of its space requirements and current use of space.

• A member of the Heritage Partnership is made responsible for checking planning and listed building applications within the project area. The same member will also undertake to comment on the applications on behalf of the Partnership.

• The Heritage Partnership champions the exploration of a long-term model for the management of the public areas of the site with the key stakeholders.

• The Cathedral reviews the housing provision for clergy and staff and commission an options appraisal to understand the potential for enhance its sustainability.

• The Heritage Partnership monitors the potential development areas in the south-east of the project area. It should also consider opportunities to use these areas to further the aims outlined above.
'DORENAVANT OUBLIER NE DOY'

~

It must not be forgotten from henceforth

(Clopton family motto on the Deanery)