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1 INTRODUCTION

Tubney House was probably first constructed as a hunting lodge named Gollds at some point before 1521. It was acquired by Magdalen College in 1537/8. The building was heavily extended in 1811 and again in the mid-19th century and, discounting a short tenure as a school, served as a private house until 2002. It was purchased from Magdalen College by Mr. and Mrs. Richard Blackwell in 1962. In 2002, Tubney House was bequeathed to the University of Oxford by the Tubney Charitable Trust in memory of Miles and Bryony Blackwell for the use of the Wildlife Conservation Research Unit (WildCRU). WildCRU is part of the university’s Department of Zoology and since the conversion of the former barns at the rear of the property in 2008-9, funded by a generous donation from Dr. Thomas Kaplan and Mrs. Dafna Recanati-Kaplan, the site has been known as the Recanati-Kaplan Centre.

1.1 Purpose of the Conservation Plan

The University of Oxford has an unrivalled portfolio of historic buildings, of which it is rightly proud. It has traditionally taken a thorough, holistic approach to building conservation, seeking to understand all the varied factors that make historic buildings significant to their diverse stakeholders, and using this to inform necessary change. It has become clear that this approach is vital to the conservation culture of an institution where so many of its historic buildings that are valued for their function also have extensive historical or architectural significance. This Conservation Plan represents the continuation of this tradition of seeking to understand what makes the university’s buildings cherished assets, and of seeking ways to conserve these most important features for the enjoyment of future generations.

The success of this approach is such that it has now become codified in government policy: First in March 2010’s Planning Policy Statement 5: Planning for the Historical Environment then in its replacement, March 2012’s National Planning Policy Framework (hereafter: NPPF). NPPF provides useful guidance on approaching the conservation of heritage assets, and postdates the university’s existing literature. NPPF defines a heritage asset as:

‘A building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest. Heritage asset includes designated heritage assets and assets identified by the local planning authority (including local listing).’

This designation clearly applies to Tubney House.

The purpose of this Conservation Plan is to update Tubney House conservation policy to take into account the new guidance provided by NPPF. It will be of use both for informing responsible regular maintenance and in the preparation of future planning applications, as specified in NPPF paragraph 128.

The Conservation Plan should form the basis for Tubney House Conservation Policy and exists as part of an ongoing process. It will be renewed and updated at least every five years or following any major alterations or legislative changes.
1.2 The Scope of the Conservation Plan

The Conservation Plan will cover the interior and exterior of Tubney House, a Grade-II-listed manor house in Tubney, approximately 8 miles southwest of Oxford. The plan will also cover the curtilage-listed outbuildings. Access was not gained to the South Lodge or Cottage One as tenants are in place, so only the exterior of these buildings will be covered. The North Lodge is no longer within the curtilage of the building.

The plan is not a catalogue and to facilitate its practical use will concentrate only on the most vulnerable aspects of the site’s significance, suggesting how they should be approached and conserved in the future. A brief list of the most significant architectural features can be found in Appendix 4 and should be referred to when planning any repair or alteration work.
1.3 Existing Information

There are limited forms of existing information available regarding Tubney House:

Oxford University Archives contains some deeds and historical correspondence relating to Tubney House, although it only came into the university’s possession in 2002. Equally, Estates Services’ own archives contain some limited records regarding the building.

Magdalen College’s archives contain some material regarding the building, mainly dating from the 1930s-50s, and this has kindly been made available for the composition of this document. Other previous owners have been approached but do not retain any relevant records.

The original 1987 list description (Appendix 1) gives a relatively thorough description of the house, providing some indication of the features that were thought to make up the particular character for which the building was originally listed.

There is limited published information available in books and articles regarding the development of the village of Tubney, which provides some information about the house and estate.

Historic plans and OS maps provide a valuable resource for the study of the building and surrounding area.

Planning and listed building consent applications have been made during the building’s recent history and these provide a fragmentary indication of the changes that have occurred in the building over time. The planning applications related to the 2002-4 conversion included an historical study of the building by Alison Maguire, which provides a valuable resource for this document.1

This document draws on statutory guidance from NPPF prepared by HM’s Department for Communities and Local Government in March 2012.

1.4 Methodology

The Conservation Plan is a document that assesses the current and predicted conservation needs of Tubney House and attempts to address them with a view towards maintaining and enhancing the significance of the heritage asset. Its formulation to supersede any existing literature is a response to the requirements of NPPF, and it is prepared in accordance with the policies contained therein.

---

1 Planning application 03/00822/FUL and listed building consent application 03/00795LBC.
2 UNDERSTANDING THE SITE
2 UNDERSTANDING THE SITE

2.1 History of the Site

The region around Tubney House shows evidence of occupation from at least the Bronze Age, with a two round barrows in the northern part of Tubney Wood (to the north of Tubney House) being levelled in 1872 and somewhat later. In 1988 and 1991 early Mesolithic flint scatters, suggesting periodic occupation, were found close to Tubney Manor Farm (to the northeast of Tubney House), on a site which also has evidence for Neolithic occupation and a Roman cemetery (with 15 inhumations dating from the 2nd to the 5th centuries as well as evidence of cremations). Traces of the Romano-British field system have also been found in this area.

The modern village of Tubney, which is composite of various scattered settlement elements, lies to the southwest of the mediaeval village of Tubney. The mediaeval village was located close the modern village of Appleton and Tubney Manor Farm (the original manor house on this site had a moat, which survives on two sides, and this had a drawbridge until c.1840). Tubney Wood is mostly relatively modern plantation and the mediaeval settlement extended into this area.

The manor of Tubney was granted to Abingdon Abbey in 965 and remained in its hands for several centuries. The tenancy of the land passed through various hands via marriage and inheritance until it was acquired by Sir John Lenham alias Plummer at some point shortly before 1470. Lenham died in 1479 and his widow granted the land to the Bishop of Winchester, William Waynflete, for Magdalen College, which he had founded in 1458. This included the site of the mediaeval village but not initially the site of Tubney house itself, as the Fettiplaces (the lords of Bessels Leigh) had a holding called Goldys (i.e. Gollds, the original hunting lodge which forms the basis of Tubney House) in 1521. Following a dispute over land ownership in 1537/8, Gollds was awarded to Magdalen College. Edmund Fettiplace (presumably a relation of John Fettiplace) gave up all his rights to lands in the manor of Tubney, taking 20 acres in Bessels Leigh, and it seems that this exchange represents a rationalisation of the holdings of both parties, suggesting some form of enclosure.

---

2 A short chronology of Tubney House can be found in Appendix 2.
3 Oxfordshire HER, available online: http://publicapps.oxfordshire.gov.uk/wps/portal/publicapps/?ut/p/c5/04_SB8K8xLLM9MSSzPy8xBz9CP0os3g
C-MgU09LYwN3H2cXA09L0cnY-cgYwNZQ6B8gFlm8r6WH0eZGbbYmBf7CPlYGnh5NkJeT04GBuxEB3eEg-3CrMDaEvOMZHyvAM4Gju7eeTnpuoX5EYYZAakKwIA4W14SO4/dl3/d3/L2dIQSEvUUt3QS9ZQnZ3LzZIjzzUjVjOTMwR0xDRDBJOU9BQuNDUjMwNzE/, accessed 19th February 2014; Russell, A., ‘Parishes: Tubney’ in Page, W., and Ditchfield, P.H., (eds.) Victoria County History: Berkshire (1924) 379-80.
5 Russell, A., op. cit. (1924), 379.
7 Ibid.
8 Maguire, A., Tubney House: An Architectural Study on the Exterior and Interior of the House including some Account of its History and Significance (report; April 2003), quoting MCA ref. EL/3 P.181.
The mediaeval village of Tubney survived the Black Death, though with a diminished population, and had 20 tenants in the 1394 tax lists.\(^9\) Brooks suggests that subsequent enclosure was a likely factor in the eventual desertion of the already-weakened settlement. The mediaeval village close Tubney Manor Farm was long deserted by the early-16\(^{th}\) century when John Leland described the site serving as a farm for Magdalen College.\(^10\) Tax records suggest that the village saw modest repopulation in the 17\(^{th}\) century, though there is nothing to suggest that this represented settlement on the same location or in the same pattern as the mediaeval settlement. By the mid-18\(^{th}\) century the settlement pattern was something akin to the modern village, related to Tubney House rather than Tubney Manor Farm. By the time of the 1801 census there thirteen dwellings with a population of seventy-nine and by 1851 there were over forty dwellings.\(^11\)

The parish of Fyfield and Tubeny was part of Berkshire until the 1974 boundary changes when it became part of Oxfordshire.

2.2 History of Tubney House

As mentioned above, John Fettiplace held a property in Tubney called Goldys in 1521. In 1537/8, Edmund Fettiplace gave up his rights to a tenement called Gollds, which is certainly the same building, and the surrounding land to Magdalen College. It is probable that the earliest portion of the extant house (the eastern wing, marked out by two 16\(^{th}\)-century windows on the southern elevation) represents Gollds, which can thus be dated to some point shortly before 1521. The original building would have been relatively modest in size, consisting of only the cellar, the easternmost two rooms on the other floors, and a small buttery and staircase to the west. This was located 1.5 miles to the southwest of the mediaeval manor, in an area which was presumably relatively isolated following the desertion of the mediaeval village. Maguire has posited

---


\(^10\) Ibid 127, quoting The Itinerary of John Leland in or about the years 1535-1543 (ed. Toulmin Smith, L.; Carbondale, 1964) pts. 9-11, 73.

that the building was originally constructed as a hunting lodge and this seems a logical suggestion. She also notes that, based on contemporary building design, the original entrance would have been on the eastern side of what is now the ground-floor board room, with the southern portion of this room possibly forming a small corridor.\textsuperscript{12}

A map of the Manor of Tubney was produced by John Gutteridge in 1767. It is not detailed enough to indicate the development of Tubney House but it does show two blocks of outbuildings, as well as a building in roughly the location of the extant South Lodge.\textsuperscript{13} The bell on the tower on the northern elevation is marked with the date ‘1790’ but this part of the building dates to some point between 1811 and 1841, so whether the bell was originally fitted on the original portion of the building or whether it originally came from elsewhere is unclear.\textsuperscript{14}

A Mr. Lockhart was Magdalen’s tenant for the house from 1810 until 1838. In 1811, he spent £1,200 on alterations to the property. This included a substantial extension to the building, with the construction of the extant main entrance hall, a library (the extant lecture room), and a grand parlour (the extant common room) (\textbf{Figure 3}). The smaller ground-floor room in the original portion of the house (the south-easternmost extant ground-floor room) was the original kitchen, with Maguire identifying elements of the original ovens in the under-stair cupboard. Maguire argues that it is possible that this room, now just off the main entrance

\textsuperscript{12} Maguire, op. cit. (2003).
\textsuperscript{13} Plan reproduced in ibid; MCA.
\textsuperscript{14} Maguire, op. cit. (2003); date on bell.

\textbf{Figure 3. Plan showing a probable reconstruction of the ground floor following the 1811 alterations}
hall, was converted into a study or parlour with the construction of the 1811 extension, in which case a new kitchen would have been required. If this was the case, then the room immediately to the west of the lecture hall was possibly constructed as a new kitchen at this point. Stretching conjecture further, if this was constructed as a kitchen at this point, then there may have been a prentice or covered passage constructed along the northern elevation in order to allow movement between this and the house proper.

The 1811 extension necessitated the demolition of the original stair tower, with the extant cellar stair being excavated at this point. The grand 1811 staircase only reached to the first floor and the extant back stairs were not constructed until c.1866, so a small spiral staircase was constructed between the first and second floors. This is no longer extant but was located in the cupboard opposite the extant stained-glass window on the first floor. Maguire also proposes that there would have been a secondary stair from the ground to the first floor, running in a dogleg from the cellar stair to the modern server room, leading directly onto the vice stair.  

An 1841 tithe map surveyed by Joseph Dymack shows that the northern range of the building was in place by this point. This included the central corridor and back stair, the easternmost three rooms off the corridor, and the tower on the northern elevation (Figure 4). This also

Figure 4. Plan showing a probable reconstruction of the ground floor c.1840

provided additional bedrooms on the upper floors. Mr. Jas Kimber took the lease to the building in 1845 and Maguire suggests that the alterations may have been conducted in anticipation of his occupation but this seems unlikely, as they were in place at least four years before this. As part of these alterations, the first and second floor of the original eastern wing (Gollds), which had previously consisted of two rooms each in line with the ground-floor configuration, were divided into three rooms each. The roof over the eastern wing was raised at this time, with Maguire identifying the original gable end preserved in the northern wall of the second floor. The rear ground-floor room of Gollds (the modern board room) was converted from a parlour into a dining room, with the ground-floor of the tower (the modern plant room) acting as a servery to this.\footnote{Ibid.}

The 1841 plan also shows extensive outbuildings. These may relate to the extant Panthera buildings and Cottage One, though the plan is not accurate enough to verify this through georeferencing.

At some later point before 1866 (when it is visible in the OS map), a kitchen extension was added to the west of the c.1840 extension, at the north-western corner of the house (Figure 5). This was the kitchen until 2002 and was in the location of the modern lavatories and back stairs.\footnote{Ibid.}
Jas Kimber held the lease to the building until 1873 when Magdalen College took it in hand. At some point before or around 1933 another small extension was added to the west of the 1811 kitchen. A 1933 *The Times* advert for the lease on the building shows that the extant porch was in place by this point, as was the since-demolished conservatory (the foundations of which are preserved on the ground) in front of the 1811 kitchen.  

Colonel Dr. G.C. Bourne took up the lease in 1920. Bourne died in 1932 and his executors gave notice on the lease in March 1933. The lease was widely advertised and a great deal of remedial work was conducted on the building whilst it was unoccupied over the following two years. This included rewiring and updating of the electric lighting installation, which were clearly already in place by this point. A new butler’s pantry was formed, which may well refer to the room constructed immediately to the west of the 1811 kitchen. The 1811

---

18 *The Times* Saturday 17th June 1933.
kitchen (which by this point served as the butler’s pantry) was converted into a gentleman’s lavatory. New sinks and lavatories were fitted in various areas and one of the first-floor bedrooms was converted into an additional bathroom. General internal and external repairs were carried out, including external repainting, roof repairs, urgent repairs to the attic stairs, and full refurbishment to both the north and south lodges. The impression given by the archive entries for this period is that the house had not been updated or properly maintained for some time, necessitating extensive work in order to remain habitable.

A description of the main house in October 1934 lists the accommodation as follows:

Top floor: 5 bedrooms, box rooms, bath room.

1st floor: 5 bedrooms, 2 dressing rooms, 2 bath rooms, WC, housemaid’s closet, linen cupboard, and cupboard under stairs.

Ground floor: drawing room, dining room, study, billiards room, gun cupboard, WC.

Ground floor domestic offices: pantry, kitchen, scullery, dairy, larder, old servants’ hall, boot room, man’s room, servants’ hall, store room, 2 outside closets, boiler house, and large cellar.

Outside: coach house, 3 saddle rooms, granary, small stable, loose box and stalls, power room, battery room, and potting shed.

Capt. K.C. McDougal took up the lease on the building in the second half of 1935. McDougal took up a second lease on the building in 1937 and this included a clause stating the Magdalen College would lay on mains water to the building when it was installed in the village. In the same year, Capt. McDougal demolished, with Magdalen’s blessing, a small summer house at the southwest corner of the lawn.

Hounds had been kept at the building (and can be seen in the 1933 The Times advert) for some time but Capt. McDougal gave these up in 1939 and brought horses over to the main building. This precipitated the repair of the stables and the extension of mains water (suggesting that this had reached the house by this point) to them.

The house was briefly requisitioned by the RAF between December 1940 and January 1941. The house was again requisitioned by the RAF in May 1941. Capt. McDougal had been called up (and was a Major by the end of the War) and Mrs. McDougal moved into the north lodge; however, both lodges were quickly also requisitioned, with Mrs. McDougal moving to Kingston Lisle near Wantage. The house was not derequisitioned until September 1946 and, though initial discussions were had with the McDougals regarding their return, they never reoccupied the building.

Around Christmas 1946, Miss L.E. Gisborne took over the lease for the house, with the intention of converting it into a kindergarten school called St. Nicholas. Considerable work

---

19 MCA ref. B/EST/9/7.
20 Ibid.
21 Ibid.
was again undertaken in the building prior to this, including substantial roof repairs. The interior was repaired and redecorated in its entirety. Once again, the scale of the works enumerated in the 1946 schedule suggests that the building was in a poor state of repair at this point. A doorway was cut between the kitchen (the easternmost modern ground-floor lavatories) and the adjacent drawing room.\textsuperscript{22}

13 new power points were installed in the building in 1948. Substantial work was conducted in the South Lodge, which had also been occupied by the RAF, in the same year. This involved complete internal repair and decoration, as well as fitting a new bathroom (the North Lodge had already been fitted with a bathroom when Mrs. McDougal briefly moved in there in 1941). The area used for the bathroom had previously had an external doorway and this was blocked up to create two casement windows.

From 1948 to 1950 the stables were converted into a cowshed for 12 cows and the adjacent barn was converted into a dairy. This could well refer to the outbuildings which now make up the Panthera.

In 1951, L.E. Gisborne, the headmistress of St. Nicholas, requested that a substantial partition be constructed in the drawing room. The description in her letter would suggest that this refers to the library (now the lecture room) and the subdivision did not go ahead. In the same year, Magdalen College sold a strip of land beside the North Lodge to the Post Office and this is where the telephone repeater station is now situated.\textsuperscript{23}

L.E. Gisborne installed an Agamatic boiler to the building in 1955 and this was still in place when it was acquired by the university in 2002. Gisborne also had a lavatory installed in the South Lodge at her own expense in 1960.\textsuperscript{24}

St. Nicholas closed in 1961, vacating the building in September. The estates bursar at Magdalen College noted that, due to the high expenditure on maintenance, the building was actually rented out at a loss to the college’s finances. He also noted that it was in such a poor state of repair that he thought it unlikely that it would be used for residential purposes again, the cost of the necessary work being far too high.\textsuperscript{25} The bursar was proved incorrect as the following year Tubney House was purchased by Mr. and Mrs. Richard Blackwell. The purchase included a covenant preventing any building on the frontage of the house without the college’s prior permission.\textsuperscript{26}

Tubney House returned to its original use as a private house. In 1972 planning permission was sought and refused for the construction of a dwelling for staff accommodation on the grounds.\textsuperscript{27} Planning permission was granted in 1976 for the construction of two additional bedrooms and a bathroom in the roof space. This does not seem to have occurred within the

\textsuperscript{22} MCA ref. ACC 02/09/34/1-6.
\textsuperscript{23} Ibid and OUA ref. LA 2/126.
\textsuperscript{24} MCA ref. ACC 02/09/34/1-6.
\textsuperscript{25} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{26} OUA ref. LA 2/126.
\textsuperscript{27} Planning application 72/00137/OUT.
main house, so this may refer to the construction in the roof space of the curtilage-listed Cottage One.\textsuperscript{28}

At some point during the Blackwell’s occupation the conservatory at the front of the building was demolished. It was presumably at this point that the butler’s pantry (the space immediately to the west of the lecture room) was converted into a self-contained annexe, with a small staircase between the added between the ground and first floor here.

In 1986, Maguerite Brook Blackwell conveyed Tubney House, including all its land and holdings, to Richard Miles Blackwell.\textsuperscript{29} Richard Miles Blackwell and his wife, Briony, continued to live in Tubney House after this. In 1997 Richard Miles Blackwell founded the Tubney Charitable Trust, with Briony Blackwell serving as one of the original trustees. Miles and Briony tragically both passed away in 2001, leaving their home and assets in a bequest to their charity. The Tubney Charitable Trust was a “spend-out” charity and its original goals were relatively broad including education, palliative care, the environment, and animal welfare.\textsuperscript{30} It was with the last two of these in mind that the trust generously donated Tubney House, as well as a sizable sum of money for refurbishment and conversion, to the University in Oxford in 2002, expressly for the use of the Wildlife Conservation Research Unit (WildCRU).

Small parcels of land around the outskirts of Tubney House’s old holdings had been sold throughout the 20\textsuperscript{th} century and by the time of the bequest the curtilage of the building was much reduced from its original extent. As at most other points in its history, the building was in a poor state of repair when its new occupants took possession in 2002. A structural survey produced by the University Surveyor’s Office in 2002 noted that the building was structurally sound but that the service installations had reached the end of their useful lives, as had the external and internal decorations, with a history of roof leaks having done extensive damage to the internal plasterwork. The external render needed replacing, the roof repairing, and the wall, door, and floor structures required upgrading in line with modern fire standards. The rainwater goods were rusted out and required full replacement. The building contained extensive asbestos, including insulation on piping as well as boarding to ceilings and fireplaces, and this needed to be removed.

Tubney House was remodelled from 2002 until 2004, when WildCRU moved into the property. The extensive work included some demolition, for instance the conservatory to the northwest of the main building. The secondary staircase between the ground and first floors in the butler’s pantry was removed and two ground-floor windows inserted in this space. The western elevation saw the greatest structural alteration. Here the extant rear entrance lobby was constructed against the western wall of the 1811 kitchen and a new secondary staircase was constructed running through all floors of the building (the extant staircases at the western end of the building discharge at nearly the same point on the first floor, meaning there was previously no effective escape route from the upper floors). The new western staircase

\textsuperscript{28} Planning applications 76/00244/FUL and 75/00237/FUL.
\textsuperscript{29} OUA ref. LA 2/126.
necessitated the construction of a new stair tower to house it (Figure 7). The outbuilding immediately to the north (the location of the westernmost modern ground-floor lavatories) of this was entirely rebuilt, retaining only its western exterior wall.

Figure 7.1, left, the western elevation during alteration work in c.2003. 7.2, right, the western elevation in 2014 with 2002 additions highlighted in red

The exterior of the building was rerendered, allowing the new elements to integrate better with the older parts. Stonework was renewed throughout, with many of the stone mullions being heavily repaired. Throughout the interior was refurbished to bring it up to modern standards, with new wiring, plumbing and services and strengthened floors in most areas. The lighting installation was overhauled and the interior completely redecorated. Several of the rooms were converted into study bedrooms for visiting staff.

WildCRU moved into Tubney House in 2004. In 2008 a generous donation from Dr. Thomas Kaplan and Mrs. Dafna Recanati-Kaplan made it possible to fully convert the barns at the rear of the property in order to provide study bedrooms for diploma students. The repurposing of the barns was an extensive project and involved the construction of a link between the two buildings, which now serves as the entrance to both. The barns were

---

31 ESA ref. 391.
32 Planning application 08/01348/FUL.
completely refurbished with environmental considerations borne in mind. Under-floor heating was fitted throughout the new building and linoleum flooring was installed in the public spaces. The barns are now known as the Panthera buildings and house ten study bedrooms as well as a common room and kitchen.

In 2010, the late 19^{th}-century greenhouse along the southern side of the northern garden wall was found to be in a deplorable state of repair. The overgrowth of vegetation within the house was cut back and the internal timber structure was found to be thoroughly rotten and the brickwork was found to be in a poor condition. The curtilage-listed structure could not be saved and in 2011 listed building consent was granted for its demolition. The brick and clay-tile floor were found to be in a good condition and this was left in place following the demolition, although the layout of the paving was reconfigured. Equally, the decorative cast-iron brackets were in a good condition and these were fitted to the northern garden wall to give an indication of the previous location of the greenhouse.\footnote{Listed building consent application 11/10500/LBC.} Repairs were carried out to the northern garden wall following the removal of the greenhouse. This included removing and rebuilding the top section of the wall including the renewal of the coping. The arch to the doorway in this northern wall was renewed, as the keystone was cracked.

Somewhat ironically for a building that was probably originally constructed as a hunting lodge and housed hunting dogs until at least 1939, Tubney House continues to serve as the base of WildCRU, the Wildlife Conservation Research Unit of the University of Oxford. The barns still serve as the Panthera buildings, housing diploma students, and the other major outbuildings, Cottage One and the South Lodge, are privately rented out.
3
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NPPF paragraph 128 specifies that in assessing planning applications:

‘Local planning authorities should require an applicant to provide a description of the significance of any heritage assets affected including any contribution made by their setting.’

The significance of Tubney House has been publically recognised by its designation as a Grade-II-listed building in 1987 (see Appendix 1).

3.1 Significance as part of Tubney village and the surrounding area

Visually Tubney House has very little impact on the surrounding area, being well set back within extensive land with considerable vegetation cover. The South Lodge, which sits directly on the Abingdon Road, has a greater visual effect on the surrounding area, being a pleasant stone-built building. The modern village of Tubney, which has its origins in the 18th century (as opposed to the mediaeval village of Tubney around Tubney Manor Farm to the northeast) is a linear settlement configured along the Abingdon Road and it seems likely that the presence of Tubney House (which, as Gollds, predates the village) has had some impact on the development of settlement, at the least preventing development on the northern side of the road due to the extent of its grounds.

3.2 Architectural Significance

3.2.1 External Elevations

Tubney House is of extensive aesthetic significance. Architecturally the building is composed of several elements, ranging in date from the 16th to the 21st century (this development is summarised in Figure 9). The main façade, visible from the south consists of three elements: the eastern wing comprises the original 16th-century building Gollds; the Gothic Revival central range, with its projecting entrance, dates from 1811; and the rectangular porch dates to the early 20th century, as do the extensions to west of the central range. From the north, the main elements are Gollds to the east and the mid-19th-century extension with its round tower. The later 19th-century kitchen extension at the western end references the Tudor design of Gollds with its crenulated gable end. The 1811 extension is not visible from the north.

The almost martial Tudor domesticity of the original eastern wing (Figure 8) contrasts starkly with the Victorian Gothic of the 1811 extension, which makes only minor concessions to Gollds in its crenulated parapets, the hood moulds to the windows, and its string course. The hood moulding, borrowed from the windows of Gollds, is carried even to the lancet-arched windows of the 1811 extension and is an effective means of linking otherwise distinct elements. The early 20th-century porch at the front of the 1811 extension is rather angular and does detract slightly from the character of the elevation. The 1811 extension is built on two floors, unlike Gollds and the c.1840 extensions, which are built over three.

On the rear, northern elevation the transition between Gollds and the c.1866 extension is eased by the round tower which borrows the string courses from Gollds. The later 19th-
century kitchen extension at the western end of the northern elevation borrows the crenulated gable end from Gollds, which is not sufficient to provide a sense of symmetry but is certainly a positive feature. As throughout, the recent rerendering homogenises the whole to some extent.

The western elevation has been nearly completely obscured by modern extension, though the tile-hung gable end of the 1811 kitchen is of some aesthetic significance. The eastern elevation remains the eastern elevation of Gollds. The major alterations here have been the probable change of the central ground-floor window from a door in 1811 and the insertion of the eastern windows on the upper floors at the same time. There were presumably smaller windows prior to this.

The building remains an interesting example of the expansion a modest 16th-century hunting lodge into a more refined rural residence throughout the 19th century. Externally it is a mix of styles, with some limited attempt having been made to reference earlier phases in subsequent expansions. The extensive 19th-century extensions were made at the cost of the tenants rather than the land owner, this being indicative of the rather “hands off” approach of Magdalen College as a landlord: the college offered preferential lease terms on the understanding that its role and expenditure would be limited.

Figure 8. A possible reconstruction of Gollds prior to the construction of the 1811 extension
Figure 9. 9.1, top, modern ground floor plan. 9.2, middle, southern elevation looking northwards. 9.3, middle, northern elevation looking southwards. Throughout the c.1521 Gollds is highlighted in red, the 1811 extension is highlighted in orange, the c.1840 extension is highlighted in yellow, the c.1861 extensions are highlighted in green, early 20th-century extensions are highlighted in light blue, and 21st-century extensions are highlighted in dark blue.
3.2.2 Internal spaces

The internal spaces in the building were refurbished to a high standard in 2002-4 and the building, which has historically suffered from a lack of proper upkeep, has benefitted greatly from this. No internal furnishings were inherited with the house and the building was thoroughly renovated. The floor on the ground floor were strengthened throughout and replaced in many cases. All spaces were redecorated but elements of the pre-existing decorative scheme were preserved in some places, for instance the rosettes in the entrance hall, the gold bosses on the plaster arch to the boardroom or the central boss in the boardroom itself. Original and historic features have been retained in several areas, for instance there are several 19th-century doors throughout the building (including the lancet-arched front door) and several fireplaces dating from the 18th and 19th centuries. The main 1811 staircase in the entrance hall is a particularly attractive piece of joinery of high aesthetic value.

Internally the transition between the different stages of construction is quite apparent as one moves between the constituent areas. The transition between the 1811 extension, which is built on two generously-proportioned floors, to the c.1840 rear extension, which is built on three floors, is quite dramatic, feeling like a clear move from a front-of-house to a back-of-house space. The transition from the entrance hall to the 16th-century east wing is similarly dramatic but, especially on the ground floor, the quality of the spaces in Gollds means that the change is perhaps less striking. The transition between the c.1840 extension and the c.1860 extension at the rear of the property is less obvious internally but there is a marked change as one moves into the well-lit modern extension to the west.

3.2.2.1 Entrance hall

The entrance hall on the ground floor of the 1811 extension is one of the most significant spaces in the building. It is of substantial aesthetic value and a definitive feature in the character of the building. The lancet-arched doorway contains a panelled 19th-century door with cinquefoil-panelled reveals and this is flanked by a matching pair of lancet windows with moulded cases and simple tracery creating two lights. This is mirrored on the single window above the main doorway. The carved tracery on the door to the lecture room references that on the front door.

Pevsner identified the staircase as an 18th-century staircase that had been reset, presumably on stylistic grounds, but this seems unlikely considering that the only pre-19th-century element of the building was Gollds, the stair tower of which would not have been wide enough to accommodate the bottom run of the current stair. The staircase is an attractive piece of joinery and a definitive feature in the character of the space. It has twist on vase balusters and a carved cornice to the treads. There is a vine leaf frieze running around the ceiling between cornice and picture rail, as well a central medallion supporting a modern electrolier. The cornice and frieze is reproduced beneath the first-floor balcony.

The outer curve of the original Gollds oven is preserved in the floor of the under-stair cupboard.

Figure 10. 10.1, left, the entrance hall looking southwards towards the front door. 10.2, right, the entrance hall looking upwards and northwards towards the staircase and ceiling. 10.3, bottom, the entrance hall looking northwards towards the main staircase
3.2.2.2 The board room and front reception room

The board room and front reception represent the original ground floor of Gollds, the 16th-century building which forms the core of Tubney House. The lobby between the entrance hall and these two rooms forms part of the original stair tower to Gollds and was decorated as part of the 1811 extension. This space includes segmental archways and of particular aesthetic significance is a moulded plaster arch with gold-painted studs which leads to a gothic overlight to the board room door.

The board room itself probably originally contained the main entrance to Gollds in its southernmost window. Apart from the modern floors, most of the internal decorations, which include an elaborate ceiling boss, shutters, and moulding, date from the 1811 expansion. The archway separating the southernmost bay from the rest of the room is probably the line of the original screens passage between the original entrance and the demolished stair tower.

The front reception room was also refurbished in 1811 and much of its internal decoration, including dados and the chimneypiece date from this. The chimneypiece has a central relief panel shown Diana the Huntress.

All these areas were subject to extensive refurbishment in 2002-4 but retain many of their historic elements. The decorative scheme is modern but retains elements of the pre-existing scheme, for instance the retention of gold detailing.

3.2.2.3 Lecture room

The lecture room on the ground floor forms the major part of the 1811 extension. This former library is dominated by three large lancet windows in carved settings on its southern wall. It is a plain though impressively-proportioned space. It has a simple cornice and a roundel in

Figure 11. 11.1, left, segmental archways in lobby of Gollds from north-eastern corner of entrance hall. 11.2, centre, ceiling boss in board room. 11.3, right, board room look northwest-wards
the ceiling. The chimneypiece has been replaced at some point but suits the room well. This room was probably saved from subdivision in 1951, which is fortunate as its aesthetic value comes more from its generous proportions and light character than any individual architectural elements. Its size is also of obvious practical value for an educational institution which hosts occasional conferences and lectures.

3.2.2.4 First-floor common room

The common room on the first floor is the twin of the lecture room on the ground floor. This area was originally a salon but was subdivided, probably in the second half of the 20th-century, when the western end of the room was cut off to form a dressing room and bathroom, with the main area then forming a master bedroom. The modern common room only has two windows on the southern wall, with the third window situated in the separated area to the west which now serves as a kitchenette. The wide sash windows were probably fitted in the 20th century, perhaps at the same time as the conversion of the western part of the room. The former dressing room at the western end of the room was converted into a kitchenette in 2002-4. There are two chimneypieces in the room with matching gothic tracery, the westernmost of which is in the subdivided area and has been boarded up. The gothic-traceried doors match those found on the ground floor.

---

Figure 13. 13.1, left, the eastern end of the first-floor common looking northwards. 13.2, centre, the chimney piece in the centre of the first-floor common room. 13.3, right, the westernmost sash window in the partitioned area at the western end of the space, looking southwards

Figure 14. 14.1, left the Director’s office looking south-westwards. 14.2, right, the Director’s office looking west-northwestwards

3.2.2.5 Director’s office and administrative spaces

The Director’s office and administrative offices occupy the first-floor of the original eastern wing of the building. This floor originally had two rooms, in line with the arrangement on the ground floor, but the northern room was subdivided probably c.1840, when the northern entrance was added due to the construction of the rear extension. The windows on the eastern walls of all three rooms were constructed in 1811. A vice stair was constructed between the
first and second floors in 1811 and this blocked the original entrance to the central room (now the Unit Manager’s office). This necessitated the construction of a new entrance from the stair lobby.

The stained glass in the lobby area blocks the original entrance from the 1811 secondary ground-to-first-floor stair, so was likely fitted when this stair was removed in c.1840.

The Director’s office in the southern part of this area contains the original 16th-century mullion and transoms on its southern window. The associated panelling on the southern wall also dates to the 16th century, though the panelling elsewhere dates to the 1811 refurbishment, as does the chimney piece (Figure 14).\(^{36}\) This room is of particular aesthetic significance.

### 3.2.2.6 Other spaces

The rear corridors date from the c.1840 extension and are generally attractive spaces, though of lower quality and less sensitive to change than the spaces in the earlier portions of the building. The servants’ bell is preserved at the eastern end of the ground floor. The c.1840 back stair at the eastern end of this area has fine newel posts and is a nice piece. The rooms in this area historically served as bedrooms and have been converted into offices and study bedrooms. On the ground floor, the former c.1840 kitchen room, later a scullery, once again serves as a kitchen and the c.1860 kitchen (which served as such until 2002) has been converted into WCs.

The second-floor areas of Gollds contain some significant features, such as the original purlins, which were sawn off when the roof was raised and are of some evidential value. The panelling in these areas dates from 1811, as do the windows on the eastern elevation. Elements of the window to the southern elevation of the southern room in this area date from the 16th century.

### 3.2.3 Outbuildings

Tubney House has various outbuildings of differing ages and levels of use and preservation. They predate 1945 in most cases and so are covered by the curtilage listing of the main building. The walled garden immediately to the west of the house is a pleasant space, though it is untended. The surrounding walls appear in their extant configuration in the 1870 OS map and were heavily repaired when the late 19th-century greenhouse was demolished in 2012.\(^{37}\) The 20th-century swimming pool to the west of the walled garden has fallen into disrepair and is of no significance.

The kennels immediately to the west of the 20th-century external toilet extension are simple outbuildings of no particular significance. Some elements of their outer walls may be contemporaneous to the 1811 kitchen extension, and a small building does appear in their location in the 1870 OS map, but they have been extensively rebuilt.

\(^{36}\) Ibid.

\(^{37}\) Map regression places the greenhouse to between 1870 and 1899.
Cottage One is located immediately to the north of the main house. At least elements of this are presumably the coach house described in the 1933 *The Times* advert. The portions of the building to the west of the coach house doors have been renewed at some point, possibly 2002. The dormer windows are not original and may date from 1976. The westernmost part of Cottage One extends into an area that externally visually appears to be part of the Panthera buildings. Cottage One has a sitting tenant and the interior was not available for the composition of this document.

The Panthera buildings were heavily repaired and converted in 2008, having previously been in a deplorable state of repair. They now house a modern building within the shell of the 19th-century barns, with a modern a link building between the two and a small modern extension at the eastern end of the northern building. The exterior elevations of the original elements

---

38 Supra n.18.
39 Planning applications 76/00244/FUL and 75/00237/FUL.
benefitted greatly from the recent alterations. The configuration of the original windows was retained, with existing opening reutilised throughout. Some additional windows were added in order to ensure that each bedroom had a window but these are narrow and discreet in appearance.

The Panthera buildings and Cottage One are stone-built historic structures of some aesthetic value; however, their greatest significance comes from their relationship with Tubney House itself. Both sets of buildings date to before 1870, when they appear on the OS maps for the area. They create the character of a yard and outbuildings which is commensurate with the status of the main house as a primarily-19th-century country estate.

The South Lodge plays a similar role, marking the southern boundary of the lands associated with the main house. The South Lodge also has a sitting tenant and the interior was not available for the composition of this document. Parts of this simple, attractive building may predate the 19th-century, as a building appears on this site in Gutteridge’s 1767 map. It is of extensive aesthetic value, contributing to the character of Tubney village and the Abingdon Road.

3.3 Archaeological Significance

As mentioned in Section 2.1, the mediaeval village of Tubney was located to the northeast of the current settlement and this area has been the subject of archaeological investigation. This area has shown signs of Mesolithic and Neolithic occupation, Roman burial, and the mediaeval settlement itself. An archaeological investigation has not been conducted at Tubney House itself or on the surrounding lands. It is probable that the Roman field system that was traceable at Tubney Manor Farm extends as far as the area around Tubney House. The area seems to have been the subject of rather early enclosure, so there is unlikely to be mediaeval settlement in the vicinity. Equally, the area has been extensively ploughed for several hundred years, which will have destroyed archaeological material closer to the surface. To the north of the house itself, there is a high probability that archaeological material related to the earlier and now-demolished outbuildings (as visible in early maps) is preserved.

There is some possibility that archaeological material, primarily related to pre-mediaeval periods in the fields and post-mediaeval period close to the house, is preserved on the site but insufficient archaeological investigation has been carried out to state this with any degree of certainty.

3.4 Historical Significance

The building is indicative of early enclosure in this part of what was Berkshire. Gollds’ original status as a probable hunting lodge was a result of the acquisition of this land by a single landlord. It also has some evidential value regarding the status of Magdalen College as a landowner in the early modern period.
3.5 **Social Significance**

Whilst the building has limited visual impact on Tubney village, it does have a relationship with the village. Its construction predates that of the village and it has always played a part in its development. It continues to play some part in village life, for instance providing occasional car-parking space for St. Lawrence’s Church.

The last private residents of Tubney House were Richard Miles and Briony Blackwell. Briony Blackwell’s ashes are scattered on the grounds, so it retains a great deal of significance for her loved ones.

3.6 **Functional Significance**

Tubney House and its outbuildings provide the base for WildCRU, the Wildlife Conservation Research Unit of the University of Oxford. The site was given to the university expressly for the use of WildCRU and associated institutions. The building could feasibly be used for most office uses but it is particularly appropriate for WildCRU because the field-based nature of much of its work and its lack of undergraduate teaching means that a central-Oxford location is not necessary. The field-based nature of its work also makes the availability of study bedrooms on the site particularly useful, allowing short-term accommodation to be offered to overseas-based staff on short visits.
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VULNERABILITIES
4 VULNERABILITIES

The ability of Tubney House to fulfil a contemporary function

The earliest portions of Tubney House were probably constructed as part of a hunting lodge but since at least the early 19th-century until 2002 (excepting the period 1941-62) the architectural alterations that occurred to the building have been related to making it a comfortable country home. The 2002-4 alterations were designed to allow it to serve as office accommodation but these were architecturally limited and had more to do with renovation after a long period of neglect (dating back through several occupants to at least the 1930s) and bringing the building in line with modern standards. WildCRU’s use of the building is particularly fitting as it utilises both the domestic nature of the original building and its potential for office usage. It could feasibly be returned to a residential usage or a more conventional office usage; however, historically domestic usages have not resulted in sufficient maintenance of the building and a more conventional office usage would likely require further alterations, notably sub-partitioning. The current usage funds the maintenance of the building whilst creating few substantial requirements for alteration.

The building is of substantial heritage significance but it is not a static monument and has been altered almost beyond recognition over its history. By remaining in use, the upkeep and conservation of the heritage asset is funded and its continued existence and significance ensured. Under the current usage, the significant areas are not threatened, and its listed status ensures that any further alterations operate within the constraints of an accepted understanding of the building’s significance as a heritage asset.

4.1 Accessibility

The ability of Tubney House to be accessed and enjoyed by anyone who has a legitimate right to use the building is central to its significance. The significance of the heritage asset is lessened if any person who wishes to legitimately use and enjoy the building is hampered in doing so by inadequate access provision. Access provision to Tubney House is typical of a building of its age. The area immediately in front of the main entrance can become muddy in rainy weather and would be difficult to manoeuvre with limited mobility. There is level access throughout the ground floor but turning spaces are rather tight and some doorways and circulation areas are narrow. There is a disabled lavatory on the ground floor. There is no level access to any of the upper floors. Stairs are fitted with handrails. The 19th-century servants’ stairs between the first and second floor are particularly narrow, though the modern stairs at the western end of the building are broader.

It is a pity that all users cannot navigate the building with equal opportunity. Lift access could conceivably be fitted in the 2002-4 western portion of the building without affecting the historic portions of the building.

The Panthera buildings are constructed on a single floor with a paved approach and level access, and include a disabled lavatory. Access to this part of the site is admirable.
4.2 Maintenance

4.2.1 External elevations and setting

The exterior elevations of Tubney House are amongst its most significant features. These have benefitted from rerendering in 2002-4. The render was likely first applied in 1811 in order to ease the transition between the original eastern wing and the first major extension. The uniform render visually ties together the whole exterior, which is of otherwise made up of disparate designs. It is lighter than the previous render, giving the building a less dour appearance. The exterior is visually in a fine condition. Historically there have been a high number of roof leaks, which have not always been repaired in a timely manner, and the 2002-4 refurbishment improved matters considerably. Some settlement occurred historically between the constituent parts of the building but this seems to have desisted. It was the aim of the 2002-4 refurbishments to make the building maintenance-free for a period of at least 5 years.

Figure 16.1, left, the external render on the building in 2002. Compare this to the extant render in the cover photograph. 16.2, right, the restored stonework of the Panthera buildings
In general the exterior of the building is in a good state of repair but this will require a continued good regime of maintenance to prevent historic problems resurfacing.

The outbuildings have also benefitted substantially from recent renovation and are in a good state of repair externally. The Panthera buildings, Cottage One, and the South Lodge remain in a good, clean state of repair. The garden wall has benefited from recent rebuilding. The walled garden itself is in an untended state as is the swimming pool. The approach to the building is a pleasant, tree-shaded journey past working fields.

4.2.2 Internal spaces

Tubney House contains various internal features of some aesthetic and illustrative significance. The 19th-century fireplaces are of some value as is the 16th-century panelling in the Director’s office and the 19th-century panelling throughout. The traceried doorways in the 1811 portion of the building are also of particular aesthetic value.

The interior has been redecorated with a generally bland institutional palate but some historic features have been picked up (for instance ceiling bosses) which lifts the character of the interior.

As the interior features are in regular use and of less permanent construction than the external structure of the building, they are vulnerable to vandalism, accidents, and general wear and tear. Some of these issues should be mitigated assuming adequate security and maintenance regimes are in place, but ultimately these significant elements will have limited lifespans. These lives can be lengthened as much as possible through regular, adequate monitoring and maintenance.

As a Grade-II-listed building, any alterations, or repairs made with non-original materials, will require listed building consent.

Figure 17. Historic details picked out in modern decorative scheme
5 CONSERVATION POLICY

Having established the significance of Tubney House as a heritage asset, and having identified ways in which the significance of Tubney House is vulnerable to harm, it is necessary to recommend policies to reduce the probability of such harm occurring, and thereby to conserve the significance of the site. In essence, these policies set parameters for managing the fabric of the site.

The Conservation Plan is intended to be an active tool for the regular maintenance and long-term management of Tubney House. It needs to be reviewed regularly, and revised as appropriate to take account of additional knowledge and changing priorities.

5.1 Tubney House continued use in a contemporary function is important to its continued significance. Permit, in line with NPPF paragraphs 131, 132, 133, and 134, alterations intended to facilitate its continued use in this way

The continued use of Tubney House in a contemporary function is important to its continued significance. It has undergone substantial renovation in recent years but in the future limited alterations may well be required to allow it to retain this significance in line with modern standards and requirements. If alteration is required in the future it should be permitted with the following provisos:

- Any alterations must be sympathetic to Tubney House’s significance as a heritage asset and, in line with NPPF paragraph 134, any proposals that involve ‘less than substantial harm to the significance’ should deliver ‘substantial public benefits.’ In line with NPPF paragraph 132, any proposals that involve ‘substantial harm or loss’ should be ‘wholly exceptional.’

- Any changes should: ‘…preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to or better reveal the significance of the asset’ (NPPF paragraph 137).

5.1.1 In order to ensure that Tubney House can operate to modern standards, and that its significance can be maintained by making access as wide as possible, special concern should be applied to ensuring that disabled access is adequate

Ensuring that the heritage asset can be enjoyed as widely as possible by those with a legitimate reason for doing so is central to its significance. As noted in Section 4.1, the accessibility of the building is hampered by its original design. There is level access to the ground floor but no level access to any of the upper floors.

Access will remain a concern in any plans developed for the site; a vigorous effort should be made to improve access to the site in any future plans, with the University seeking to exceed its statutory obligations and always viewing this as part of an ongoing process.
5.2 Note that Tubney House is a Grade-II-listed building and ensure that appropriate consents are obtained for works to the interior and exterior of the building

In order to ensure the heritage asset’s significance, alterations may be required in the future, and due to the listed status of the building, even minor routine repairs may need consent. Caution should be applied in order to ensure that any statutory duties are fulfilled. In cases of doubt Estates Services should be contacted in the first instance, and if necessary they will refer queries on to the Vale of White Horse District Council.

5.3 Ensure proper consultation in advance of any work to the building with the Local Authority conservation officer (through Estates Services) and any other interested parties

It is important to guarantee that the best advice is obtained at an early stage of any proposal to alter any part of the building in order to ensure that the significance of the building is respected.

5.4 Refer to this Conservation Plan when considering repairs or alterations in any space

The Conservation Plan gives an overview of which aspects of the building are significant or vulnerable. Where original or significant material is extant, repairs should be carried out using the same materials and techniques and should not affect the significance of the asset without providing substantial public benefits in line with NPPF paragraph 134.

5.5 Any alteration or redevelopment must respect the character of Tubney village and the surrounding area. The South Lodge in particular makes an important contribution to the character of this stretch of the Abingdon Road

Tubney House plays an important part in the character of Tubney village, which is arranged along its southern boundary. The South Lodge in particular makes a visual contribution to the character of the village. The various outbuildings that make up the site, including the Panthera buildings, Cottage One, and the 19th-century garden walls, have a complementary relationship with the main house which should be maintained. Any plans for alterations should take into account the relationship between the listed buildings within this significant group.

5.6 Conservation of specific factors contributing to overall significance

Tubney House possesses various external and internal features of some significance (Sections 3.1 and 3.2). An effort should be made to identify and conserve original or significant architectural features and keep these in use where possible in line with Section 5.1; however, it is accepted that all materials have a natural lifespan and some degree of change must be permitted to keep the building safe, usable, and generally fit for function. Some material will have a very long life expectancy if given routine maintenance; others are impermanent and may need periodic replacement. Within the framework of understanding and valuing what is present in the building a degree of ongoing change is inevitable.
5.6.1 The southern, eastern, and northern elevations of Tubney House will remain substantially unaltered. Any minor alterations that are planned will only be undertaken with a full understanding of and respect for its significance and the contribution it makes to its setting.

The external elevations are amongst the most significant elements of the main house. The southern elevation is made up primarily of a combination of the original 16th-century façade of the eastern wing and the 1811 façade of the main house, providing a rather stark contrast. The 20th-century porch on the 1811 façade is the feature least sensitive to change and, discounting practical considerations, its removal would have the potential for enhancing the visual impact of the façade by revealing the gothic doorway.

The eastern elevation is entirely the 16th-century eastern wing but this was substantially altered at the same time as the 1811 extension, with the construction of the majority of its windows.

The northern façade is similar to the southern façade in that it is made up of the 16th-century eastern wing and a 19th-century extension. The curved tower eases the transition between the original wing and the c.1840 extension and the c.1861 extension at the western end references the eastern wing with its crenulated parapet.

The western elevation has been the most affected by modern alteration and little historical material remains exposed, meaning this area is the least sensitive to change.

In all cases the elevations are made of a combination of styles and periods which hold together relatively well. The uniform render eases the transitions between different elements.

If alterations are considered in the future these should be undertaken only in the context of this significance and in line with Section 5.1 and 5.1.1.

5.6.3 Any alterations to be made to the interior spaces of Tubney House will respect the significance of both the individual elements and the building as a whole.

The internal spaces of the building contain various items which contribute positively to the character of the building as a whole, most notably retained fireplaces, skirting, dados, and cornice moulding, and historic joinery, such as stairs, windows, window settings, and doors. Floor coverings are for the most part modern additions, with the 20th-century flooring on the ground-floor having been strengthened in 2002.

Any internal alterations planned in the future should only be undertaken with a full understanding and respect for the character of the internal spaces in line with Section 5.1 and 5.1.1.
5.6.3.1 Any alterations to be made to the entrance hall will respect the significance of both the individual elements and the building as a whole

This is one of the most significant spaces in the building and the defining space of the 1811 extension. No major alterations should be expected in this space and the doors, windows, stairs, landings, cornices, friezes, and any other moulding should all remain substantially unaltered.

Any alterations planned in the future should be incredibly limited in scope and should only be undertaken with a full understanding and respect for the character of this space in line with Section 5.1 and 5.1.1.

5.6.3.2 Any alterations to be made to the board room and front reception room will respect the significance of both the individual elements and the building as a whole

These spaces make up the ground floor of the original 16\textsuperscript{th}-century portion of the building, though their internal features are attributable to the work undertaken during the 1811 extension. The 1811 chimneypiece in the front reception is of some aesthetic significance as is the roundel on the ceiling of the board room.

Any alterations planned in the future should only be undertaken with a full understanding and respect for the character of this space in line with Section 5.1 and 5.1.1.

5.6.3.3 Any alterations to be made to the lecture room will respect the significance of both the individual elements and the building as a whole

The ground-floor lecture room was constructed as the library of the 1811 extension and is the main ground-floor space in the building. The windows are central to the character of the space. There is a probably-20\textsuperscript{th}-century chimneypiece of some aesthetic value but there is little other historical material in the space. It is of lower significance than the entrance hall but its status as a single large space, as it is represented externally, is of some importance to the layout of the building.

Any alterations planned in the future should only be undertaken with a full understanding and respect for the character of this space in line with Section 5.1 and 5.1.1.

5.6.3.4 Any alterations to be made to the first-floor common room will respect the significance of both the individual elements and the building as a whole

The first-floor common room was subdivided at some point in the 20\textsuperscript{th}-century. The removal of the partitions at the western end of the room would not detract from the character of the space. It benefits from an attractive chimneypiece and a gothic panelled doorway to the first-floor landing to the entrance hall.

Any alterations planned in the future should only be undertaken with a full understanding and respect for the character of this space in line with Section 5.1 and 5.1.1.
5.6.3.5 Any alterations to be made to the Director’s office and administrative offices will respect the significance of both the individual elements and the building as a whole

These form the first floor of the original wing of the building. As with the ground floor, these were substantially affected by the 1811 extension, notably with the reconfiguration of their original entrances and the introduction of new windows and panelling. The panelling on the southern wall of the Director’s office is the original 16th-century panelling. The stained-glass window in the first-floor lobby may well date to the removal of the 1811 secondary staircase during the construction of the c.1840 rear extension.

Any alterations planned in the future should only be undertaken with a full understanding and respect for the character of this space in line with Section 5.1 and 5.1.1.

5.6.3.6 Any alterations to be made in the rear spaces, including the kitchen and study bedrooms, will respect the significance of both the individual elements and the building as a whole

These rear spaces include the second-floor of the 16th-century east wing and the remaining elements of the c.1840 and c.1861 extensions. The second-floor of the east wing is of higher significance than the rear spaces in the 19th-century extension, which are in turn of lesser significance than the other areas of the house. The secondary staircase is a pleasant piece of joinery which is typical of its age. As a whole these are pleasant spaces which are interesting in their contrast from the more-elaborate front-of-house spaces. The modern extension at the western end of the building is not significant excepting in how it relates to the older portions of the house.

Any alterations planned in the future should only be undertaken with a full understanding and respect for the character of this space in line with Section 5.1 and 5.1.1.

5.6.4 Any alterations which affect the outbuildings, including the Panthera buildings, Cottage One, the garden walls, and the South Lodge will respect the significance of both the individual elements and the building as a whole

South Lodge is the most significant outbuilding, having an important visual impact on Tubney village. The Panthera buildings and Cottage One are attractive buildings which enhance the setting of Tubney House. This is also the case for the garden walls and kennels.

Any alterations planned in the future should only be undertaken with a full understanding and respect for the character of this space in line with Section 5.1 and 5.1.1.
5.7 In conformity with NPPF paragraph 110, efforts should be made to ensure that Tubney House contribution to climate change is as minimal as is feasible for a building of its age, size, materials, and use. Any proposals for alterations should assess the feasibility of incorporating low and zero carbon technologies.

Ensuring that the building is sustainable will be crucial to its long-term survival and significance. As stated in NPPF paragraph 110, development should seek to ‘minimise pollution and other adverse effects on the local and natural environment.’

5.8 If during any subsequent renovations or alterations any excavation work is carried out beneath Tubney House, an archaeological assessment will be made of the potential for significant finds, and if appropriate an archaeologist will be given a watching brief as excavation takes place.

It is possible that there is significant archaeological material preserved beneath Tubney House and the surrounding grounds (see Section 3.3). Should any excavation work be carried out in this area, an assessment of the archaeological potential should be made. This should include at least a desk-based assessment, but possibly geophysics and trial trenching. A watching brief will almost certainly be required for any excavation.

5.9 A good practice of routine recording, investigation, and maintenance will be enacted and sustained. Such an approach will minimise the need for larger repairs or other interventions and will usually represent the most economical way of maintaining an asset.

5.9.1 Estates Services (or its agents) will ensure that a senior member of staff has responsibility for the administration and recording of a routine maintenance programme for the building.

All buildings need to routinely be maintained if they are to stay in good condition. This requires a detailed maintenance programme and, critically, someone who is responsible for ensuring that routine operations are carried out. A proper record of the repair and maintenance work in a maintenance log is a useful management tool. Such information will be recorded in the estates management software package Planon.

5.9.2 The Conservation Plan will be circulated to all senior staff who work in Tubney House and to all other members of the University who have responsibility for the building.

The value of the heritage asset needs to be appreciated by all senior staff managing or working in the building. Only in this way will the heritage asset be properly treated, repaired, and maintained.

5.9.3 The Conservation Plan will be made available to the Vale of White Horse District Council, English Heritage, and any other party with legitimate interest in the building.

The Conservation Plan is intended to be a useful document to inform all parties with a legitimate interest in the building.
5.10 The Conservation Plan will be reviewed and updated from time to time as work is carried out on the building or as circumstances change. The recommendations should be reviewed at least at five-yearly intervals

Policy changes, building alterations, or other changes of circumstance, will affect the conservation duties and requirements of the building. The policy recommendations in the Conservation Plan will inform the future of the building and should be a useful tool for people carrying out maintenance work or where more significant alterations are being considered. The recommendations need to be kept up to date if they are to remain relevant.
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APPENDICES

Appendix 1  Listed Building Description

List Entry Summary

This building is listed under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended for its special architectural or historic interest.

Name: TUBNEY HOUSE

List Entry Number: 1368570

Location

TUBNEY HOUSE

The building may lie within the boundary of more than one authority.

County: Oxfordshire
District: Vale of White Horse
District Type: District Authority
Parish: Fyfield and Tubney

National Park: Not applicable to this List entry.

Grade: II

Date first listed: 06-Jul-1987

Date of most recent amendment: Not applicable to this List entry.

_____________________

Legacy System Information

The contents of this record have been generated from a legacy data system.

Legacy System: LBS

UID: 249577

_____________________

Asset Groupings

Tubney House, Oxfordshire
Conservation Plan, February 2014
This List entry does not comprise part of an Asset Grouping. Asset Groupings are not part of the official record but are added later for information.

---

**List Entry Description**

**Summary of Building**

Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

**Reasons for Designation**

Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

**History**

Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

**Details**

FYFIELD AND TUBNEY TUBNEY
SU4398
13/79 Tubney House

- II

House. Early C17: remodelled and extended in early C19. Walls stuccoed as imitation stone ashlar; hipped and gabled Welsh slate roofs; numerous brick stacks. C17 L-plan remodelled as early C19 double-depth plan. Early C19 Gothick Revival style. 2 storeys; 5-window range. Early C19 two-storey canted bay right of centre has early C20 porch added to front of tall pointed-arched early C19 Gothick style panelled door, and hood moulds over Gothick windows with 2-light casements. Gabled front of outer bay has early C17 three-light ovolo-moulded stone-mullioned attic window and crenellated and canted early C19 two-storey bay which has similar early C17 mullioned and transomed window over early C19 six-pane sash. 3-window range to left of entry has hood-moulds over 8-pane sashes, and pointed-arched French windows on ground floor. Crenellated parapet carried across front. Right side wall of 3-storey, 3-window range: label moulds over sashes. Rear elevation: has 6-pane sashes, and gabled outer bays of which the right bay has label moulds over 6-pane sashes and adjoins early C19 semi-circular bay with stone chamfered doorway, 2-light chamfered stone-mullioned windows and one splayed lights. Interior: cellars have two C17 chamfered and step-to-ogee-stopped beams (partly rotten). Hall: cinquefoil-panelled reveals to front door, and Gothick-style panelled doors. Early C19 staircase (c.1720-30), with fine iron-twist on vase balusters, was reset in early C19 as straight-run stair rising to balcony. Segmental-arched entries to lobby and rooms on right. Room to right has early C19 fireplace with
Diana the Huntress carving, and a cased beam. Room to rear of this, entered through 6-panelled door with Gothick overlight and plasterwork arch, has fine plaster boss in ceiling. First floor has early C19 panelled doors, some with Gothick traceried heads, early C18 (c.1720-30) fireplace and panelling to right, and Gothick fireplace over drawing room to left. Early C19 king-post roof. (Buildings of England: Berkshire, p.243).

Listing NGR: SU4347398872

Selected Sources

1. **Book Reference** - **Author**: Pevsner, N - **Title**: The Buildings of England: Berkshire - **Date**: 1966 - **Page References**: 243

Map

**National Grid Reference: SU 43473 98872**

The below map is for quick reference purposes only and may not be to scale. For a copy of the full scale map, please see the attached PDF - [1368570.pdf](#)

© Crown Copyright and database right 2012. All rights reserved. Ordnance Survey Licence number 100019088.
© British Crown and SeaZone Solutions Limited 2011. All rights reserved. Licence number 102006.006.

This copy shows the entry on 19-Feb-2014 at 08:40:12.
## Appendix 2  
### Chronology of Tubney House

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>965</td>
<td>Tubney was included in 50 hides at Marcham granted to Abingdon Abbey</td>
<td>Brooks (1984) 123; VCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1479</td>
<td>Magdalen College receives the manor of Tubney from Sir John Lenham alias Plummer</td>
<td>Maguire (2003), VCH Berkshire IV.379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1537/8</td>
<td>Edmund Feteplace of Besilles Lee, Berkshire, disputes ownership of land in Besilles Lee and Tubney with Magdalen. Feteplace receives land in both places and Magdalen is awarded a building called Gollds, along with other lands and the manor in Tubney. Gollds is probably the earliest part of the extant manor house and may have been constructed as a hunting lodge. Maguire posits that contemporary building design would suggest that the original entrance would be on the eastern side of what is now the ground-floor board room</td>
<td>Maguire (2003) based on Magdalen College archives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1761</td>
<td>John Roque’s <em>A Topographical Map of the County of Berkshire</em> shows a block form of the house. This shows only the easternmost part of the house (and 2 sets of outbuildings) and shows the modern field boundaries largely intact. A similar layout is shown in John Gutteridge’s 1767 map of the manor of Tubney</td>
<td>Maguire (2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1790</td>
<td>The cast iron bell is fitted in the northern tower</td>
<td>Maguire (2003), date marked on bell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1810-38</td>
<td>A Mr. Lockhart pays the fine on the house from 1810 to 1838. Mrs. Mary Marriott Greenwollers leased the nearby Tubney Farm and associated lands from Magdalen College in 1828 and her lease was renewed in 1835 and 1842</td>
<td>Maguire (2003) based on Magdalen College archives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1811</td>
<td>The tenant, Mr. Lockhart, spends c.£1,200 on alterations to Tubney House</td>
<td>Maguire (2003) based on Magdalen College archives ES/2/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>Joseph Dymock’s plan of the estate shows the house greatly expanded as well as expanded outbuildings to the northwest</td>
<td>Maguire (2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845-73</td>
<td>Mr. Jas Kimber held the lease to the house</td>
<td>Maguire (2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845</td>
<td>Based on a comparison of the 1841 and 1857 maps, Maguire surmises that the expansion of the house may have occurred c.1845 in order to modernise the building upon Kimber’s occupation. This involves the construction of a new kitchen and servant’s hall, with the modern board room being converted from a parlour into a dining room. A servery is constructed serving the new dining room in the form of the modern plant room and the northern tower. The first and second floors of the original, eastern wing (Gollds) are divided into three rooms each</td>
<td>Maguire (2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>Magdalen College’s plan of the site describes it as the ‘House, Gardens, Orchard and Pleasure Grounds at Tubney Berks belonging to Mr. Jas Kimber under Mag College Oxford occupied by Col. Hall 1857.’ The plan shows a similarly expanded house as the 1841 plan,</td>
<td>Magdalen College archives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td>The 1866 Ordnance Survey map of Oxford shows Tubney House labelled as such and showing it as a double-pile plan</td>
<td>Maguire (2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>Magdalen College takes the lease in hand</td>
<td>Maguire (2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>The farm is leased to a Mr. Walker and the House to a Miss Walsh</td>
<td>Maguire (2003) based on Magdalen College archives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>Colonel Dr. G.C. Bourne takes up a lease on the house</td>
<td>MCA B/EST/9/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>Colonel Bourne died in 1932 and his executors gave notice on his lease in March 1933, it ending on 29th September 1933</td>
<td>MCA B/EST/9/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>The small block at the western end of the main building was in place by this point, when it served as the rear wall to a conservatory</td>
<td>Maguire (2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>The electric light installation and wiring is updated</td>
<td>MCA B/EST/9/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>Capt. K.C. McDougal signs his first lease on the building. Various works are undertaken on the building at the start of his tenancy. This includes various repairs, new WCs, and new doorways. A bedroom is converted into a bathroom</td>
<td>MCA B/EST/9/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1935</td>
<td>The attic stairs are repaired</td>
<td>MCA B/EST/9/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>Capt. K.C. McDougal signs his second lease on the building and this includes the a clause stating that Magdalen College will lay on mains water to the building when it reaches the village</td>
<td>MCA B/EST/9/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>Capt. K.C. McDougal demolishes, with Magdalen’s permission, the small summer house at the southwest corner of the lawn</td>
<td>MCA B/EST/9/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>The piping around the conservatory is leaking and is replaced at Magdalen’s expense. This has since been demolished</td>
<td>MCA B/EST/9/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Hounds are no longer kept at the house and their kennels are converted back to stabling, with lead piping and water laid on</td>
<td>MCA B/EST/9/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1940</td>
<td>The house is requisitioned by the RAF until 27th January 1941</td>
<td>MCA B/EST/9/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1941-September 1946</td>
<td>The house is again requisitioned by the RAF (with Capt. McDougal (Major by the end of the War) being called up and Mrs. McDougal moving initially into North Lodge, until both lodges are requisitioned and she moves to Kingston Lisle near Wantage). The building is not derequisitioned until 29th September 1946 and the McDougals’ never return in the end</td>
<td>MCA B/EST/9/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christmas 1946</td>
<td>Miss L.E. Gisborne takes over the house at around Christmas 1946 with plans to convert it into a kindergarten school called St. Nicholas</td>
<td>MCA ACC 02/09/34/1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>Various works are undertaken the building’s conversion to St. Nicholas School, this includes substantial repairs to the roof and chimneys, a new doorway between the kitchen (the easternmost modern ground-floor toilets). It is possible that it is at this point that the 20th-century addition to the west of the 1811 extension is converted into a kitchen (as a WC is converted into a kitchen and a serving hatch is constructed from the Butler’s Pantry)</td>
<td>MCA ACC 02/09/34/1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>13 power points are installed in the building in December</td>
<td>MCA ACC 02/09/34/1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Substantial repair work and redecoration is carried out in the South Lodge. A new bathroom is fitted, with an external door being blocked up to form two casement windows to the bathroom</td>
<td>MCA ACC 02/09/34/1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948-50</td>
<td>The stables are converted into a cowshed for 12 cows and a dairy is constructed in the adjacent building. This could refer to the barns now used as the Panthera</td>
<td>MCA ACC 02/09/34/1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>L.E. Gisborne wishes to partition the drawing room. It would seem from her letter that she is referring here to the library/lecture room</td>
<td>MCA ACC 02/09/34/1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Magdalen College sells the post office the strip of land upon which the telephone repeater station is now located</td>
<td>OUA LA 2/126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>L.E. Gisborne installs an Agamatic boiler at her own expense. This may have been the Aga in place when the university acquired the building in 2002</td>
<td>MCA ACC 02/09/34/1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>L.E. Gisborne installs a toilet in the South Lodge at her own expense</td>
<td>MCA ACC 02/09/34/1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>The estates bursar at Magdalen College notes the building is in too poor estate to ever be used for residential purposes again, as the cost of the necessary work would be far too high</td>
<td>MCA ACC 02/09/34/1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Mr. and Mrs. Richard Blackwell purchase the house from Magdalen College. The sale includes a covenant that they will not build on the frontage of the house without the college’s permission</td>
<td>Conveyance in the University Archives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Planning permission is refused for dwelling for staff accommodation</td>
<td>Planning application 72/00137/OUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Planning permission is granted for the addition of two bedrooms and a bathroom in the roof space. This may refer to Cottage One</td>
<td>Planning applications 76/00244/FUL and 75/00237/FUL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Maguerite Brook Blackwell conveys Tubney House, including all lands and holdings, to Richard Miles Blackwell</td>
<td>OUA LA 2/126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Planning permission is granted for the change of use of the building from a dwelling to research office accommodation</td>
<td>Planning application 02/01521/FUL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Planning permission is granted for extensions and alterations. This is in reference to the works related to Wild CRU’s occupation of the building</td>
<td>Planning application 03/00822/FUL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Listed building consent is granted for the conversion of the barns and the erection of the link corridor between them in order to form the Panthera</td>
<td>Planning application 08/01348/FUL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>The greenhouse in the garden is demolished</td>
<td>ESA; planning application 11/10500/LBC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4  Checklist of Significant Features

This checklist is intended for the use of those working or planning work on the site or buildings. It highlights features of architectural significance within Tubney House; these may be original features or new additions that nevertheless contribute positively to the character of the building. As this is a Grade-II-listed building any repair or alteration work to factors that contribute to the significance of the building will require listed building consent in order to avoid prosecution under the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act, 1990. If planned work will likely affect any of the aspects featured in the list below advice should immediately be sought from the Building Conservation Team at Estates Services.

The checklist lists both general significant features that affect the building as a whole and which should be held in mind if working in any space, and specific features of particular significance that should receive special regard if working in these particular spaces. The Further Information column refers to the relevant page reference in the Conservation Plan proper.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tubney House, Building # 391</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SIGNIFICANT FEATURE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External elevations, chimneys, and roof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows in historic portions of building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joinery and panelling throughout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moulding throughout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main staircase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fireplaces throughout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior elevations of outbuildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specific Features:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Elevations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- External render</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Hood moulds throughout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mullions and transoms on eastern wing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Carved tracery on 1811 wing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Crenulated parapets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Moulded string courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Roofs throughout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Chimneys throughout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Bell on northern tower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Tower on southern elevation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Gothic panelled doors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Sash windows throughout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Casement windows in eastern wing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Main staircase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Landing in entrance hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Moulded frieze, cornice, and roundel in entrance hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Plaster moulded pilasters and arches in lobby to eastern wing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Panelling in eastern wing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Moulded plaster in board room including roundel and cornice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Chimneypiece in front reception room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Chimneypiece in lecture room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Windows in lecture room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Tiling in rear passage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Eastern secondary staircase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Stained glass on landing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Chimneypiece in Director’s office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Chimneypiece in common room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outbuildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Garden walls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-External walls of Panthera buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-External walls of Cottage One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-External elevations of South Lodge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The internal spaces of Cottage One and the South Lodge have sitting tenants and were not accessible for the composition of this document. As a consequence, they are not covered in this checklist.

PRIOR TO UNDERTAKING ANY REPAIRS OR ALTERATIONS ON THE ABOVE-LISTED ARCHITECTURAL FEATURES, CONTACT THE CONSERVATION TEAM AT ESTATES SERVICES ON (01865) (2)78750
Appendix 5  Floor plans

7.5.1  Basement Plan
7.5.2 Ground-floor Plan
7.5.3 First-floor Plan
7.5.4 Second-floor Plan